

Care Quality Commission

Inspection Evidence Table

Greens Norton Medical Centre (1-558982420)

Inspection date: 22 January 2020

Date of data download: 21 January 2020

Overall rating: Good

Please note: Any Quality Outcomes Framework (QOF) data relates to 2018/19.

Safe

Rating: Requires Improvement

The rating for this key question has moved from Good to Requires Improvement due to concerns with the cold chain, medicines storage, recruitment checks and staff vaccinations as detailed below.

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 took account of patients accessing any online services.	Yes
Policies and procedures were monitored, reviewed and updated.	Yes
Partners and staff were trained to appropriate levels for their role.	Yes
There was active and appropriate engagement in local safeguarding processes.	Yes
The Out of Hours service was informed of relevant safeguarding information.	Yes
There were systems to identify vulnerable patients on record.	Yes
Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks were undertaken where required.	Yes
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 such as health visitors, school nurses, community midwives and social workers to support and protect adults and children at risk of significant harm.	Yes

Recruitment systems

Y/N/Partial

Recruitment checks were carried out in accordance with regulations (including for agency staff and locums).	No ¹
Staff vaccination was maintained in line with current Public Health England (PHE) guidance if relevant to role.	Partial ²
There were systems to ensure the registration of clinical staff (including nurses and pharmacists) was checked and regularly monitored.	Yes
<p>Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:</p> <p>1. We found that some staff did not have the required references and that these had not been obtained prior to them commencing their employment at the practice. The practice manager undertook to obtain these following our inspection and provided evidence that this had been done.</p> <p>2. We were informed that the practice used a third-party organisation to ensure that staff had the required vaccinations. However, the practice held no records of these themselves and there was no evidence to demonstrate how the practice were assured that these had been done.</p>	

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: December 2019	Yes
There was a record of equipment calibration. Date of last calibration: 09/08/2019	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: November 2019	Yes
There was a log of fire drills. Date of last drill: 11/09/2019	Yes
There was a record of fire alarm checks. Date of last check: 15/11/2019	Yes
There was a record of fire training for staff. Date of last training: 13/01/2020	Yes
There were fire marshals.	Yes
A fire risk assessment had been completed. Date of completion: 10/04/2019	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: 13/01/2020	Yes
Health and safety risk assessments had been carried out and appropriate actions taken. Date of last assessment: 13/01/2020	Yes

Infection prevention and control

Appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene were met.

	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: 14/01/2020	Yes
The practice had acted on any issues identified in infection prevention and control audits.	Yes
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.	Yes
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: The practice had a program of renovations in place which included replacing the carpeted flooring in the consultation rooms.	

Risks to patients

There were adequate systems to assess, monitor and manage risks to patient safety.

	Y/N/Partial
There was an effective approach to managing staff absences and busy periods.	Yes
There was an effective induction system for temporary staff tailored to their role.	Yes
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.	Yes
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
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: There were good systems in place to enable staff to look for and manage people who may have required urgent medical attention.	

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 did not have systems for the appropriate and safe use of medicines, including medicines optimisation

Indicator	Practice	CCG average	England average	England comparison
Number of antibacterial prescription items prescribed per Specific Therapeutic group Age-sex Related Prescribing Unit (STAR PU) (01/10/2018 to 30/09/2019) <small>(NHS Business Service Authority - NHSBSA)</small>	0.88	0.95	0.87	No statistical variation
The number of prescription items for co-amoxiclav, cephalosporins and quinolones as a percentage of the total number of prescription items for selected antibacterial drugs (BNF 5.1 sub-set). (01/10/2018 to 30/09/2019) <small>(NHSBSA)</small>	8.7%	7.8%	8.5%	No statistical variation
Average daily quantity per item for Nitrofurantoin 50 mg tablets and capsules, Nitrofurantoin 100 mg m/r capsules, Pivmecillinam 200 mg tablets and Trimethoprim 200 mg tablets prescribed for uncomplicated urinary tract infection (01/04/2019 to 30/09/2019) <small>(NHSBSA)</small>	6.40	6.04	5.60	No statistical variation
Average daily quantity of oral NSAIDs prescribed per Specific Therapeutic Group Age-sex Related Prescribing Unit (STAR-PU) (01/04/2019 to 30/09/2019) <small>(NHSBSA)</small>	1.52	2.11	2.08	No statistical variation

