Care Quality Commission

Inspection Evidence Table

Danson Family Practice (1-8969943052)

Inspection date: 20 May 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.	
The Out of Hours service was informed of relevant safeguarding information.	
There were systems to identify vulnerable patients on record.	
Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks were undertaken where required.	
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.	

Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:

The provider told us they followed up on patients who did not attend appointments. They carried out an audit on these patients and successfully identified patients who did not attend their appointments, referring them to the safeguarding team when appropriate.

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 UK Health and Security Agency (UKHSA) 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:	Yes Unknown
There was a fire procedure.	Yes
Date of fire risk assessment: Actions from fire risk assessment were identified and completed.	

Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:

The building landlord carried out annual formal health and safety risk assessments. The provider had requested a copy, but it had not been provided at the time of the inspection. The practice manager carried out regular informal walkarounds of the practice and reported any issues as they arose.

Infection prevention and control

Appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene were met/not 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:	Yes 12/10/2021
The practice had acted on any issues identified in infection prevention and control audits.	Yes
The arrangements for managing waste and clinical specimens kept people safe.	Yes

Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:

In addition to the annual full infection prevention and control audits, a daily check was carried out and documented to ensure all clinical areas were clean. GPs and nursing staff cleaned their rooms after seeing each patient.

Risks to patients

There were adequate in 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

Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:

The provider told us they rarely used locum GPs. They had a short-term locum advanced nurse practitioner and we saw they had been through a formal induction.

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
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

Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:

The practice had recently employed a registered nurse whose had an administrative role. Their responsibilities included checking clinical correspondence such as test results and liaising with the GPs when further action was needed. The providers found this was beneficial as a clinician dealt with correspondence quickly.

We saw that referrals, including urgent referrals, were monitored to ensure there were no delays.

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)	0.72	0.86	0.76	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). (01/01/2021 to 31/12/2021) (NHSBSA)	9.9%	7.4%	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)	3.69	4.39	5.28	Variation (positive)
Total items prescribed of Pregabalin or Gabapentin per 1,000 patients (01/07/2021 to 31/12/2021) (NHSBSA)	226.8‰	186.8‰	129.2‰	No statistical variation
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)		0.89	0.62	No statistical variation
Number of unique patients prescribed multiple psychotropics per 1,000 patients (01/07/2021 to 31/12/2021) (NHSBSA)		7.4‰	6.8‰	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.	Yes

Medicines management	Y/N/Partial
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
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.	Partial
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 and Improvement Area Team Controlled Drugs Accountable Officer.	
The practice had taken steps to ensure appropriate antimicrobial use to optimise patient outcomes and reduce the risk of adverse events and antimicrobial resistance.	
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.	
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 UKHSA guidance to ensure they remained safe and effective.	Yes

Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:

As part of the inspection a number of set clinical record searches were undertaken by a CQC GP specialist advisor without visiting the practice. The records of patients prescribed certain high-risk medicines were checked to ensure the required monitoring was taking place. These searches were visible to the practice.

We checked a selection of high-risk medicines, including Methotrexate, Azathioprine and Leflunomide. Of the patients prescribed these medicines, only one was overdue their monitoring. However, we saw that this patient had recently been contacted, by telephone and then by letter, informing them their review was due.

We saw there was no protocol in place for managing medicines where patients required blood tests. such as for patients prescribed ACE inhibitors (used to treat a number of heart conditions). GPs told us they checked blood tests were due when patients requested a repeat prescription, rather than having a recall system in place. The provider explained that they had known the patients for a number of years. They issued text messages to remind patients a blood test was due, and then the GPs

Medicines management

Y/N/Partial

discussed on a case by case basis if they would issue a reduced prescription until the patient attended. Our searches identified that 50 patients potentially did not have up to date monitoring. We examined five of these; all were overdue, and the practice had recently contacted two of the patients. The provider told us they would take action to ensure all relevant patients had been contacted.

Track record on safety and lessons learned and improvements made

The practice learned and made improvements when things went wrong.

