

# Care Quality Commission

## Inspection Evidence Table

### The Nuffield Practice (1-5462765322)

Inspection date: 2 September 2021

Date of data download: 31 August 2021

## Overall rating: Good

At our previous inspection in November 2019, we rated the practice Requires Improvement overall due to concerns we found in the provision of safe and well-led services. At this inspection we checked whether the service was providing safe, effective and well-led services and found improvements had been made since November 2019. We have rated the practice as good overall.

Please note: Any Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) data relates to 2019/20.

## Safe

## Rating: Good

At our previous inspection in November 2019, we rated this domain Requires Improvement due to concerns we identified regarding risks related to medicines security and management and the monitoring of patients prescribed high risk medications.

At this inspection, we found improvements in the areas where risks had been identified by the previous inspection team.

### Safety systems and processes

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

Safeguarding	Y/N/Partial
There was a lead member of staff for safeguarding processes and procedures.	Yes
Safeguarding systems, processes and practices were developed, implemented and communicated to staff.	Yes
There were policies covering adult and child safeguarding which were accessible to all staff.	Yes
Policies and procedures were monitored, reviewed and updated.	Yes
Partners and staff were trained to appropriate levels for their role.	Yes
There was active and appropriate engagement in local safeguarding processes.	Yes
The Out of Hours service was informed of relevant safeguarding information.	Yes
There were systems to identify vulnerable patients on record.	Yes

<b>Safeguarding</b>	<b>Y/N/Partial</b>
Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks were undertaken where required.	Yes
Staff who acted as chaperones were trained for their role.	Yes
There were regular discussions between the practice and other health and social care professionals such as health visitors, school nurses, community midwives and social workers to support and protect adults and children at risk of significant harm.	Yes
<p>Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:</p> <p>The practice informed us that staff had access to training tool kits on female genital mutilation and child sexual exploitation to ensure staff had the necessary awareness to identify any risk factors. They were aware not all staff had undertaken the training yet and informed us this training would take place.</p>	

<b>Recruitment systems</b>	<b>Y/N/Partial</b>
Recruitment checks were carried out in accordance with regulations (including for agency staff and locums).	Yes
Staff vaccination was maintained in line with current Public Health England (PHE) guidance if relevant to role.	Yes
There were systems to ensure the registration of clinical staff (including nurses and pharmacists) was checked and regularly monitored.	Yes
<p>Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:</p> <p>At our previous inspection in November 2019, we found that not all staff had appropriate reviews of their health and wellbeing to ensure they were able to provide safe services.</p> <p>At this inspection, we found all background staff checks were in place regarding health and vaccination records. We reviewed two staff files for clinical staff who had joined the practice in the previous 12 months. They contained the appropriate background checks, health questionnaires and vaccination records.</p>	

<b>Safety systems and records</b>	<b>Y/N/Partial</b>
-----------------------------------	--------------------

There was a record of portable appliance testing or visual inspection by a competent person. Date of last inspection/test: October 2019	Yes
There was a record of equipment calibration. Date of last calibration: December 2020	Yes
There were risk assessments for any storage of hazardous substances for example, liquid nitrogen, storage of chemicals.	Yes
There was a fire procedure.	Yes
A fire risk assessment had been completed. Date of completion: August 2021	Yes
Actions from fire risk assessment were identified and completed.	Yes

<b>Health and safety</b>	<b>Y/N/Partial</b>
Premises/security risk assessment had been carried out. Date of last assessment: May 2019	Yes
Health and safety risk assessments had been carried out and appropriate actions taken. Date of last assessment: May 2019	Yes

## Infection prevention and control

### Appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene were met.

	Y/N/Partial
There was an infection risk assessment and policy.	Yes
Staff had received effective training on infection prevention and control.	Yes
Infection prevention and control audits were carried out. Date of last infection prevention and control audit: July 2021	Yes
The practice had acted on any issues identified in infection prevention and control audits.	Yes
There was a system to notify Public Health England of suspected notifiable diseases.	Yes
The arrangements for managing waste and clinical specimens kept people safe.	Yes