Medicines management	Y/N/Partial
The practice ensured medicines were stored safely and securely with access restricted to authorised staff.	No ¹
Blank prescriptions were kept securely and their use monitored in line with national guidance.	Yes
Staff had the appropriate authorisations to administer medicines (including Patient Group Directions or Patient Specific Directions).	Yes
The practice could demonstrate the prescribing competence of non-medical prescribers, and there was regular review of their prescribing practice supported by clinical supervision or peer review.	No ²
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
If the practice had controlled drugs on the premises there were appropriate systems and written procedures for the safe ordering, receipt, storage, administration, balance checks and disposal of these medicines, which were in line with national guidance.	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.	Yes
Vaccines were appropriately stored, monitored and transported in line with PHE guidance to ensure they remained safe and effective.	No ³
<p>Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We found that some of the medicines in the dispensary had not been stored safely due to fridge temperatures not being adequately monitored and acted upon. We found periods of time in both the main location, Greens Norton and at the branch location, Weedon when the fridge temperature indicated that these medicines were not being stored safely. We raised this with the provider who had been unaware of these high temperature readings. Immediate steps were taken following our inspection to ensure that medicines were reviewed and that they were safe to be administered. 2. We found a lack of adequate clinical oversight and monitoring for the non-medical prescribers at the practice to ensure they were prescribing in line with recommended guidance. We raised this during our inspection and the provider assured us that this was something they would start doing. Although we saw that some supervisions took place, this was not consistent. 3. We found the fridge which stored the vaccines at the branch location, Weedon, had temperature recordings which were unsafe dating back to January 2018 through to 6 December 2019. No action had been taken to address the high temperature readings and the provider was unable to demonstrate that these vaccines had been safely stored. The practice took immediate steps to address this following our inspection. The practice manager had been unaware of the temperature readings prior to our inspection. Steps were taken by the relevant agencies following our inspection to review any potential harm to patients as a result of this and to review if any patients needed to be recalled. 	

Dispensary services (where the practice provided a dispensary service)	Y/N/Partial
There was a GP responsible for providing effective leadership for the dispensary.	Yes
The practice had clear Standard Operating Procedures which covered all aspects of the dispensing process, were regularly reviewed, and a system to monitor staff compliance.	Yes
Dispensary staff who worked unsupervised had received appropriate training and regular checks of their competency.	Yes
Prescriptions were signed before medicines were dispensed and handed out to patients. There was a risk assessment or surgery policy for exceptions such as acute prescriptions.	Yes
Medicines stock was appropriately managed and disposed of, and staff kept appropriate records.	Partial ¹
Medicines that required refrigeration were appropriately stored, monitored and transported in line with the manufacturer's recommendations to ensure they remained safe and effective.	No ²
If the dispensary provided medicines in Monitored Dosage Systems, there were systems to ensure staff were aware of medicines that were not suitable for inclusion in such packs, and appropriate information was supplied to patients about their medicines.	Yes
If the practice offered a delivery service, this had been risk assessed for safety, security, confidentiality and traceability.	Yes
Dispensing incidents and near misses were recorded and reviewed regularly to identify themes and reduce the chance of reoccurrence.	Yes
Information was provided to patients in accessible formats for example, large print labels, braille, information in a variety of languages etc.	Yes
There was the facility for dispensers to speak confidentially to patients and protocols described the process for referral to clinicians.	Yes
<p>Explanation of any answers and other comments on dispensary services:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We found stocks of controlled drugs which had not been destroyed in a timely manner or as soon as possible, in accordance with recommended guidance. We found medicines from May 2019 in the controlled drugs cabinet which were awaiting destruction. The Standard Operating Procedures around this required review. 2. Fridge temperatures were being recorded, however, action was not being taken when readings were out of range, putting patients at risk of harm. The provider took immediate steps to address this following our inspection. 	

