Care Quality Commission

Inspection Evidence Table

Eden Medical Group (1-7197600846)

Inspection date: 13 and 14 December 2022

Date of data download: 05 December 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.	Y
Partners and staff were trained to appropriate levels for their role.	Υ
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.	
We spoke with the GP with responsibility for safeguarding within the practice. They were able to give a	

comprehensive account of how the practice ensured that vulnerable people were protected from harm.

Recruitment systems	Y/N/Partial
Recruitment checks were carried out in accordance with regulations (including for agency staff and locums).	Y
Staff vaccination was maintained in line with current UK Health and Security Agency (UKHSA) guidance if relevant to role.	Y

Safety systems and records	Y/N/Partial
Health and safety risk assessments had been carried out and appropriate actions taken.	V
Date of last assessment: 04/07/2022	ľ
There was a fire procedure.	Y
Date of fire risk assessment: 04/07/2022	
Actions from fire risk assessment were identified and completed.	f

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.	Y
Infection prevention and control audits were carried out. Date of last infection prevention and control audit: November 2022	Y
The practice had acted on any issues identified in infection prevention and control audits.	Υ
The arrangements for managing waste and clinical specimens kept people safe.	Υ

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.	Y
There was an effective induction system for temporary staff tailored to their role.	Υ
The practice was equipped to respond to medical emergencies (including suspected sepsis) and staff were suitably trained in emergency procedures.	Υ
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.	′ Y
There were enough staff to provide appointments and prevent staff from working excessive hours	Partial
The practice acknowledged that in order to provide sufficient staffing at the practice staff	had warker

The practice acknowledged that in order to provide sufficient staffing at the practice staff had worked additional hours on occasion. The staff told us they would like to see the staffing increased at the practice in order to increase availability of appointments. The practice showed us how they had used relevant data to help target busy periods at the practice. For example, administrative staff were working morning shifts as this was when the most telephone calls were received.

Information to deliver safe care and treatment

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

Υ
Υ
Υ
Υ
Υ
Υ
_

Our review of patient records in relation to the clinical searches identified that care records were managed in line with current guidance.

Appropriate and safe use of medicines

The practice had systems for the appropriate and safe use of medicines, including medicines optimisation

Note: From July 2022, CCGs have been replaced with Sub Integrated Care Board Locations (SICBL) and CCG ODS codes have been retained as part of this.

Indicator	Practice	SICBL average	England average	England comparison
Number of antibacterial prescription items prescribed per Specific Therapeutic group Age-sex Related Prescribing Unit (STAR PU) (01/10/2021 to 30/09/2022) (NHS Business Service Authority - NHSBSA)	0.89	0.94	0.82	No statistical variation
The number of prescription items for coamoxiclav, cephalosporins and quinolones as a percentage of the total number of prescription items for selected antibacterial drugs (BNF 5.1 sub-set). (01/10/2021 to 30/09/2022) (NHSBSA)	6.5%	8.3%	8.5%	No statistical variation
Average daily quantity per item for Nitrofurantoin 50 mg tablets and capsules, Nitrofurantoin 100 mg m/r capsules, Pivmecillinam 200 mg tablets	4.33	4.61	5.28	Tending towards variation (positive)

Indicator	Practice	SICBL average	England average	England comparison
and Trimethoprim 200 mg tablets prescribed for uncomplicated urinary tract infection (01/04/2022 to 30/09/2022) (NHSBSA)				
Total items prescribed of Pregabalin or Gabapentin per 1,000 patients (01/01/2022 to 30/06/2022) (NHSBSA)	205.1‰	167.8‰	128.0‰	No statistical variation
Average daily quantity of Hypnotics prescribed per Specific Therapeutic group Age-sex Related Prescribing Unit (STAR PU) (01/10/2021 to 30/09/2022) (NHSBSA)		0.28	0.58	No statistical variation
Number of unique patients prescribed multiple psychotropics per 1,000 patients (01/04/2022 to 30/09/2022) (NHSBSA)		7.2‰	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.	Y
Blank prescriptions were kept securely, and their use monitored in line with national guidance.	Y
Staff had the appropriate authorisations to administer medicines (including Patient Group Directions or Patient Specific Directions).	Υ
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.	Y
There was a process for the safe handling of requests for repeat medicines and evidence of effective medicines reviews for patients on repeat medicines.	Υ
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.	Υ
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. ²	Y
The practice monitored the prescribing of controlled drugs. (For example, investigation of unusual prescribing, quantities, dose, formulations and strength).	Y
There were arrangements for raising concerns around controlled drugs with the NHS England and Improvement Area Team Controlled Drugs Accountable Officer.	Y
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.	Y
The practice had taken steps to ensure appropriate antimicrobial use to optimise patient outcomes and reduce the risk of adverse events and antimicrobial resistance.	Y
For remote or online prescribing there were effective protocols for verifying patient identity.	Υ