## Risks to patients

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

	Y/N/Partial
There was an effective approach to managing staff absences and busy periods.	Yes
There was an effective induction system for temporary staff tailored to their role.	Yes
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

## 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

## 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) (01/07/2020 to 30/06/2021) (NHS Business Service Authority - NHSBSA)	0.65	0.61	0.69	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). (01/07/2020 to 30/06/2021) (NHSBSA)	10.6%	12.5%	10.0%	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 (01/01/2021 to 30/06/2021) (NHSBSA)	4.92	5.31	5.38	No statistical variation
Total items prescribed of Pregabalin or Gabapentin per 1,000 patients (01/01/2021 to 30/06/2021) (NHSBSA)	88.9‰	87.2‰	126.0‰	No statistical variation
Average daily quantity of Hypnotics prescribed per Specific Therapeutic group Age-sex Related Prescribing Unit (STAR PU) (01/07/2020 to 30/06/2021) (NHSBSA)	0.13	0.42	0.65	Significant Variation (positive)
Number of unique patients prescribed multiple psychotropics per 1,000 patients (01/10/2020 to 31/03/2021) (NHSBSA)	6.5‰	5.2‰	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
Blank prescriptions were kept securely, and their use monitored in line with national guidance.	Yes
Staff had the appropriate authorisations to administer medicines (including Patient Group Directions or Patient Specific Directions).	Yes
The practice could demonstrate the prescribing competence of non-medical prescribers, and there was regular review of their prescribing practice supported by clinical supervision or peer review.	Yes
There was a process for the safe handling of requests for repeat medicines and evidence of structured medicines reviews for patients on repeat medicines.	Yes
The practice had a process and clear audit trail for the management of information about changes to a patient's medicines including changes made by other services.	Yes
There was a process for monitoring patients' health in relation to the use of medicines including high risk medicines (for example, warfarin, methotrexate and lithium) with appropriate monitoring and clinical review prior to prescribing.	Yes
The practice monitored the prescribing of controlled drugs. (For example, investigation of unusual prescribing, quantities, dose, formulations and strength).	Yes
There were arrangements for raising concerns around controlled drugs with the NHS England Area Team Controlled Drugs Accountable Officer.	Yes
If the practice had controlled drugs on the premises there were appropriate systems and written procedures for the safe ordering, receipt, storage, administration, balance checks and disposal of these medicines, which were in line with national guidance.	Yes
The practice had taken steps to ensure appropriate antimicrobial use to optimise patient outcomes and reduce the risk of adverse events and antimicrobial resistance.	Yes
For remote or online prescribing there were effective protocols for verifying patient identity.	Yes
The practice held appropriate emergency medicines, risk assessments were in place to determine the range of medicines held, and a system was in place to monitor stock levels and expiry dates.	Yes
There was medical oxygen and a defibrillator on site and systems to ensure these were regularly checked and fit for use.	Yes
Vaccines were appropriately stored, monitored and transported in line with PHE guidance to ensure they remained safe and effective.	Yes
<p>Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:</p> <p>At our previous inspection in November 2019, we found fridges used to store vaccines were not secure or monitored appropriately. We also found the systems for monitoring patients on high risk medicines did not always ensure that monitoring took place or that prescribing was always safe.</p>	

Medicines management	Y/N/Partial
<p>At this inspection we conducted remote searches on the clinical system. These identified that the practice was monitoring patients on high risk medications appropriately and they were prompted to attend for blood tests or other observations when required.</p> <p>We also observed the fridges were locked, the keys were stored in a key safe and also were kept by staff who accessed the fridges frequently. We saw the system for monitoring the fridge temperatures was operated effectively. A data monitor had been implemented as a back up to the manual recording.</p>	

## Track record on safety and lessons learned and improvements made

### The practice learned and made improvements when things went wrong.

Significant events	Y/N/Partial
The practice monitored and reviewed safety using information from a variety of sources.	Yes
Staff knew how to identify and report concerns, safety incidents and near misses.	Yes
There was a system for recording and acting on significant events.	Yes
Staff understood how to raise concerns and report incidents both internally and externally.	Yes
There was evidence of learning and dissemination of information.	Yes
Number of events recorded in last 12 months:	25
Number of events that required action:	25

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

Event	Specific action taken
The sending of an urgent referral form was delayed	The system for processing urgent referrals was amended to help staff identify when referrals require prioritisation.