Track record on safety and lessons learned and improvements made

The practice learned and made improvements when things went wrong.

Significant events	Y/N/Partial
The practice monitored and reviewed safety using information from a variety of sources.	Yes
Staff knew how to identify and report concerns, safety incidents and near misses.	Yes
There was a system for recording and acting on significant events.	Yes
Staff understood how to raise concerns and report incidents both internally and externally.	Yes
There was evidence of learning and dissemination of information.	Partial
Number of events recorded in last 12 months:	18
Number of events that required action:	18
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: Significant events were recorded separately for each practice site, of which there were two, and the dispensary. Although these were being recorded and action taken as needed, there was a lack of oversight to review these for themes and trends. We discussed this with the practice manager who agreed that this could be improved upon.	

Examples of significant events recorded and actions by the practice.

Event	Specific action taken
Prescribing error	Patient contacted, apology given and medicines re-prescribed.
Near miss – medicines incorrectly dispensed	Patient contacted. Significant event meeting held. Changes made within the dispensary to assist staff in the dispensing process.

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

Effective

Rating: Good

Effective needs assessment, care and treatment

Patients' needs were assessed, and care and treatment was delivered in line with current legislation, standards and evidence-based guidance supported by clear pathways and tools.

	Y/N/Partial
The practice had systems and processes to keep clinicians up to date with current evidence-based practice.	Yes
Patients' immediate and ongoing needs were fully assessed. This included their clinical needs and their mental and physical wellbeing.	Yes
Patients presenting with symptoms which could indicate serious illness were followed up in a timely and appropriate way.	Yes
We saw no evidence of discrimination when staff made care and treatment decisions.	Yes
Patients' treatment was regularly reviewed and updated.	Yes
There were appropriate referral pathways to make sure that patients' needs were addressed.	Yes
Patients were told when they needed to seek further help and what to do if their condition deteriorated.	Yes
The practice used digital services securely and effectively and conformed to relevant digital and information security standards.	Yes

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) (01/10/2018 to 30/09/2019) <small>(NHSBSA)</small>	0.95	0.73	0.74	No statistical variation

Older people

Population group rating: Good

Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The practice used a clinical tool to identify older patients who were living with moderate or severe frailty. Those identified received a full assessment of their physical, mental and social needs. The practice had developed a template to assist on admission to hospital for older patients. 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 who

had a named, accountable GP.

- Flu, shingles and pneumonia vaccinations were offered to relevant patients in this age group.

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 suspected hypertension were offered ambulatory blood pressure monitoring.
- 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 (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) <small>(QOF)</small>	86.2%	82.6%	79.3%	No statistical variation
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	14.2% (110)	17.5%	12.8%	N/A
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 (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) <small>(QOF)</small>	73.7%	79.5%	78.1%	No statistical variation
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	5.8% (45)	11.2%	9.4%	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 (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) <small>(QOF)</small>	80.3%	82.2%	81.3%	No statistical variation
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	11.0% (85)	14.6%	12.7%	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 (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) <small>(QOF)</small>	74.1%	77.1%	75.9%	No statistical variation
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	1.4% (14)	9.9%	7.4%	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 (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) <small>(QOF)</small>	95.2%	92.4%	89.6%	Tending towards variation (positive)
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	6.2% (18)	14.9%	11.2%	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 (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) (QOF)	85.5%	84.6%	83.0%	No statistical variation
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	2.4% (63)	4.4%	4.0%	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 (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) (QOF)	94.5%	93.4%	91.1%	No statistical variation
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	3.6% (12)	4.4%	5.9%	N/A

