

Care Quality Commission

Inspection Evidence Table

Uxendon Crescent Surgery (1-549637694)

Inspection date: 28 March 2019

Date of data download: 21 March 2019

Overall rating: Good

Please note: Any Quality Outcomes Framework (QOF) data relates to 2017/18.

Safe

Rating: Good

Safety systems and processes

The practice had 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. | Yes |
| Policies and procedures were monitored, reviewed and updated. | Yes |
| Policies were accessible to all staff. | Yes |
| Partners and staff were trained to appropriate levels for their role (for example, level three for GPs, including locum GPs). | Yes |
| There was active and appropriate engagement in local safeguarding processes. | Yes |
| There were systems to identify vulnerable patients on record. | Yes |
| There was a risk register of specific patients. | Yes |
| Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks were undertaken where required. | Yes |
| Staff who acted as chaperones were trained for their role. | Yes |
| There were regular discussions between the practice and other health and social care professionals such as health visitors, school nurses, community midwives and social workers to support and protect adults and children at risk of significant harm. | Yes |
| Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: The Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health issued updated guidance in January 2019 which set out the appropriate level of safeguarding children training required for different members of staff, which included the recommendation that practice nurses should be trained to level 3. The practice was aware | |

| Safeguarding | Y/N/Partial |
|--|-------------|
| of the guidance, had amended its safeguarding children policy to reflect the update and was working towards compliance for all relevant staff. | |

| Recruitment systems | Y/N/Partial |
|--|-------------|
| Recruitment checks were carried out in accordance with regulations (including for agency staff and locums). | Yes |
| Staff vaccination was maintained in line with current Public Health England (PHE) guidance and 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 |
| Staff had any necessary medical indemnity insurance. | Yes |
| Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: We reviewed the files of staff who had been recruited since our last inspection and found they complied with regulations and with the recruitment policy and procedure of the practice. | |

| Safety systems and records | Y/N/Partial |
|---|-------------|
| There was a record of portable appliance testing or visual inspection by a competent person. Date of last inspection/test: 23.04.2018 | Yes |
| There was a record of equipment calibration. Date of last calibration: 23.04.2018 | Yes |
| There were risk assessments for any storage of hazardous substances for example, storage of chemicals. | Yes |
| There was a fire procedure. | Yes |
| There was a record of fire extinguisher checks. Date of last check: May 2018 | Yes |
| There was a record of fire alarm maintenance. Date of last check: August 2018 | Yes |
| There was a log of fire drills. Date of last drill: 18.02.19 (full evacuation with staff and patients) | Yes |
| There was a record of fire alarm checks. Date of last check: 26.03.19 (undertaken weekly) | Yes |
| There was a record of fire training for staff. Date of last training: Variable dates. Undertaken annually via on-line training portal. | Yes |
| There were fire marshals. | Yes |
| A fire risk assessment had been completed. Date of completion: 17.05.18 | Yes |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Actions from fire risk assessment were identified and completed. | Yes |
| Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We saw evidence of a valid gas safety certificate undertaken on 09.04.2018 and an electrical installation condition report undertaken on 12.05.18 (valid five years). | |

| Health and safety | Y/N/Partial |
|---|-------------|
| Premises/security risk assessment had been carried out. Date of last assessment: 05.04.18 | Yes |
| Health and safety risk assessments had been carried out and appropriate actions taken. Date of last assessment: 05.04.18 | Yes |
| Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: | |
| We saw staff had received health and safety and moving and handling training as part of the mandatory training schedule. | |

Infection prevention and control

Appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene were met/not met.

| | Y/N/Partial |
|--|-------------|
| There was an infection risk assessment and policy. | Yes |
| Staff had received effective training on infection prevention and control. | Yes |
| Date of last infection prevention and control audit: | 11.02.2019 |
| 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: | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An infection prevention and control (IPC) audit had been undertaken by the Primary Care IPC Team. We saw that the practice had acted upon some of the actions, for example the IPC audit found that the buckets used for cleaning were not clean and were not kept dry and inverted. On the day of the inspection we observed all buckets to be clean and stored appropriately. The action plan had also made some recommendations with a 12 and 18 months completion timeframe, for example to replace some clinical sinks with IPC compliant sinks. The practice told us this was scheduled to be completed in May 2019. A Legionella risk assessment had been undertaken on 31 May 2018 and we saw evidence that monthly water temperature testing was carried out. All staff had received IPC training relevant to their role and refresher training was undertaken annually. A recently recruited practice nurse had been nominated as the IPC lead but had not yet undertaken any enhanced training to support them in the extended role. The practice nurse demonstrated the process to decontaminate non-disposable equipment, for example an ear irrigator and we saw a log was maintained. Handwashing, sharps injury and sepsis awareness posters were displayed in all clinical rooms. Spillage kits were available and staff we spoke with knew where they were located. Staff we spoke with knew how handle clinical specimens on reception and had access to personal protective equipment. | |