Significant events		
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.		
There was a system for recording and acting on significant events.		
Staff understood how to raise concerns and report incidents both internally and externally.		
There was evidence of learning and dissemination of information.		
Number of events recorded in last 12 months:		
Number of events that required action:	10	

Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:

We saw that significant events were recorded, investigated, discussed and appropriate action taken.

Examples of significant events recorded and actions by the practice.

Event	Specific action taken
, · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	This was investigated and it was found one person who was responsible for checking the fridge had left and another was working remotely. The practice ensured the medicines in the fridge were safe and put a new system in place to ensure one person working at the practice had overall responsibility, with other staff being available whenever they were off work.
Significant event from March 2022. An	The practice audited urgent two week wait referrals and
urgent referral had not been actioned.	found at the two-week date that the referral had not been received. The reasons were investigated but were unclear. The practice changed their audit so that referrals were checked weekly. This meant that if there was a problem with the referral this was identified before the two-week date.

Safety alerts	Y/N/Partial
There was a system for recording and acting on safety alerts.	Yes

Staff understood how to deal with alerts.

Yes

Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:

As part of the inspection a number of set clinical record searches were undertaken by a CQC GP specialist advisor without visiting the practice. The records of patients prescribed certain high-risk medicines were checked to ensure the required monitoring was taking place. These searches were visible to the practice.

We checked the he Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA) alerts giving advice for patients prescribed Clopidogrel and Omeprazole. Fourteen patients were prescribed this combination of medicines and we checked five in detail. Four had been informed of the potential risk. The other had only been prescribed the combination briefly and we considered the risk as low.

Effective

Rating: Good

QOF requirements were modified by NHS England and Improvement 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 was 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

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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 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.
- As part of our remote clinical searches we looked at diabetic retinopathy patients with a high HbA1c reading. We examined five of the 18 patients and found one had not had a diabetic review in the previous 12 months. However, they were noted as being out of the country.
- 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.
- Patients with suspected hypertension were offered ambulatory blood pressure monitoring.
- Patients with COPD were offered rescue packs.

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 and Improvement)	50	51	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	56	58	96.6%	Met 95% WHO based target

Pneumococcal booster) (PCV booster) (01/04/2020 to 31/03/2021) (NHS England and Improvement)				
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 and Improvement)	56	58	96.6%	Met 95% WHO based target
The percentage of children aged 2 who have received immunisation for measles, mumps and rubella (one dose of MMR) (01/04/2020 to 31/03/2021) (NHS England and Improvement)	57	58	98.3%	Met 95% WHO based target
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 and Improvement)	68	69	98.6%	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

Any additional evidence or comments

The provider told us that nurses routinely telephoned patients who did not bring their children to child vaccination appointments.

Cancer Indicators	Practice	CCG average	England average	England comparison
The percentage of persons eligible for cervical cancer screening at a given point in time who were screened adequately within a specified period (within 3.5 years for persons aged 25 to 49, and within 5.5 years for persons aged 50 to 64). (Snapshot date: 31/12/2021) (UK Health and Security Agency)	69.7%	N/A	80% Target	Below 70% uptake
Females, 50-70, screened for breast cancer in last 36 months (3 year coverage, %) (01/04/2020 to 31/03/2021) (UKHSA)	52.4%	58.0%	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) (UKHSA)	56.3%	58.4%	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) (UKHSA)	50.0%	50.8%	55.4%	No statistical variation

Any additional evidence or comments

The provider told us they had continued with cervical screening throughout the Covid-19 pandemic. The practice nurses offered patients more convenient times to attend for screening, and telephoned patients who did not attend their appointments. They continued to work with women to improve their uptake of cervical screening.

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

We saw that the practice had carried out some audits, including prescribing audits. These included full audit cycles. The practice had recently employed a registered nurse whose had an administrative role. They were also carrying out clinical audits, with a plan to carry out approximately one a month.