Families, children and young people

Population group rating: Good

Findings

- The practice has met the minimum 90% target for all childhood immunisation uptake indicators. The practice has met the WHO based national target of 95% (the recommended standard for achieving herd immunity) for all childhood immunisation uptake indicators.
- 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), Hepatitis B (Hep B) ((i.e. three doses of DTaP/IPV/Hib/HepB) (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) (NHS England)	115	118	97.5%	Met 95% WHO based target
The percentage of children aged 2 who have received their booster immunisation for Pneumococcal infection (i.e. received Pneumococcal booster) (PCV booster) (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) (NHS England)	115	118	97.5%	Met 95% WHO based target
The percentage of children aged 2 who have received their immunisation for Haemophilus influenza type b (Hib) and Meningitis C (MenC) (i.e. received Hib/MenC booster) (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) (NHS England)	115	118	97.5%	Met 95% WHO based target
The percentage of children aged 2 who have received immunisation for measles, mumps and rubella (one dose of MMR) (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) (NHS England)	115	118	97.5%	Met 95% WHO based target

Note: Please refer to the CQC guidance on Childhood Immunisation data for more information:
<https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-providers/gps/how-we-monitor-gp-practices>

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

Population group rating: **Good**

Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The practice had systems to inform eligible patients to have the meningitis vaccine, for example before attending university for the first time. Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks including NHS checks for patients aged 40 to 74. There was appropriate and timely follow-up on the outcome of health assessments and checks where abnormalities or risk factors were identified. 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	82.4%	N/A	80% Target	Met 80% target

period (within 3.5 years for women aged 25 to 49, and within 5.5 years for women aged 50 to 64). (31/03/2019 to 30/06/2019) (Public Health England)				
Females, 50-70, screened for breast cancer in last 36 months (3 year coverage, %) (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) (PHE)	78.6%	75.1%	71.6%	N/A
Persons, 60-69, screened for bowel cancer in last 30 months (2.5 year coverage, %)(01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) (PHE)	66.2%	57.0%	58.0%	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. (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) (PHE)	74.6%	68.1%	68.1%	N/A
Number of new cancer cases treated (Detection rate: % of which resulted from a two week wait (TWW) referral) (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) (PHE)	67.7%	54.1%	53.8%	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. There was a lead GP for patients with a learning disability.
- End of life care was delivered in a coordinated way which took into account the needs of those whose circumstances may make them vulnerable.
- The practice had a system for vaccinating patients with an underlying medical condition according to the recommended schedule.
- The practice demonstrated that they had a system to identify people who misused substances.
- The practice reviewed young patients at local residential homes.
- Staff had received specific training in relation to domestic violence.

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. Patients had personalised care plans.
- 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.
- All staff had received dementia training in the last 12 months.
- 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 (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) ^(QOF)	91.9%	93.6%	89.4%	No statistical variation
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	9.8% (4)	17.2%	12.3%	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 (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) ^(QOF)	94.7%	94.0%	90.2%	No statistical variation
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	7.3% (3)	13.5%	10.1%	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 (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) ^(QOF)	88.0%	84.6%	83.6%	No statistical variation
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	10.0% (13)	9.0%	6.7%	N/A

Monitoring care and treatment

The practice had a comprehensive programme of quality improvement activity and routinely reviewed the effectiveness and appropriateness of the care provided.

Indicator	Practice	CCG average	England average
Overall QOF score (out of maximum 559)	556.3	550.4	539.2
Overall QOF score (as a percentage of maximum)	99.5%	98.5%	96.7%
Overall QOF exception reporting (all domains)	3.9%	6.9%	5.9%

	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.	Yes
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

- Regular prescribing audits in areas such as antibiotics and hypnotics.
- Improved telephone systems
- Staff performance reviews and succession planning
- Flu audit to improve uptake of flu vaccines
- MSK audit - steroid injections & outcomes for patients
- Scanning quality audits to monitor and improve processes
- Sodium valproate audits – six monthly

