

Care Quality Commission

Inspection Evidence Table

Drs Gower, Kendall, Rookledge and Dean (1-558994731)

Inspection date: 28 February 2020

Date of data download: 14 February 2020

Overall rating: Good

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

Safe

Rating: Good

Safety systems and processes

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

Safeguarding	Y/N/Partial
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
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: Vulnerable patients were effectively identified and managed within the practice. A safeguarding meeting was taking place at the time of our inspection. Meeting records we reviewed were not detailed and did	

Safeguarding	Y/N/Partial
not provide a sufficient audit trail of discussions. We discussed this with the provider who told us they would work on improving this following our inspection.	

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: 13/04/2020	Yes
There was a record of equipment calibration. Date of last calibration: 10/07/2019	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: 26/03/2019	Yes
There was a log of fire drills. Date of last drill: 20/04/2019	Yes
There was a record of fire alarm checks. Date of last check: 29/01/2020	Yes
There was a record of fire training for staff. Date of last training: 28/02/2020	Yes
There were fire marshals.	Yes
A fire risk assessment had been completed. Date of completion: 23/07/2019	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: 07/05/2019	Yes
Health and safety risk assessments had been carried out and appropriate actions taken.	Yes

Date of last assessment: 07/05/2019	
-------------------------------------	--

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: June 2019	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

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

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

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) (NHS Business Service Authority - NHSBSA)	0.95	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) (NHSBSA)	8.0%	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) (NHSBSA)	7.93	6.04	5.60	Significant Variation (negative)
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) (NHSBSA)	2.03	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.	Partial 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).	Partial ²
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.	Partial ³
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 changes to a patient's medicines including changes made by other services.	Yes
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
For remote or online prescribing there were effective protocols for verifying patient identity.	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.	Yes

Medicines management	Y/N/Partial
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There was some confusion at the practice at the time of our inspection about whether the cleaners who attended the practice in the evenings accessed the dispensary. The practice manager reviewed the cleaning schedules and later confirmed that the cleaners did not access this area as the dispensary was locked over night. 2. We found one Patient Group Direction which had not been appropriately authorised. We raised this with the nursing team who told us that this would be immediately addressed. 3. Clinical supervision for non-medical prescribers was not taking place consistently and the process for this needed strengthening. The practice manager addressed this and implemented a system to ensure this was done following our inspection. 	

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.	Yes
Medicines that required refrigeration were appropriately stored, monitored and transported in line with the manufacturer's recommendations to ensure they remained safe and effective.	Yes
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.	N/A
If the practice offered a delivery service, this had been risk assessed for safety, security, confidentiality and traceability.	N/A
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
Explanation of any answers and other comments on dispensary services:	
We found an organised and well-managed dispensary with good systems and processes in place to ensure patient safety.	

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.	Yes
Number of events recorded in last 12 months:	28
Number of events that required action:	28

Examples of significant events recorded and actions by the practice.

Event	Specific action taken
Incorrect information in a patient letter.	Correspondence checked and learning disseminated about checking letters before issuing. Staff member involved in discussions.
Dispensing error.	Action taken to ensure staff learning. Staff to allow more time when dispensing.

Safety alerts	Y/N/Partial
There was a system for recording and acting on safety alerts.	Partial
Staff understood how to deal with alerts.	Partial
<p>Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:</p> <p>Prior to our inspection, the provider had recognised that this was an area in which the practice needed to improve. Although there was a system for recording safety alerts, the actions were not consistently recorded to provide assurance that these had been done. We checked a sample of recent safety alerts and found that all the necessary action had been taken. However, the provider and practice manager recognised that the system needed some improvement and assured us that this would happen following our inspection.</p>	

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>	1.05	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 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.

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 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>	82.0%	82.6%	79.3%	No statistical variation
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	18.4% (55)	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>	77.6%	79.5%	78.1%	No statistical variation
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	3.0% (9)	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>	81.7%	82.2%	81.3%	No statistical variation
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	10.4% (31)	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>	78.0%	77.1%	75.9%	No statistical variation
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	0.8% (3)	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>	88.8%	92.4%	89.6%	No statistical variation
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	1.1% (1)	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) <small>(QOF)</small>	86.0%	84.6%	83.0%	No statistical variation
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	1.1% (9)	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) <small>(QOF)</small>	96.9%	93.4%	91.1%	Tending towards variation (positive)
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	1.0% (1)	4.4%	5.9%	N/A

Families, children and young people

Population group rating: Good

Findings

- The practice met the minimum 90% for all four childhood immunisation uptake indicators. The practice also met the WHO based national target of 95% (the recommended standard for achieving herd immunity) for all four 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)	49	50	98.0%	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)	58	59	98.3%	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)	58	59	98.3%	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)	58	59	98.3%	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: Requires Improvement

Findings

- Cervical screening rates were below national averages and the practice did not have an effective system in place to adequately follow-up non-attenders.
- 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 period (within 3.5 years for women aged 25 to 49, and within 5.5 years for women aged 50 to 64). (01/07/2019 to 30/09/2019) (Public Health England)	78.2%	N/A	80% Target	Below 80% target
Females, 50-70, screened for breast cancer in last 36 months (3 year coverage, %) (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) (PHE)	71.1%	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)	66.3%	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)	84.8%	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)	44.1%	54.1%	53.8%	No statistical variation

Any additional evidence or comments

Although patients were being called for their cervical screening checks, the practice was not following up on non-attenders. The cervical screening rates were below national averages and we raised this as an issue with the practice during our inspection.

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.
- 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) <small>(QoF)</small>	100.0%	93.6%	89.4%	Variation (positive)
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	4.5% (1)	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) <small>(QoF)</small>	90.9%	94.0%	90.2%	No statistical variation
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	0.0% (0)	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)	81.5%	84.6%	83.6%	No statistical variation
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	3.6% (1)	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)	555.8	550.4	539.2
Overall QOF score (as a percentage of maximum)	99.4%	98.5%	96.7%
Overall QOF exception reporting (all domains)	3.2%	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:

- High-risk drug audits to ensure patient safety when prescribing – we found all sample records we looked at indicated that high-risk medicines had been safely prescribed.
- Medication reviews completed regularly to review prescribing.
- Admissions and referrals regularly reviewed to improve patient outcomes.
- Deaths reviewed.

Effective staffing

The practice was able 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
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: Staff training needs were monitored and staff records showed that staff received appropriate and updated training as needed for their roles. Staff told us they had time for training and could approach the practice manager about any training they felt they needed.	

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>	97.5%	94.8%	95.0%	No statistical variation
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	0.1% (2)	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

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 described an open and supportive culture at the practice. They felt they could approach management should they need to and all of the staff we spoke with described being part of a supportive and well functioning team.

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.

	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.	Yes
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

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
The PPG were positive about the way in which the practice was run and described it as a valuable and well-thought of part of the local community. The group had recently changed how it worked, moving to a “virtual” group in order to attract a more diverse range of members. This change was in its infancy and so there was some way to go to embed this change and to ensure the group continued to work effectively. However, the representatives of the group we spoke with were able to give examples of how the practice had used patient feedback to improve and spoke very highly of the practice management.

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

Examples of continuous learning and improvement

The practice was a training practice which was committed to learning and developing staff. Dispensing staff were undergoing additional training and the practice was able to share their own dispensing best practice with other practices in the locality.

Staff were regularly able to access training in areas they would benefit from and the practice had achieved their Gold Plus Level and Level 4 Supporting Working Carers Accreditation.

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.