

Care Quality Commission

Inspection Evidence Table

The Petersfield Medical Practice (1-541241153)

Inspection date: 30 March 2022

Date of data download: 23 March 2022

Overall rating: Good

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
Safeguarding systems, processes and practices were developed, implemented and communicated to staff.	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
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: We saw evidence that the practice had discussed safeguarding at clinical meetings; one of the GP partners also had quarterly meetings with health visitors and told us they were able to contact them if they had any concerns about children.	

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

Safety systems and records	Y/N/Partial
Health and safety risk assessments had been carried out and appropriate actions taken. Date of last assessment: March 2022	Yes
There was a fire procedure. Date of fire risk assessment: January 2022	Yes
Actions from fire risk assessment were identified and completed.	Partial ¹
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: 1. Due to ongoing building work some of the actions were yet to be completed, however the practice was able show progress towards these actions and considerations in the planning of the building work to mitigate the risk. Actions included an additional fire escape route from the first floor to the car park.	

Infection prevention and control

Appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene were met.

	Y/N/Partial
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: January 2022	Yes
The practice had acted on any issues identified in infection prevention and control audits.	Partial ¹
The arrangements for managing waste and clinical specimens kept people safe.	Yes
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: 1. Due to ongoing building work some of the actions were yet to be completed, however, the practice was able show progress towards these actions for example, integrated panel system (IPS) sinks were yet to be installed but we saw evidence of a quotation and plan.	

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

The practice was equipped to respond to medical emergencies (including suspected sepsis) and staff were suitably trained in emergency procedures.	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 were enough staff to provide appointments and prevent staff from working excessive hours	Yes ¹
<p>Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:</p> <p>1. The practice told us there was a recruitment drive as the current reception staff were working over their contracted hours as they were short staffed. The practice had gained support from an external human resource company to prevent staff working excessive hours.</p>	

Information to deliver safe care and treatment

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

	Y/N/Partial
Individual care records, including clinical data, were written and managed securely and in line with current guidance and relevant legislation.	Yes
There was a system for processing information relating to new patients including the summarising of new patient notes.	Partial ¹
There were systems for sharing information with staff and other agencies to enable them to deliver safe care and treatment.	Yes
Referrals to specialist services were documented, contained the required information 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
<p>Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:</p> <p>1. The practice told us they had a backlog of 661 patient notes waiting to be summarised dating back to July 2021. The practice told us the records were easily accessible should a GP need them. The practice had an action plan in place to give dedicated time for the summarizer to work through the backlog, however, due to the fact that reception were already short staffed, they could not assure us that this time was given.</p>	

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) (01/01/2021 to 31/12/2021) (NHS Business Service Authority - NHSBSA)	0.48	0.80	0.76	Variation (positive)
The number of prescription items for co-amoxiclav, cephalosporins and quinolones as a percentage of the total number of prescription items for selected antibacterial drugs (BNF 5.1 sub-set). (01/01/2021 to 31/12/2021) (NHSBSA)	9.1%	11.2%	9.2%	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 (01/07/2021 to 31/12/2021) (NHSBSA)	4.54	5.18	5.28	No statistical variation
Total items prescribed of Pregabalin or Gabapentin per 1,000 patients (01/07/2021 to 31/12/2021) (NHSBSA)	54.2‰	119.7‰	129.2‰	Variation (positive)
Average daily quantity of Hypnotics prescribed per Specific Therapeutic group Age-sex Related Prescribing Unit (STAR PU) (01/01/2021 to 31/12/2021) (NHSBSA)	0.53	0.64	0.62	No statistical variation
Number of unique patients prescribed multiple psychotropics per 1,000 patients (01/04/2021 to 30/09/2021) (NHSBSA)	4.3‰	5.8‰	6.7‰	No statistical variation

Note: ‰ means *per 1,000* and it is **not** a percentage.