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 (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) (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
For patients who accessed the practice's digital service there were clear and effective processes to make referrals to other 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 (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) <small>(QOF)</small>	92.5%	94.8%	95.0%	No statistical variation
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	0.8% (31)	0.8%	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
Policies for any online services offered were in line with national guidance.	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.	51
Number of CQC comments received which were positive about the service.	48
Number of comments cards received which were mixed about the service.	3
Number of CQC comments received which were negative about the service.	0

Source	Feedback
Comments cards	Patient feedback was complimentary about the way in which staff treated patients. Feedback referred to the clinician and the reception and administrative staff being respectful and kind towards patients.
Staff interviews	Staff spoke about patients respectfully and told us that the practice was centred around meeting patient needs.

National GP Survey results

Practice population size	Surveys sent out	Surveys returned	Survey Response rate%	% of practice population
13665.0	246.0	117.0	47.6%	0.86%

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 (01/01/2019 to 31/03/2019)	96.9%	87.6%	88.9%	Variation (positive)
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 (01/01/2019 to 31/03/2019)	96.9%	86.5%	87.4%	Variation (positive)
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 (01/01/2019 to 31/03/2019)	100.0%	94.8%	95.5%	Significant Variation (positive)
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who responded positively to the overall experience of their GP practice (01/01/2019 to 31/03/2019)	99.1%	81.8%	82.9%	Significant Variation (positive)

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

Any additional evidence
The practice achieved high levels of patient satisfaction through the feedback obtained from its own patient survey. It had high satisfaction rates with the Friends and Family feedback which also indicated patient's felt they received a high level of service from kind and caring staff. The National GP Patient Survey results above also indication a high level of patient satisfaction.

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
CQC comments cards	48 out of the 51 comments cards were positive about the care delivered at the practice and referred to the caring and friendly approach of the staff and clinicians who worked 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 during their last GP appointment they were involved as much as they wanted to be in decisions about their care and treatment (01/01/2019 to 31/03/2019)	99.3%	92.8%	93.4%	Variation (positive)

	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.	Yes

Carers	Narrative
Percentage and number of carers identified.	480 carers which equated to 3.4%
How the practice supported carers (including young carers).	The practice has achieved the Northamptonshire Carers Silver 'Investors in Carers' accreditation. They had designated 'care-coordinators' who helped identify carers and improve awareness of available services. The practice held a number of carers events. The practice was working to continue to identify young carers and provide support where needed.

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	08:00 – 18:30
Tuesday	07:00 – 18:30
Wednesday	08:00 – 20:30
Thursday	07:00 – 18:30
Friday	08:00 – 18:30
Appointments available:	
Monday	08:00 – 18:30
Tuesday	07:00 – 18:30
Wednesday	08:00 – 20:30
Thursday	07:00 – 18:30
Friday	08:00 – 18:30

National GP Survey results

Practice population size	Surveys sent out	Surveys returned	Survey Response rate%	% of practice population
13665.0	246.0	117.0	47.6%	0.86%

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 (01/01/2019 to 31/03/2019)	100.0%	94.3%	94.5%	Significant Variation (positive)

Any additional evidence or comments

Patient feedback at the practice, and the survey results indicated above, demonstrated high levels of patient satisfaction with the service.

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.
- Longer appointments were available to over 75s.
- The practice provided a medicines delivery service three times a week for older patients.
- The practice made twice weekly visits to the two care homes they looked after to review patients.
- Over 85s were able to request repeat medicines over the telephone due to their vulnerability.

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 and community matrons 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.

- Nurses and GP's had lead areas of expertise to respond effectively to patients with long-term conditions.
- Templates had been developed to assist staff in delivery high quality care and treatment to patients with long-terms conditions and these were widely used within the practice.

Families, children and young people

Population group rating: Good

Findings

- Additional appointments were available until 8.30pm on a Wednesday 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.
- Children under 12 were routinely offered a same day appointment.
- Uptake rates for cervical screening and child immunisations were above recommended targets.