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.	Yes
There was a clear and appropriate approach for supporting and managing staff when their performance was poor or variable.	Yes

Coordinating care and treatment

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

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

Helping patients to live healthier lives

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

	Y/N/Partial
The practice identified patients who may need extra support and directed them to relevant services. This included patients in the last 12 months of their lives, patients at risk of developing a long-term condition and carers.	Yes
Staff encouraged and supported patients to be involved in monitoring and managing their own health.	Yes
Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks.	Yes
Staff discussed changes to care or treatment with patients and their carers as necessary.	Yes
The practice supported national priorities and initiatives to improve the population's health, for example, stop smoking campaigns and tackling obesity.	Yes

Consent to care and treatment

The practice 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

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)	93.0%	86.0%	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)	93.1%	84.9%	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)	90.0%	93.2%	95.6%	No statistical variation
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)	73.1%	76.8%	83.0%	No statistical variation

Question	Y/N
The practice carries out its own patient survey/patient feedback exercises.	No

Any additional evidence

The practice had not carried out a recent patient survey, but they had analysed the results of the national survey to identify areas of improvement. They had an action plan in place.

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

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)	86.3%	89.8%	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.	Yes
Information about support groups was available on the practice website.	Yes

Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:

The practice had a bi-lingual member of staff on the rota daily in-between 8am and 6.30pm, and they also had access to face to face and telephone interpreters.

The practice had access to leaflets, but they were unable to have a wide variety on display due to restrictions in the building.

Carers	Narrative
	The practice had 152 cares on the register, which was 3.4% of the practice population.
	Carers were given a carers' pack containing useful information, including about local support groups. Carers were offered flu vaccinations and an annual health check. The provider told us they knew their patients well so were able to offer the support they required. Although there were no young carers currently registered, the practice held information to support young carers if required. The practice had updated their carers' register during the Covid-19 pandemic, spending time to ensure it was up to date.
How the practice supported recently bereaved patients.	The practice sent bereavement cards when they considered this appropriate. The provider explained they knew the family dynamics of their patients so were able to provide the support required. They could signpost patients to the bereavement service and for counselling if needed.

Privacy and dignity

The practice respected did not always respect 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

Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:

The provider was aware of the practice demographics and adjusted its services to meet the needs of patients when required. The practice was in a location with a high level of deprivation and had identified the issues relating to this. One example provided was around prescriptions. Some patients were not aware of how to apply for free prescriptions so were not accessing the medicines they needed. A focused care worker worked with patients to explain their rights and help them apply for any benefits they may be entitled to. GPs issued prescriptions for a longer time period where they considered this would be beneficial to the period and they could evidence it was safe to do so.

During the Covid-19 pandemic the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) identified patients who had not been vaccinated and contacted them by making house calls. The practice provided them with a mobile telephone number and when a patient agreed to be vaccinated an immediate appointment was made for them. This was for patients in all practices in the area.

Language was another barrier to patients receiving the care they required. Some patients did have the confidence to contact the practice, and would wait until a relative was available, sometimes in the evening. The practice organised their rota so there was a multi-lingual staff member available whenever the practice was open. The practice had sourced support for patients in languages other than English due to the number of patients they had who spoke English as a second language. They used a local company for weight management and also exercise on prescription for patients who did not speak English. The local diabetes awareness sessions were only delivered in English, so the practice ensured patients received information in their first language.

The practice had access to British Sign Language (BLS) interpreters. We saw an example of a vulnerable patient requiring a BLS interpreter during the Covid-19 pandemic. The practice set up a call via Microsoft Teams so the patient could receive advice without attending the practice.

The practice provided care for patients in a nearby bail hostel. They found that patients could be discharged from prison after long sentences without the required information about their health and prescribed medicines. They worked with the staff of the hostel and liaised with the prison service so the patients received the medicine they required in a safe way. We saw that the practice adjusted how they worked in order to look after the needs of these patients and other patients in the practice. Appointments were often made for quieter times of the day, for example over the lunchtime period. One named GP usually saw the patients to provide continuity of care. When appropriate they met the patient at the door and escorted them directly toa consultation room, avoiding the need for other staff to be involved.