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).	Yes

Medicines management	Y/N/Partial
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.	Yes
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 ²
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
<p>Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> On inspection we found the nurses rooms were in the process of being renovated and that medicines would be stored in a lockable cupboard once the building work had been completed. However, on the day of inspection they were placed in a cupboard without a lock with a nurse present; at the end of the day the practice told us these rooms would be locked. As part of our inspection and with consent from the practice, we imported and ran a suite of clinical searches. We found the practice was monitoring patients on high-risk medicines appropriately. For example. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 23 patients were taking methotrexate, and all had received the required monitoring Nine patients were taking azathioprine, four were identified as requiring monitoring. We reviewed these records and found three had received required monitoring, one was overdue but we saw evidence the practice had tried to contact this patient. We found all patients with hypothyroidism had a thyroid function test within the last 18 months. 	

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 ¹
Number of events recorded in last 12 months:	5
Number of events that required action:	4
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We saw evidence that meetings were held for different staff groups within the practice, however, some meeting minutes we saw did not use the structured agenda set out by the practice, although learning events had been documented and shared it wasn't consistent across the groups as the use of the template was inconsistent. 	

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

Event	Specific action taken
Letter scanned on incorrect patient record	Reminder to take extra care when checking details to ensure it correlates with record and letter.
Delay in non-urgent referral	Referral process updated to task referrals to ensure they are completed.

Safety alerts	Y/N/Partial
There was a system for recording and acting on safety alerts.	Partial ¹
Staff understood how to deal with alerts.	Yes
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As part of the inspection we used clinical searches to review the practice system to ensure action on safety alerts. We reviewed an alert and found: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A historical alert relating to a combination of medicines which reduces their effectiveness had not been incorporated into good practice. We found three patients taking this combination of medicines. We reviewed the records and found the practice had not discussed the risk with the patients. We discussed this with the practice who took immediate action to review these patients. 	

The systems and processes had been improved and the practice could evidence that safety alerts had been actioned appropriately, the process in place prevented any further safety alerts being missed.

Effective

Rating: Good

QOF requirements were modified by NHS England for 2020/21 to recognise the need to reprioritise aspects of care which were not directly related to COVID-19. This meant that QOF payments were calculated differently. For inspections carried out from 1 October 2021, our reports will not include QOF indicators. In determining judgements in relation to effective care, we have considered other evidence as set out below.

Effective needs assessment, care and treatment

Patients' needs were assessed, and care and treatment were 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 had prioritised care for their most clinically vulnerable patients during the pandemic	Yes

Effective care for the practice population

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.• Patients over 75 years have a named GP to co-ordinate their care, patients at high risk of admission are discussed at our weekly practice meeting.• 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.• 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. The practice was aware they didn't complete many NHS checks during COVID-19 and has shown an action plan with priorities to restart this.
- 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.
- The practice assessed and monitored the physical health of people with mental illness, severe mental illness, and personality disorder.
- Patients with poor mental health, including dementia, were referred to appropriate services.

Management of people with long term conditions

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. We looked at patients who received two or more rescue steroids and found of the 18 patients two had not been reviewed appropriately. We highlighted this with the practice who took immediate action. The practice had implemented clinical searches to ensure this didn't happen again.
- 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. Our searches showed two patients with a potential missed diagnosis of diabetes. The practice told us they were aware of these patients but had met difficulties with patient engagement.
- House bound diabetic patients were followed up by the Community Diabetes Team, whose assessments and recommendations were then communicated to the practice by telephone or email.
- The PCN held an outreach event at the local mosque for the diabetic/pre diabetic population group. The event was held at the mosque to engage the BAME population in diabetic prevention and treatment but was open to the whole community. The PCN Care Coordinator invited all patients from the surgeries in the network to attend the event. Social Prescribers and GPs also attended the event to raise awareness of health checks, self-management of diabetes and healthy lifestyles.

- Adults with newly diagnosed cardio-vascular disease were offered statins.
- Patients with COPD were offered rescue packs.
- Patients with suspected hypertension were offered ambulatory blood pressure monitoring.
- Patients with asthma were offered an asthma management plan.