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.
- The practice was open until 6.30pm throughout the week with extended opening times on a Wednesday evening. Pre-bookable appointments were also available to all patients at additional locations within the area, as the practice was a member of a GP federation. Appointments were available on alternate Saturday and Sundays.
- High number of patients using the on-line booking and medicines ordering service.
- Telephone appointments available with GP and practice nurses.
- The practice offered a range of in-house services reducing the need to go to hospital e.g. phlebotomy, electrocardiogram (ECG), ambulatory blood pressure monitoring, dermatology, musculoskeletal (MSK) and cardiology.
- Health checks were offered for those aged 40 to 74.
- Opportunistic sexual health advice and chlamydia screening was undertaken.

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, Travellers 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 and Travellers.
- 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.
- Staff awareness training on domestic violence and whole practice training had highlighted the issues of domestic violence and has raised vigilance amongst both clinical and ancillary staff. Posters signposting support services for domestic violence were on display at the practice.
- There was a PCN Social Prescriber Link Worker in post at the practice as well as a Federation Mental Health nurse.

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.
- All clinicians had mental health training and supported patients in accessing mental health services including emergency care. There was a good awareness of how to refer to local mental health services including the Crisis team and signpost to a variety of mental health support services.
- The practice was able to facilitate continuity of care for mental health patients with the same GP.
- There was close collaboration with community psychiatrists including joint consultations and collaborative working with three other local practices to provide a mental health worker once a week.

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
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: The practice had a system to ensure that vulnerable and older patients were seen at home, should this be needed, and that medicines were delivered where patients struggled to get into the practice.	

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 (01/01/2019 to 31/03/2019)	97.8%	N/A	68.3%	Significant Variation (positive)
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who responded positively to the overall experience of making an appointment (01/01/2019 to 31/03/2019)	95.7%	65.9%	67.4%	Significant Variation (positive)
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who were very satisfied or fairly satisfied with their GP practice appointment times (01/01/2019 to 31/03/2019)	94.9%	63.8%	64.7%	Significant Variation (positive)
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who were satisfied with the type of appointment (or appointments) they were offered (01/01/2019 to 31/03/2019)	91.1%	74.3%	73.6%	Variation (positive)

Any additional evidence or comments

The above survey results indicated high levels of patient satisfaction in relation to access to appointments at the practice. This was reflected in the feedback we received from patients as part of our inspection.

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.	21
Number of complaints we examined.	5
Number of complaints we examined that were satisfactorily handled in a timely way.	5
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

Examples of learning from complaints.

Complaint	Specific action taken
Patient not able to get through to the practice by telephone.	Patient contacted and an apology given. New telephone system installed due to a theme identified with telephone access.
Complaint about a consultation with a staff member and their attitude during the consultation.	Patient contacted and concerns discussed. Resolved before complaint progressed and learning shared with staff.

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

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 we spoke with as part of our inspection enjoyed working at the practice and felt there was an open and inclusive culture. All of the staff we spoke with felt they could raise any issues or concerns and that these would be dealt with fairly, without any blame. Staff said there were clearly defined roles and responsibilities and that recent changes in how the location and branch worked had been beneficial for staff and patients. The staff felt they worked well as a team and supported each other as much as possible.

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 some effective processes for managing risks, issues and performance.

	Y/N/Partial
There were comprehensive assurance systems which were regularly reviewed and improved.	Yes
There were processes to manage performance.	Yes
There was a systematic programme of clinical and internal audit.	Yes
There were effective arrangements for identifying, managing and mitigating risks.	Partial
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
<p>Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: Some areas of concern with the cold chain, staff vaccinations and gaps in recruitment checks had not been identified by the practice themselves prior to our inspection. These systems required improvement in order to effectively monitor the risks within the service.</p>	

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
There were effective arrangements for identifying, managing and mitigating risks.	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 with the Patient Participation Group Chair as part of our inspection. They were positive about the way in which the practice worked with them and felt that their views and suggestions were listened to and that some of these had been actioned. They were an active group who met regularly and were able to give examples of how issues they had raised had been looked at and considered for improvement. One such example was older patients and how they ordered repeat prescriptions. The Chair described the GP's as responsive and felt that, overall, there was a good relationship between the group and the patients.