Medicines management	Y/N/Partial
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.	Y
There was medical oxygen and a defibrillator on site and systems to ensure these were regularly checked and fit for use.	Y
Vaccines were appropriately stored, monitored and transported in line with UKHSA guidance to ensure they remained safe and effective.	Y

Our review of clinical records showed medicine reviews had been coded correctly but did not always have full details about the review. The practice acknowledged this had been identified as part of regular checks and were putting measures in place to improve, including further auditing. For patients who had blood tests arranged via the hospital the practice had identified the systems in place to share this information were not always effective. They were developing their own process to ensure they were routinely recording the results which indicated it was safe to continue prescribing medicines.

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.	Υ
Staff knew how to identify and report concerns, safety incidents and near misses.	Υ
There was a system for recording and acting on significant events.	Y
Staff understood how to raise concerns and report incidents both internally and externally.	Y
There was evidence of learning and dissemination of information.	Y
Number of events recorded in last 12 months:	46
Number of events that required action:	46

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

	Specific action taken
The practice worked closely with those seeking asylum within the UK. However, a patient was identified to have a previously undetected detached retina.	The practice worked with other stakeholders to ensure that patients who had recently arrived in the UK were correctly screened on arrival.

Safety alerts	Y/N/Partial
There was a system for recording and acting on safety alerts.	Y
Staff understood how to deal with alerts.	Y
We saw examples of actions taken on recent alerts, for example, regarding sodium valproate.	

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 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.	Y
Patients' immediate and ongoing needs were fully assessed. This included their clinical needs and their mental and physical wellbeing.	Y
Patients presenting with symptoms which could indicate serious illness were followed up in a timely and appropriate way.2	Y
We saw no evidence of discrimination when staff made care and treatment decisions.	Υ
Patients' treatment was regularly reviewed and updated.³	Y
There were appropriate referral pathways to make sure that patients' needs were addressed.	Υ
Patients were told when they needed to seek further help and what to do if their condition deteriorated.	Y
The practice prioritised care for their most clinically vulnerable patients.	Y

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.
- The practice had systems to inform eligible patients to have the meningitis vaccine, for example before attending university for the first time.
- Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks including NHS checks for
 patients aged 40 to 74. There was appropriate and timely follow-up on the outcome of health
 assessments and checks where abnormalities or risk factors were identified.
- 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 an effective annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met. For patients with the most complex needs, the GP worked with other health and care professionals to deliver a coordinated package of care.
- Staff who were responsible for reviews of patients with long-term conditions had received specific training.
- GPs followed up patients who had received treatment in hospital or through out of hours services for an acute exacerbation of asthma.
- The practice shared clear and accurate information with relevant professionals when deciding care delivery for patients with long-term conditions.
- The practice could demonstrate how they identified patients with commonly undiagnosed conditions, for example diabetes, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), atrial fibrillation and hypertension.
- Adults with newly diagnosed cardio-vascular disease were offered statins.
- Patients with suspected hypertension were offered ambulatory blood pressure monitoring.
- Patients with COPD were offered rescue packs.
- 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) (UKHSA COVER team)	145	151	96.0%	Met 95% WHO based target
The percentage of children aged 2 who have received their booster immunisation for Pneumococcal infection (i.e. received Pneumococcal booster) (PCV booster) (01/04/2020 to 31/03/2021) (UKHSA COVER team)	137	144	95.1%	Met 95% WHO based target
The percentage of children aged 2 who have received their immunisation for Haemophilus influenza type b (Hib) and	139	144	96.5%	Met 95% WHO based target