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) (01/04/2020 to 31/03/2021) (NHS England)	59	60	98.3%	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) (01/04/2020 to 31/03/2021) (NHS England)	41	45	91.1%	Met 90% minimum
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) (01/04/2020 to 31/03/2021) (NHS England)	41	45	91.1%	Met 90% minimum
The percentage of children aged 2 who have received immunisation for measles, mumps and rubella (one dose of MMR) (01/04/2020 to 31/03/2021) (NHS England)	41	45	91.1%	Met 90% minimum
The percentage of children aged 5 who have received immunisation for measles, mumps and rubella (two doses of MMR) (01/04/2020 to 31/03/2021) (NHS England)	41	45	91.1%	Met 90% minimum

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>

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	52.9%	N/A	80% Target	Below 70% uptake

49, and within 5.5 years for women aged 50 to 64). (Snapshot date: 30/09/2021) (Public Health England)				
Females, 50-70, screened for breast cancer in last 36 months (3 year coverage, %) (01/04/2020 to 31/03/2021) (PHE)	50.2%	55.7%	61.3%	N/A
Persons, 60-74, screened for bowel cancer in last 30 months (2.5 year coverage, %) (01/04/2020 to 31/03/2021) (PHE)	59.1%	68.0%	66.8%	N/A
Number of new cancer cases treated (Detection rate: % of which resulted from a two week wait (TWW) referral) (01/04/2020 to 31/03/2021) (PHE)	72.2%	61.2%	55.4%	No statistical variation

Any additional evidence or comments

The practice was aware of its low performance in respect of 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). The practice told us since January 2022 they have had the support of a care coordinator, social prescriber and a health champion to reach out to the BAME population and this has helped increase their uptake. They have also given practice nurses the ability to send reminders on a regular basis through a communication tool. The practice was in the process of contacting and removing patients that had no activity within recent years due to the high population of students. The practice told us they had a high student population and shared its own figures which showed under 50's at 51% and over 50's at 77% which showed progress had been made since January 2022.

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.

	Y/N/Partial
Clinicians took part in national and local quality improvement initiatives.	Yes
The practice had a programme of targeted quality improvement and used information about care and treatment to make improvements.	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

<p>The practice had a programme of targeted quality improvement such as clinical audits.</p> <p>An audit was conducted in June 2021 and repeated in March 2022 of clinicians record keeping in medical records. The audit in June 2021 which showed four patients who did not have the listed criteria documented in their records. A second audit carried out in March 2022 showed two patients who did not have the listed criteria in their records. The practice shared the findings with clinical staff who reviewed medical notes to ensure consistent note keeping in the future.</p>
--

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.	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
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.	Partial ¹
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: 1. The nursing staff told us that there was an open-door policy and felt supported by the GP's, however, we found no structured review for learning opportunities or formalised documentation other than appraisals to assure us of competencies.	

Coordinating care and treatment

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

Indicator	Y/N/Partial
Care was delivered and reviewed in a coordinated way when different teams, services or organisations were involved.	Yes
Patients received consistent, coordinated, person-centred care when they moved between services.	Yes

Helping patients to live healthier lives

Staff were consistent and proactive in helping patients to live healthier lives.

	Y/N/Partial
The practice identified patients who may need extra support and directed them to relevant services. This included patients in the last 12 months of their lives, patients at risk of developing a long-term condition and carers.	Yes
Staff encouraged and supported patients to be involved in monitoring and managing their own health.	Yes
Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks.	Partial ¹
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 and tackling obesity.	Yes
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: 1. The practice was aware they didn't complete many NHS checks during COVID-19 due to vulnerability of the patients and showed an action plan with priorities to restart this.	

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
Do Not Attempt Cardio Pulmonary Resuscitation (DNACPR) decisions were made in line with relevant legislation and were appropriate.	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

Patient feedback	
Source	Feedback
CQC Give feedback on your care	We received two positive feedback comments around the good communication skills by the staff, staff going above and beyond for the care of patients and following through treatment to ensure the best care is given.

National GP Patient Survey results

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 (01/01/2021 to 31/03/2021)	89.3%	89.5%	89.4%	No statistical variation
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 (01/01/2021 to 31/03/2021)	90.8%	88.2%	88.4%	No statistical variation
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 (01/01/2021 to 31/03/2021)	95.9%	95.7%	95.6%	No statistical variation

Indicator	Practice	CCG average	England average	England comparison
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who responded positively to the overall experience of their GP practice (01/01/2021 to 31/03/2021)	85.0%	83.0%	83.0%	No statistical variation

Question	Y/N
The practice carries out its own patient survey/patient feedback exercises.	Partial ¹

Any additional evidence
1. The practice had not conducted patient feedback exercises during the pandemic, however, the practice had plans to conduct a survey and had started Friends and Family Test (FFT) in March 2022.