Practice Opening Times	
Day	Time
Opening times:	
Monday	8am – 6.30pm
Tuesday	8am – 6.30pm
Wednesday	8am – 6.30pm
Thursday	8am – 6.30pm
Friday	8am – 6.30pm
Appointments available	

Appointments available:

Appointments were available at any time when the practice was open. GPs were flexible and would administer baby immunisations if the parents were not available at a time the nurse was on duty.

GPs also had telephone consultations with patients after the practice had closed each evening, and during the weekends and bank holidays.

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.
- 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 under five were offered a same day appointment when necessary.
- Pre-bookable face to face appointments for children under the age of 16 were available at a nearby practice.
- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including homeless people, Travellers and those with a learning disability.
- People in vulnerable circumstances were easily able to register with the practice, including those
 with no fixed abode such as homeless people and Travellers.

 The practice adjusted the delivery of its services to meet the needs of patients with a learning disability. Appointments were often made for when the practice was quieter during the lunchtime period.

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 and Improvement 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 minimise 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

Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:

The practice had no set clinic times and the clinicians were responsive to the needs of each individual patient. If no appointment slots were available reception staff messaged GPs who would triage them and see them if this was required.

We saw evidence that GPs carried out telephone consultations every weekday evening after the practice had closed. They also had telephone consultations for an hour and a half every Saturday, Sunday and bank holiday. We saw evidence that the majority of these telephone consultations were fully utilised. The provider explained that as well as being able to provide continuity of care for patients who were unable to speak to a GP within normal surgery hours, if they had any concerns about a patient, or if a nurse thought a patient would benefit from contact during the weekend, they were able to contact them themselves instead of referring the patient to the out of hours service. The GPs were able to contact the 7 Day Access service if they felt a patient needed a face to face appointment following their telephone consultation.

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)	71.5%	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)	67.3%	61.8%	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)	54.2%	59.6%	67.0%	No statistical variation
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who were satisfied with the appointment (or appointments) they were offered (01/01/2021 to 31/03/2021)	71.6%	74.3%	81.7%	No statistical variation

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

Complaints were listened and responded to and used to improve the quality of care.

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

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

Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:

We saw that all formal complaints were recorded, investigated, acted on and appropriately responded to. The practice manager explained they verbal complaints were not currently recorded as they were usually minor issues that could be immediately rectified. They told us they would look at their procedure to ensure they knew of any complaints' themes so relevant discussions could be held.

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 vision, values and strategy were developed in collaboration with staff, patients and external partners.	Yes
Staff knew and understood the vision, values and strategy and their role in achieving them.	Yes
Progress against delivery of the strategy was monitored.	Yes

Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:

The practice had a mission statement: "This practice recognises its privileged position in relation to the opportunity it has to help the local population with their physical, psychological, and social care needs. It strives to do more for all its patients, who sometimes need more but always deserve more."

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.	
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

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

Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:

The practice manager had put in place a summary of the main points of policies. This meant that staff could quickly refer to guidance such as safeguarding telephone numbers without reading the whole policy.

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
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.	
Patient records were held in line with guidance and requirements.	Yes
Patients were informed and consent obtained if interactions were recorded.	
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.	
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 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 (PPG).	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

Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:

The practice did have a PPG, but they struggled to engage with them digitally during the Covid-19 pandemic. They had recently managed to arrange a face to face meeting and new members had also joined the PPG. We saw a meeting had been arranged for June 2022.

We saw evidence that the practice had discussed the results of the GP patient survey, looking at every indicator and looking at areas where they felt improvements could be made.

Continuous improvement and innovation

There were systems and processes for learning, continuous improvement and innovation.

	Y/N/Partial
There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement.	Yes
Learning was shared effectively and used to make improvements.	Yes
Evaluation of any analysis and additional avidance.	

Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:

The provider demonstrated that they knew their practice population well. They made changes to their service to adapt to the needs of their patients. This included sourcing local support for patients who did not speak English as a first language, and having additional telephone consultations outside their practice opening times. Staff worked together as a team and areas where improvement could be made were discussed regularly in meetings.

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 practices 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-qp-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.
- UKHSA: UK Health and Security Agency.
- 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.