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

## Effective

## Rating: Good

### Effective needs assessment, care and treatment

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

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

## Older people

## Population group rating: Good

Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The practice followed up on older patients discharged from hospital to ensure any care required was assessed and met.</li><li>• Where do not attempt cardiopulmonary resuscitation (DNACPR) orders were in place, they were always completed with involvement of individuals or the appropriate use of best interest decision making.</li><li>• The practice carried out structured annual medicines reviews for older patients.</li><li>• Staff had appropriate knowledge of treating older people including their psychological, mental and communication needs.</li><li>• Flu, shingles and pneumonia vaccinations were offered to relevant patients in this age group.</li></ul>

## People with long-term conditions

## Population group rating: Good

Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Patients with long-term conditions were offered a structured annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met.</li><li>• Staff who were responsible for reviews of patients with long-term conditions had received specific training.</li></ul>



- The practice could demonstrate how they identified patients with commonly undiagnosed conditions, for example diabetes and chronic kidney disease.
- Patients with long term conditions were offered a management care plan to support them with self-care.

Long-term conditions	Practice	CCG average	England average	England comparison
The percentage of patients with asthma, on the register, who have had an asthma review in the preceding 12 months that includes an assessment of asthma control using the 3 RCP questions. (01/04/2019 to 31/03/2020) (QOF)	77.4%	77.3%	76.6%	No statistical variation
PCA* rate (number of PCAs).	3.7% (35)	12.2%	12.3%	N/A
The percentage of patients with COPD who have had a review, undertaken by a healthcare professional, including an assessment of breathlessness using the Medical Research Council dyspnoea scale in the preceding 12 months (01/04/2019 to 31/03/2020) (QOF)	93.8%	91.1%	89.4%	No statistical variation
PCA rate (number of PCAs).	8.2% (20)	14.2%	12.7%	N/A

\*PCA: Personalised Care Adjustments allow practices to remove a patient from the indicator for limited, specified reasons.

Long-term conditions	Practice	CCG average	England average	England comparison
The percentage of patients aged 79 years or under with coronary heart disease in whom the last blood pressure reading (measured in the preceding 12 months) is 140/90 mmHg or less (01/04/2019 to 31/03/2020) (QOF)	87.3%	83.3%	82.0%	No statistical variation
PCA* rate (number of PCAs).	1.9% (5)	4.6%	5.2%	N/A
The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, without moderate or severe frailty in whom the last IFCC-HbA1c is 58 mmol/mol or less in the preceding 12 months (01/04/2019 to 31/03/2020) (QOF)	77.9%	66.5%	66.9%	Tending towards variation (positive)
PCA rate (number of PCAs).	33.9% (139)	14.6%	15.3%	N/A
The percentage of patients aged 79 years or under with hypertension in whom the last blood pressure reading (measured in the preceding 12 months) is 140/90 mmHg or less (01/04/2019 to 31/03/2020) (QOF)	80.5%	72.2%	72.4%	No statistical variation
PCA rate (number of PCAs).	3.4% (62)	6.3%	7.1%	N/A

In those patients with atrial fibrillation with a record of a CHA2DS2-VASc score of 2 or more, the percentage of patients who are currently treated with anti-coagulation drug therapy (01/04/2019 to 31/03/2020) <sup>(QOF)</sup>	93.4%	91.0%	91.8%	No statistical variation
PCA rate (number of PCAs).	11.9% (41)	5.3%	4.9%	N/A
The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, without moderate or severe frailty in whom the last blood pressure reading (measured in the preceding 12 months) is 140/80 mmHg or less (01/04/2019 to 31/03/2020) <sup>(QOF)</sup>	85.1%	77.0%	75.9%	No statistical variation
PCA rate (number of PCAs).	10.0% (41)	10.1%	10.4%	N/A

\*PCA: Personalised Care Adjustments allow practices to remove a patient from the indicator for limited, specified reasons.