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

Source	Feedback
Give feedback on your care link	The comments received were positive relating to care and treatment received, working with the patient to manager concerns and the time taken by practice staff to listen to concerns.

National GP Patient 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 (01/01/2021 to 31/03/2021)	96.1%	93.3%	92.9%	No statistical variation

	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.	Partial ¹
Information about support groups was available on the practice website.	Yes
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:	
1. The practice had acknowledged the limited availability of leaflets in other languages and had reached out to their Clinical Commissioning Group for support. The practice was able to use language line and links to websites to offer alternatives for the patients.	

Carers	Narrative
Percentage and number of carers identified.	57 carers had been identified which is 1% of the practice list. We found the number of older patients was significantly lower than national average.
How the practice supported carers (including young carers).	The practice displayed a carers support policy and encouraged carers to give their details to ensure the practice were aware of who are carers and that they had contact points should they need help.
How the practice supported recently bereaved patients.	The practice told us reception staff were made aware of recently bereaved patients and they would contact recently bereaved patients or families to offer their condolences and any support that may be required.

Privacy and dignity

The practice respected patients' privacy and dignity.

	Y/N/Partial
A private room was available if patients were distressed or wanted to discuss sensitive issues.	Yes
There were arrangements to ensure confidentiality at the reception desk.	Yes

Responsive

Rating: Good

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice organised and delivered services to meet patients' needs.

	Y/N/Partial
The practice understood the needs of its local population and had developed services in response to those needs.	Yes
The importance of flexibility, informed choice and continuity of care was reflected in the services provided.	Yes
The facilities and premises were appropriate for the services being delivered.	Yes
The practice made reasonable adjustments when patients found it hard to access services.	Yes
There were arrangements in place for people who need translation services.	Yes
The practice complied with the Accessible Information Standard.	Yes

Practice Opening Times	
Day	Time
Opening times:	
Monday	8am to 6pm
Tuesday	8am to 6pm
Wednesday	8am to 6pm
Thursday	8am to 6pm
Friday	8am to 6pm
Appointments available:	
Monday	8:30am to 6pm
Tuesday	8:30am to 6pm
Wednesday	8:30am to 6pm
Thursday	8:30am to 6pm
Friday	8:30am to 6pm

Further information about how the practice is responding to the needs of their population

- 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.
- 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.
- The practice liaised regularly with the community services to discuss and manage the needs of patients with complex medical issues.
- All parents or guardians calling with concerns about a child were offered a same day appointment when necessary.
- The practice was open until 6pm on a Monday and Friday. 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 Saturday and Sunday provided by the PCN.
- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including homeless people, Travelers 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 Travelers.
- The PCN held an outreach event at the local mosque for the diabetic/pre diabetic population group. The event was held at the mosque to engage the BAME population in diabetic prevention and treatment but was open to all. The PCN Care Coordinator invited all patients from the surgeries in the network to attend the event. Social Prescribers and GPs attended the event to raise awareness of health checks, self-management of diabetes and healthy lifestyles.
- The practice adjusted the delivery of its services to meet the needs of patients with a learning disability.

Access to the service

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

The COVID-19 pandemic has affected access to GP practices and presented many challenges. In order to keep both patients and staff safe early in the pandemic practices were asked by NHS England to assess patients remotely (for example by telephone or video consultation) when contacting the practice and to only see patients in the practice when deemed to be clinically appropriate to do so. Following the changes in national guidance during the summer of 2021 there has been a more flexible approach to patients interacting with their practice. During the pandemic there was a significant increase in telephone and online consultations compared to patients being predominantly seen in a face to face setting.