Continuous improvement and innovation

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

	Y/N/Partial
There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement.	Yes
Learning was shared effectively and used to make improvements.	Yes
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: The practice was a teaching practice, committed to improving and learning on an on-going basis.	

Examples of continuous learning and improvement

- Regular prescribing audits
- Improved telephone systems
- Staff performance reviews and succession planning
- Flu audit to improve uptake of flu vaccines
- MSK audit - steroid injections & outcomes for patients
- Scanning quality audits to monitor and improve processes
- Sodium valproate audits – six monthly

Notes: CQC GP Insight

GP Insight assesses a practice's data against all the other practices in England. We assess relative performance for the majority of indicators using a "z-score" (this tells us the number of standard deviations from the mean the data point is), giving us a statistical measurement of a practice's performance in relation to the England average. We highlight practices which significantly vary from the England average (in either a positive or negative direction). We consider that z-scores which are higher than +2 or lower than -2 are at significant levels, warranting further enquiry. Using this technique we can be 95% confident that the practice's performance is genuinely different from the average. It is important to note that a number of factors can affect the Z score for a practice, for example a small denominator or the distribution of the data. This means that there will be cases where a practice's data looks quite different to the average, but still shows as no statistical variation, as we do not have enough confidence that the difference is genuine. There may also be cases where a practice's data looks similar across two indicators, but they are in different variation bands.

The percentage of practices which show variation depends on the distribution of the data for each indicator, but is typically around 10-15% of practices. The practices which are not showing significant statistical variation are labelled as no statistical variation to other practices.

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

The following language is used for showing variation:

Variation Bands	Z-score threshold
Significant variation (positive)	≤ -3
Variation (positive)	> -3 and ≤ -2
Tending towards variation (positive)	> -2 and ≤ -1.5
No statistical variation	< 1.5 and > -1.5
Tending towards variation (negative)	≥ 1.5 and < 2
Variation (negative)	≥ 2 and < 3
Significant variation (negative)	≥ 3

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

- Child Immunisation indicators. These are scored against the World Health Organisation target of 95% rather than the England average. Note that practices that have "Met 90% minimum" have not met the WHO target of 95%.
- The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who responded positively to how easy it was to get through to someone at their GP practice on the phone uses a rules based approach for scoring, due to the distribution of the data. This indicator does not have a CCG average.
- The percentage of women eligible for cervical cancer screening at a given point in time who were screened adequately within a specified period (within 3.5 years for women aged 25 to 49, and within 5.5 years for women aged 50 to 64). This indicator does not have a CCG average and is scored against the national target of 80%.

It is important to note that z-scores are not a judgement in themselves, but will prompt further enquiry, as part of our ongoing monitoring of GP practices.

Guidance and Frequently Asked Questions on GP Insight can be found on the following link:

<https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-providers/gps/how-we-monitor-gp-practices>

Note: The CQC GP Evidence Table uses the most recent validated and publicly available data. In some cases at the time of inspection this data may be relatively old. If during the inspection the practice has provided any more recent data, this can be considered by the inspector. However, it should be noted that any data provided by the practice will be unvalidated and is not directly comparable to the published data. This has been taken into account during the inspection process.

Glossary of terms used in the data.

- **COPD:** Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease
- **PHE:** Public Health England
- **QOF:** Quality and Outcomes Framework
- **STAR-PU:** Specific Therapeutic Group Age-sex weightings Related Prescribing Units. These weighting allow more accurate and meaningful comparisons within a specific therapeutic group by taking into account the types of people who will be receiving that treatment.