## Families, children and young people

## Population group rating: Good

### Findings

- The practice has met the minimum 90% for all five childhood immunisation uptake indicators. The practice has also met the WHO based national target of 95% (the recommended standard for achieving herd immunity) for one of five childhood immunisation uptake indicators.
- The practice contacted the parents or guardians of children due to have childhood immunisations.
- The practice had arrangements for following up failed attendance of children's appointments following an appointment in secondary care or for immunisation and would liaise with health visitors when necessary.
- The practice had arrangements to identify and review the treatment of newly pregnant women on long-term medicines. These patients were provided with advice and post-natal support in accordance with best practice guidance.
- Young people could access services for sexual health and contraception.

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) (01/04/2019 to 31/03/2020) (NHS England)	99	105	94.3%	Met 90% minimum
The percentage of children aged 2 who have received their booster immunisation for Pneumococcal infection (i.e. received Pneumococcal booster) (PCV booster) (01/04/2019 to 31/03/2020) (NHS England)	91	96	94.8%	Met 90% minimum
The percentage of children aged 2 who have received their immunisation for Haemophilus influenza type b (Hib) and Meningitis C (MenC) (i.e. received Hib/MenC booster) (01/04/2019 to 31/03/2020) (NHS England)	91	96	94.8%	Met 90% minimum
The percentage of children aged 2 who have received immunisation for measles, mumps and rubella (one dose of MMR) (01/04/2019 to 31/03/2020) (NHS England)	93	96	96.9%	Met 95% WHO based target
The percentage of children aged 5 who have received immunisation for measles, mumps and rubella (two doses of MMR) (01/04/2019 to 31/03/2020) (NHS England)	107	113	94.7%	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>

## Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

Population group rating: Good

Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks including NHS checks for patients aged 40 to 74.</li> <li>Patients could book or cancel appointments online and order repeat medicines without the need to attend the surgery.</li> <li>The practice provided a variety of means to access appointments such as online, phone and face to face where necessary.</li> </ul>

Cancer Indicators	Practice	CCG average	England average	England comparison
The percentage of women eligible for cervical cancer screening at a given point in time who were screened adequately within a specified period (within 3.5 years for women aged 25 to 49, and within 5.5 years for women aged 50 to 64). (Snapshot date: 31/03/2021) <small>(Public Health England)</small>	76.4%	N/A	80% Target	Below 80% target
Females, 50-70, screened for breast cancer in last 36 months (3 year coverage, %) (01/04/2019 to 31/03/2020) <small>(PHE)</small>	73.7%	72.3%	70.1%	N/A
Persons, 60-74, screened for bowel cancer in last 30 months (2.5 year coverage, %) (01/04/2019 to 31/03/2020) <small>(PHE)</small>	67.5%	64.4%	63.8%	N/A
The percentage of patients with cancer, diagnosed within the preceding 15 months, who have a patient review recorded as occurring within 6 months of the date of diagnosis (01/04/2019 to 31/03/2020) <small>(QoF)</small>	92.6%	95.0%	92.7%	N/A
Number of new cancer cases treated (Detection rate: % of which resulted from a two week wait (TWW) referral) (01/04/2019 to 31/03/2020) <small>(PHE)</small>	78.2%	65.5%	54.2%	Variation (positive)

Any additional evidence or comments
<p>The practice had focused on recalling patients eligible for cervical screening when required as part of their quality improvement work and providing clinics specifically for this purpose. In addition they closely monitored the uptake on their clinical system. The practice's own data from August 2021 indicated that:</p> <p>91% uptake for patients aged 25 to 49 years 95% uptake for patients aged 50 to 64 years</p> <p>The practice informed us they would continue to target improvements and monitor the uptake of cervical screening.</p>

**People whose circumstances make them vulnerable**

**Population group rating: Good**

**Findings**

- Same day appointments and longer appointments were offered when required.
- Patients with a learning disability were offered an annual health check. There were 93 patients listed on the clinical system as having a learning disability and 82 had a health check listed within the last 12 months.
- The practice had a system for vaccinating patients with an underlying medical condition according to the recommended schedule.
- The practice demonstrated that they had a system to identify people who misused substances.