	Y/N/Partial
Patients had timely access to appointments/treatment and action was taken to minimize the length of time people waited for care, treatment or advice	Yes
The practice offered a range of appointment types to suit different needs (e.g. face to face, telephone, online)	Yes
Patients were able to make appointments in a way which met their needs	Yes
There were systems in place to support patients who face communication barriers to access treatment	Yes
Patients with most urgent needs had their care and treatment prioritised	Yes
There was information available for patients to support them to understand how to access services (including on websites and telephone messages)	Yes

National GP Patient Survey results

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 (01/01/2021 to 31/03/2021)	80.0%	N/A	67.6%	No statistical variation
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who responded positively to the overall experience of making an appointment (01/01/2021 to 31/03/2021)	71.2%	72.6%	70.6%	No statistical variation
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who were very satisfied or fairly satisfied with their GP practice appointment times (01/01/2021 to 31/03/2021)	58.4%	68.6%	67.0%	No statistical variation
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who were satisfied with the	80.8%	83.6%	81.7%	No statistical variation

Indicator	Practice	CCG average	England average	England comparison
appointment (or appointments) they were offered (01/01/2021 to 31/03/2021)				

Source	Feedback
For example, NHS Choices	Feedback on NHS choices was mixed in respect of accessibility of appointments
CQC Give feedback on your care	All feedback received via this method was positive in respect of accessing the practice.

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.	11
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

Example(s) of learning from complaints.

Complaint	Specific action taken
Rude GP on telephone consult	Letter apologising for upsetting the patient and shared in team meeting.
Long phone queues and line dropped	Letter apologising for the phone queues, also contacted phone company to investigate call lines being dropped.

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.	Partial ¹
There was a leadership development programme, including a succession plan.	Yes
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: 1. We received mixed feedback from staff about the leadership team, while some staff were positive, others told us that the leadership team was not always available and this meant some staff did not feel supported.	

Vision and strategy

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

	Y/N/Partial
The vision, values and strategy were developed in collaboration with staff, patients and external partners.	Partial
Staff knew and understood the vision, values and strategy and their role in achieving them.	Partial
Progress against delivery of the strategy was monitored.	Yes
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: 1. Staff told us they were not involved in the vision and some were unsure what the vision was, however, staff demonstrated and patient feedback both showed high quality sustainable care.	

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 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 questionnaire and feedback	Feedback from staff was mixed, they told us leaders are approachable and they were able to raise concerns, however, they believe communication could be improved. Staff were proud of their work and told us there was a good culture within the 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 quality improvement programme in place.	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

The practice had systems in place to continue to deliver services, respond to risk and meet patients' needs during the pandemic

	Y/N/Partial
The practice had adapted how it offered appointments to meet the needs of patients during the pandemic.	Yes
The needs of vulnerable people (including those who might be digitally excluded) had been considered in relation to access.	Yes
There were systems in place to identify and manage patients who needed a face-to-face appointment.	Yes
The practice actively monitored the quality of access and made improvements in response to findings.	Yes
There were recovery plans in place to manage backlogs of activity and delays to treatment.	Yes
Changes had been made to infection control arrangements to protect staff and patients using the service.	Yes
Staff were supported to work remotely where applicable.	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 monitor and improve performance.	Yes
Performance information was used to hold staff and management to account.	Yes
Staff whose responsibilities included making statutory notifications understood what this entailed.	Yes

Governance and oversight of remote services

	Y/N/Partial
The practice used digital services securely and effectively and conformed to relevant digital and information security standards.	Yes
The provider was registered as a data controller with the Information Commissioner's Office.	Yes
Patient records were held in line with guidance and requirements.	Yes
Patients were informed and consent obtained if interactions were recorded.	Yes
The practice ensured patients were informed how their records were stored and managed.	Yes
Patients were made aware of the information sharing protocol before online services were delivered.	Yes
The practice had arrangements to make staff and patients aware of privacy settings on video and voice call services.	Yes
Online consultations took place in appropriate environments to ensure confidentiality.	Yes
The practice advised patients on how to protect their online information.	Yes

Engagement with patients, the public, staff and external partners

The practice was inconsistent in involving 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.	No
Staff views were reflected in the planning and delivery of services.	Partial ²
The practice worked with stakeholders to build a shared view of challenges and of the needs of the population.	Yes
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: 1. The practice had members on the PPG, however engagement since the pandemic was not apparent and we were not able to speak to the PPG for feedback. 2. Some staff told us their views were not asked for when changes were made to the services.	

Continuous improvement and innovation

There was some 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.	Partial ¹
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: 1. Learning was shared between groups within the practice, but due to the lack of practice staff meetings and lack of structure to meeting minutes we could not be assured learning was shared effectively.	

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.
-
- ‰ = per thousand.