Meningitis C (MenC) (i.e. received Hib/MenC booster) (01/04/2020 to 31/03/2021) (UKHSA COVER team)				
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) (UKHSA COVER team)	137	144	95.1%	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) (UKHSA COVER team)	188	204	92.2%	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

Any additional evidence or comments

Though the immunisation figures for the practice met WHO targets the practice was keen to make further improvements. They had analysed their data and noted that patients from other countries (including Scotland) had often started their immunisation programmes in their country of origin. The practice had developed more efficient ways to ensure this information was correctly recorded in their own clinical records system.

Cancer Indicators	Practice	SICBL 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: 30/06/2022) (UK Health and Security Agency)	73.5%	N/A	80% Target	Below 80% target
Females, 50-70, screened for breast cancer in last 36 months (3 year coverage, %) (01/04/2020 to 31/03/2021) (UKHSA)	68.7%	65.4%	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)	67.6%	70.3%	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)	45.5%	58.1%	55.4%	No statistical variation

Note: From July 2022, CCGs have been replaced with Sub Integrated Care Board Locations (SICBL) and CCG ODS codes have been retained as part of this.

Any additional evidence or comments

The practice had accessed additional funding in order to offer additional cervical screening appointments. An additional nurse had completed cervical cytology training to further increase capacity.

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.	Υ
The practice had a programme of targeted quality improvement and used information about care and treatment to make improvements.	Y
The practice regularly reviewed unplanned admissions and readmissions and took appropriate action.	Y

Examples of improvements demonstrated because of clinical audits or other improvement activity in past two years

Following audit, the practice had improved on their safety alerts protocol to ensure they picked up newly registered patients who were on medicines where there had been a past safety alert.

An audit had been set up to identify people with a diagnosis of diabetes and a poor attendance record Measures were now in place to ensure this group of patients were actively followed up and offered additional appointments.

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.	Y
The practice had a programme of learning and development.	Υ
Staff had protected time for learning and development.	Υ
There was an induction programme for new staff.	Υ
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.	Y
The practice could demonstrate how they assured the competence of staff employed in advanced clinical practice, for example, nurses, paramedics, pharmacists and physician associates.	Υ
There was a clear and appropriate approach for supporting and managing staff when their performance was poor or variable.	Y

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.	Υ
Patients received consistent, coordinated, person-centred care when they moved between services.	Υ

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.	Y
Staff encouraged and supported patients to be involved in monitoring and managing their own health.	Y
Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks.	Y
Staff discussed changes to care or treatment with patients and their carers as necessary.	Y
The practice supported national priorities and initiatives to improve the population's health for example, stop smoking campaigns and tackling obesity.	Y

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.	Y
Clinicians supported patients to make decisions. Where appropriate, they assessed and recorded a patient's mental capacity to make a decision.	Υ
Do Not Attempt Cardio Pulmonary Resuscitation (DNACPR) decisions were made in line with relevant legislation and were appropriate.	Y

Our clinical review of notes where a DNACPR decision had been recorded identified where possible the patient's views had been sought and respected. We saw that information had been shared with relevant agencies.

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.	Y
Staff displayed understanding and a non-judgemental attitude towards patients.	Y
Patients were given appropriate and timely information to cope emotionally with their care, treatment or condition.	Y

Patient feedback		
Source	Feedback	
test	The latest results from the friends and family test indicated 86% of patients who had used the service in November 2022 had stated their experience was either 'very good' or 'good'.	

National GP Patient Survey results

Note: From July 2022, CCGs have been replaced with Sub Integrated Care Board Locations (SICBL) and CCG ODS codes have been retained as part of this.