**People experiencing poor mental health  
(including people with dementia)**

**Population group rating: Good**

**Findings**

- The practice assessed and monitored the physical health of people with mental illness, severe mental illness, and personality disorder by providing annual reviews.
- Same day and longer appointments were offered when required.
- There was a system for following up patients who failed to attend for administration of long-term medicines.
- Patients at risk of dementia were identified and offered an assessment to detect possible signs of dementia. When dementia was suspected there was an appropriate referral for diagnosis.

Mental Health Indicators	Practice	CCG average	England average	England comparison
The percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who have a comprehensive, agreed care plan documented in the record, in the preceding 12 months (01/04/2019 to 31/03/2020) <sup>(QOF)</sup>	92.9%	90.0%	85.4%	No statistical variation
PCA* rate (number of PCAs).	4.9% (5)	15.9%	16.6%	N/A
The percentage of patients diagnosed with dementia whose care plan has been reviewed in a face-to-face review in the preceding 12 months (01/04/2019 to 31/03/2020) <sup>(QOF)</sup>	88.3%	81.8%	81.4%	No statistical variation
PCA rate (number of PCAs).	5.7% (14)	5.1%	8.0%	N/A

\*PCA: Personalised Care Adjustments allow practices to remove a patient from the indicator for limited, specified reasons.

## Monitoring care and treatment

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

Indicator	Practice	England average
Overall QOF score (out of maximum 559)	558.6	533.9
Overall QOF score (as a percentage of maximum)	99.9%	95.5%
Overall QOF PCA reporting (all domains)	6.2%	5.9%

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

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

We reviewed audits of minor surgery and patients prescribed high-risk medications which had been used to ensure improvement monitoring of these patients. The practice's audit planner indicated the audits were being repeated as planned to monitor the relevant care outcomes.

## Any additional evidence or comments

There was a comprehensive schedule of clinical audits in place. This demonstrated there was a system to govern and maintain the breadth of audit activity in place.
---

## 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 always had processes to obtain 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



## Well-led

## Rating: Good

At our previous inspection in November 2019, we rated this domain Requires Improvement due to concerns we identified regarding the lack of governance in specific areas and risk which had not been identified, assessed and mitigated.

At this inspection, we found improvements in the areas where risks had been identified by the previous inspection team. There was a strengthening of governance arrangements.

### Leadership capacity and capability

#### There was compassionate, inclusive and effective leadership at all levels.

	Y/N/Partial
Leaders demonstrated that they understood the challenges to quality and sustainability.	Yes
They had identified the actions necessary to address these challenges.	Yes
Staff reported that leaders were visible and approachable.	Yes
There was a leadership development programme, including a succession plan.	Yes

### Vision and strategy

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

	Y/N/Partial
The practice had a clear vision and set of values that prioritised quality and sustainability.	Yes
There was a realistic strategy to achieve their priorities.	Yes
The vision, values and strategy were developed in collaboration with staff, patients and external partners.	Yes
Staff knew and understood the vision, values and strategy and their role in achieving them.	Yes
Progress against delivery of the strategy was monitored.	Yes

## Culture

### The practice had a culture which drove high quality sustainable care.

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

Examples of feedback from staff or other evidence about working at the practice

Source	Feedback
Staff interviews	Staff reported being well supported, listened to and valued by the leadership team. They felt they could share concerns or suggestions and these would be acted on.

## 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:  At our previous inspection in November 2019, we found there were gaps in governance regarding medications management and monitoring of high-risk medications.  At this inspection, we found from extensive remote searches of patients prescribed high-risk medications, that patients received appropriate reviews of their prescribing. There were systems to keep medicines safe and monitored in line with national guidance.	

## Managing risks, issues and performance

**There were clear and effective processes for managing risks, issues and performance.**

	Y/N/Partial
There were comprehensive assurance systems which were regularly reviewed and improved.	Yes
There were processes to manage performance.	Yes
There was a quality improvement programme in place.	Yes
There were effective arrangements for identifying, managing and mitigating risks.	Yes
A major incident plan was in place.	Yes
Staff were trained in preparation for major incidents.	Yes
When considering service developments or changes, the impact on quality and sustainability was assessed.	Yes

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

	Y/N/Partial
The practice had adapted how it offered appointments to meet the needs of patients during the pandemic.	Yes
The needs of vulnerable people (including those who might be digitally excluded) had been considered in relation to access.	Yes
There were systems in place to identify and manage patients who needed a face-to-face appointment.	Yes
The practice actively monitored the quality of access and made improvements in response to findings.	Yes
There were recovery plans in place to manage backlogs of activity and delays to treatment.	Yes
Changes had been made to infection control arrangements to protect staff and patients using the service.	Yes
Staff were supported to work remotely where applicable.	Yes

## Appropriate and accurate information

**There was a demonstrated commitment to using data and information proactively to drive and support decision making.**

	Y/N/Partial
Staff used data to monitor and improve performance.	Yes
Performance information was used to hold staff and management to account.	Yes
There were effective arrangements for identifying, managing and mitigating risks.	Yes
Staff whose responsibilities included making statutory notifications understood what this entails.	Yes

## Governance and oversight of remote services

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

## Engagement with patients, the public, staff and external partners

**The practice involved the public, staff and external partners to sustain high quality and sustainable care.**

	Y/N/Partial
Patient views were acted on to improve services and culture.	Yes
The practice had an active Patient Participation Group.	Yes
Staff views were reflected in the planning and delivery of services.	Yes
The practice worked with stakeholders to build a shared view of challenges and of the needs of the population.	Yes
Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:  The practice had undertaken a comprehensive survey on patient opinion and were in the process of determining the outcomes of the results in terms of making any changes to services. The initial results showed a high level of regard from patients.	

Feedback from Patient Participation Group.

Feedback
We spoke with two members of the PPG. They both explained the practice was very inclusive of the PPG's ideas and views. The PPG were supported in undertaking their own initiatives such as mental health walks and patient newsletters.

## 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

Examples of continuous learning and improvement
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The practice had a 'wiki page' which enabled ease of access to a broad range of information including governance systems, policies and specific information related to staff roles such as infection control.</li><li>A new system of monitoring emergency medicines and equipment had been implemented to improve the efficiency of the process and ensure periodic checks are relevant to both medicines and the equipment. This was still in the process of being embedded.</li></ul>

## 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)	$\leq -3$
Variation (positive)	$> -3$ and $\leq -2$
Tending towards variation (positive)	$> -2$ and $\leq -1.5$
No statistical variation	$< 1.5$ and $> 1.5$
Tending towards variation (negative)	$\geq 1.5$ and $< 2$
Variation (negative)	$\geq 2$ and $< 3$
Significant variation (negative)	$\geq 3$

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

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

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

Guidance and Frequently Asked Questions on GP Insight can be found on the following link: <https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-providers/gps/how-we-monitor-gp-practices>

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

## Glossary of terms used in the data.

- **COPD:** Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease.
- **PHE:** Public Health England.
- **QOF:** Quality and Outcomes Framework.
- **STAR-PU:** Specific Therapeutic Group Age-sex weightings Related Prescribing Units. These weighting allow more accurate and meaningful comparisons within a specific therapeutic group by taking into account the types of people who will be receiving that treatment.
- **\*PCA:** Personalised Care Adjustment. This replaces the QOF Exceptions previously used in the Evidence Table (see [GMS QOF Framework](#) ). Personalised Care Adjustments allow practices to remove a patient from the indicator for limited, specified reasons.
- 
- % = per thousand.