Indicator	Practice	SICBL average	England average	
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 (01/01/2022 to 30/04/2022)	88.6%	85.8%	84.7%	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 (01/01/2022 to 30/04/2022)	89.4%	85.4%	83.5%	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 (01/01/2022 to 30/04/2022)	97.8%	94.4%	93.1%	Tending towards variation (positive)

Indicator	Practice	SICBL average	England average	
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who responded positively to the overall experience of their GP practice (01/01/2022 to 30/04/2022)	83.6%	74.0%	72.4%	No statistical variation

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

Involvement in decisions about care and treatment

Staff helped patients to be involved in decisions about care and treatment / patients were not 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.	Y	
Staff helped patients and their carers find further information and access community and advocacy services.	Y	
Easy read and pictorial materials were available. Staff spoke a variety of different languages and a		

Easy read and pictorial materials were available. Staff spoke a variety of different languages and a telephone translation service was available for people that did not speak English as their first language.

National GP Patient Survey results

Note: From July 2022, CCGs have been replaced with Sub Integrated Care Board Locations (SICBL) and CCG ODS codes have been retained as part of this.

Indicator	Practice	SICBL 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 (01/01/2022 to 30/04/2022)	94.1%	91.8%	89.9%	No statistical variation

	Y/N/Partial
Interpretation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language.	Y
Patient information leaflets and notices were available in the patient waiting area which told patients how to access support groups and organisations.	Υ
Information leaflets were available in other languages and in easy read format.	Υ
Information about support groups was available on the practice website.	Υ

Carers	Narrative
_	125, equating to 0.8% of the practice population. The practice was developing strategies to increase this figure.
How the practice supported carers (including young carers).	The practice used its social prescribing service to support carers.
How the practice supported recently bereaved patients.	The practice ensured that people who had lost a relative were contacted and where appropriate offered bereavement counselling.

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.	Y
There were arrangements to ensure confidentiality at the reception desk.	Y

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

Practice Opening Times			
Day	Time		
Opening times:			
Monday	8am – 8pm		
Tuesday	8am -6.30pm		
Wednesday	8am -6.30pm		
Thursday	8am -6.30pm		
Friday	8am -6.30pm		
Appointments available:			
Monday	7.30am - 8pm		
Tuesday	7.30am – 6.30pm		
Wednesday	7.30am – 6.30pm		
Thursday	7.30am – 6.30pm		
Friday	7.30am – 6.30pm		

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.
- Additional nurse appointments were available after 4.30pm for school age children so that they
 did not need to miss school. In addition, extra appointments were offered during school holidays.
 Additional clinics were currently being provided to address potential strep A diagnosis amongst
 children
- All parents or guardians calling with concerns about a child were offered a same day appointment when necessary.
- The practice was open until 8.00 on Mondays and 6.30pm Tuesday to Friday.
- 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.

Access to the service

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

	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	Υ
The practice offered a range of appointment types to suit different needs (e.g. face to face, telephone, online)	Y
Patients were able to make appointments in a way which met their needs	Υ
There were systems in place to support patients who face communication barriers to access treatment (including those who might be digitally excluded).	Υ
Patients with most urgent needs had their care and treatment prioritised	Υ
There was information available for patients to support them to understand how to access services (including on websites and telephone messages)	Υ

The practice had ensured more staff were deployed at busier times within the practice to help support better access. In addition, they had diversified their range of appointments to include direct access to physiotherapy, pharmacy and social prescribing.

National GP Patient Survey results

Note: From July 2022, CCGs have been replaced with Sub Integrated Care Board Locations (SICBL) and CCG ODS codes have been retained as part of this.

Indicator	Practice	SICBL 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 (01/01/2022 to 30/04/2022)	47.8%	N/A	52.7%	No statistical variation
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who responded positively to the overall experience of making an appointment (01/01/2022 to 30/04/2022)	61.7%	57.1%	56.2%	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 (01/01/2022 to 30/04/2022)	55.6%	55.0%	55.2%	No statistical variation
The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who were satisfied with the appointment (or appointments) they were offered (01/01/2022 to 30/04/2022)	82.5%	76.8%	71.9%	No statistical variation

Source	Feedback
Choices	Though the practice received good feedback via the friends and family test 50% of their feedback in the last year on NHS reviews was poor. However, the practice responded to each negative review with the aim of engaging with patient's and improving their service.

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.	88
Number of complaints we examined.	8
Number of complaints we examined that were satisfactorily handled in a timely way.	8
Number of complaints referred to the Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman.	0

Y/N/Partial

Information about how to complain was readily available.	Y
There was evidence that complaints were used to drive continuous improvement.	Υ

Example(s) of learning from complaints.

Complaint	Specific action taken
Staff attitude	The practice had provided additional training.

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.	Υ
They had identified the actions necessary to address these challenges.	Υ
Staff reported that leaders were visible and approachable.	Υ
There was a leadership development programme, including a succession plan.	Υ

The leaders in the practice had identified the main challenge to their service was ensuring there were sufficient staff to meet patient's needs. Staff questionnaires confirmed this to be an issue. In order to address this the leadership team had continued their recruitment strategy and were upskilling the workforce. The practice acknowledged many of their GPs had qualified within the past 5 years. To support them clinically regular short 'huddle' meetings were held throughout the day along with formal mentoring.

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.	Υ
Staff knew and understood the vision, values and strategy and their role in achieving them.	Υ
Progress against delivery of the strategy was monitored.	Υ

Culture

The practice had a culture which drove high quality sustainable.

	Y/N/Partial
There were arrangements to deal with any behaviour inconsistent with the vision and values.	Y
Staff reported that they felt able to raise concerns without fear of retribution.	Υ
There was a strong emphasis on the safety and well-being of staff.	Υ
There were systems to ensure compliance with the requirements of the duty of candour.	Υ
When people were affected by things that went wrong, they were given an apology and informed of any resulting action.	Υ
The practice encouraged candour, openness and honesty.	Υ
The practice had access to a Freedom to Speak Up Guardian.	Y
Staff had undertaken equality and diversity training.	Y

Source	Feedback
,	The majority of staff surveyed expressed confidence in the local leadership at the practice, they did raise issues about staffing, but we noted this was an open discussion and being communicated between all staff at all levels.

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.	Υ
Staff were clear about their roles and responsibilities.	Υ
There were appropriate governance arrangements with third parties.	Y
There are recovery plans in place to manage backlogs of activity and delays to treatment.	Υ

Since the provider, North Cumbria Primary Care (NCPC) was established, the governance structures had been developed and improved. Governance and systems were NCPC wide, such as finance and human resources. In addition, the practice worked collaboratively with colleagues from their Primary Care Network (PCN). These arrangements were subject to service level agreements and hosting arrangements and included appropriate governance.

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.	Y
There were processes to manage performance.	Y
There was a quality improvement programme in place.	Y
There were effective arrangements for identifying, managing and mitigating risks.	Υ
A major incident plan was in place.	Y
Staff were trained in preparation for major incidents.	Y
When considering service developments or changes, the impact on quality and sustainability was assessed.	Y

NCPC had a quality and assurance system based around identifying risks and using the information to improve and address issues. We saw their corporate risk register and practice risk register were linked together using bespoke data and information dashboards. The dashboards helped to monitor performance in all areas including finance, quality, staffing, complaints and incidents. It was this information that was used to identify and improve key challenges and monitor patient satisfaction.

The practice had a business continuity plan which was enacted during the pandemic. There was an incident policy in place that gave clear guidance on reporting and escalating incidents.

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.	Y
Performance information was used to hold staff and management to account.	Υ
Staff whose responsibilities included making statutory notifications understood what this entailed.	Y

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.	Υ
The provider was registered as a data controller with the Information Commissioner's Office.	Y
Patient records were held in line with guidance and requirements.	Υ
Patients were informed and consent obtained if interactions were recorded.	Υ
The practice ensured patients were informed how their records were stored and managed.	Y
Patients were made aware of the information sharing protocol before online services were delivered.	Y
The practice had arrangements to make staff and patients aware of privacy settings on video and voice call services.	Y
Online consultations took place in appropriate environments to ensure confidentiality.	Υ
The practice advised patients on how to protect their online information.	Υ
Staff are supported to work remotely where applicable.	Υ

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.	Υ
The practice had an active Patient Participation Group.	Υ
Staff views were reflected in the planning and delivery of services.	
The practice worked with stakeholders to build a shared view of challenges and of the needs of the population.	Υ

Continuous improvement and innovation

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

	Y/N/Partial
There was a strong focus on continuous learning and improvement.	Υ
Learning was shared effectively and used to make improvements.	Y

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 SICBL 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 SICBL 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.