Risks to patients

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

| | Y/N/Partial |
|--|-------------|
| There was an effective approach to managing staff absences and busy periods. | Yes |
| There was an effective induction system for temporary staff tailored to their role. | Yes |
| Comprehensive risk assessments were carried out for patients. | Yes |
| Risk management plans for patients were developed in line with national guidance. | Yes |
| Panic alarms were fitted and administrative staff understood how to respond to the alarm and the location of emergency equipment. | Yes |
| Clinicians knew how to identify and manage patients with severe infections including sepsis. | Yes |
| Receptionists were aware of actions to take if they encountered a deteriorating or acutely unwell patient and had been given guidance on identifying such patients. | Yes |
| There was a process in the practice for urgent clinical review of such patients. | Yes |
| There was equipment available to enable assessment of patients with presumed sepsis or other clinical emergency. | Yes |
| There were systems to enable the assessment of patients with presumed sepsis in line with National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidance. | Yes |
| When there were changes to services or staff the practice assessed and monitored the impact on safety. | Yes |
| <p>Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: The practice had a sepsis identification and management protocol which was accessible to all staff. We saw that the practice had also delivered training to its non-clinical staff and we saw sepsis awareness guidance for reception staff.</p> | |

Information to deliver safe care and treatment

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

| | Y/N/Partial |
|---|-------------|
| Individual care records, including clinical data, were written and managed securely and in line with current guidance and relevant legislation. | Yes |
| There was a system for processing information relating to new patients including the summarising of new patient notes. | Yes |
| There were systems for sharing information with staff and other agencies to enable them to deliver safe care and treatment. | Yes |
| Referral letters contained specific information to allow appropriate and timely referrals. | Yes |
| Referrals to specialist services were documented. | Yes |
| 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 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| The practice demonstrated that when patients use multiple services, all the information needed for their ongoing care was shared appropriately and in line with relevant protocols. | Yes |
|---|-----|

Appropriate and safe use of medicines

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

| Indicator | Practice | CCG average | England average | England comparison |
|--|----------|-------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Number of antibacterial prescription items prescribed per Specific Therapeutic group Age-sex Related Prescribing Unit (STAR PU) (01/01/2018 to 31/12/2018) (NHS Business Service Authority - NHSBSA) | 0.82 | 0.60 | 0.91 | 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). (01/01/2018 to 31/12/2018) (NHSBSA) | 11.3% | 10.5% | 8.7% | No statistical variation |
| Average daily quantity per item for Nitrofurantoin 50 mg tablets and capsules, Nitrofurantoin 100 mg m/r capsules, Pivmecillinam 200 mg tablets and Trimethoprim 200 mg tablets prescribed for uncomplicated urinary tract infection (01/04/2018 to 30/09/2018) (NHSBSA) | 5.82 | 5.89 | 5.64 | No statistical variation |
| Average daily quantity of oral NSAIDs prescribed per Specific Therapeutic Group Age-sex Related Prescribing Unit (STAR-PU) (01/07/2018 to 31/12/2018) (NHSBSA) | 0.76 | 1.13 | 2.13 | Variation (positive) |

| 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 |

| Medicines management | Y/N/Partial |
|---|--------------------|
| 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 |
| 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 |
| 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 |
| The practice had arrangements to monitor the stock levels and expiry dates of emergency medicines/medical gases. | 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 |
| Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: | |
| In July 2018 the practice recruited an in-house clinical pharmacist, 25 hours per week. The role included patient consultations to undertake medicine reviews, including those patients on polypharmacy (the concurrent use of multiple medications by a patient), dealing with patient medication queries and liaising with community pharmacists. We spoke with the pharmacist on the day of the inspection who told us they were supervised by the GP partner prescribing lead. The practice told us there had been a positive impact on its medicine management system and processes because of the pharmacist. | |

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: | 4 |
| Number of events that required action: | Yes |

Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:

- Staff we spoke with told us that when things went wrong there was a culture of openness and support.
- Significant events were a standing agenda item and we saw minutes of meetings which included outcomes and learning points from incidents.

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

| Event | Specific action taken |
|--|---|
| Attempted break-in at the practice (unsuccessful). Activation of alarm caused intruder to flee. No physical access to premises. No loss of property. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police attendance. • The practice reviewed its closing procedure with all staff and used the incident to update the practice closing check list to include a tick box that every window and door had been checked as secure before locking up the surgery. • The practice updated its intruder alarm system to a monitored system directly to the alarm company who notify the police and the partners in the event of an alarm activation. |

| 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: | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The practice told us that alerts were received by the practice manager and pharmacist and disseminated to all clinical staff. The clinical pharmacist and lead GP reviewed and made a decision on their relevance. • We saw that some recent alerts had been acted upon and patient searches and follow-up undertaken. | |

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 |
| 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 were in place 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 |

| Prescribing | Practice performance | CCG average | England average | England comparison |
|---|----------------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|
| Average daily quantity of Hypnotics prescribed per Specific Therapeutic group Age-sex Related Prescribing Unit (STAR PU) (01/01/2018 to 31/12/2018) <small>(NHSBSA)</small> | 0.40 | 0.42 | 0.79 | Tending towards variation (positive) |

Older people

Population group rating: Good

| Findings |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The practice used a clinical tool to identify older patients who were living with moderate or severe frailty. Those identified received a full assessment of their physical, mental and social needs. The practice followed up on older patients discharged from hospital. It ensured that their care plans and prescriptions were updated to reflect any extra or changed needs. Staff had appropriate knowledge of treating older people including their psychological, mental and communication needs. Health checks were offered to patients over 75 years of age. The practice participated in the Whole Systems Integrated Care (WSIC) initiative which enabled more effective management of patients through linked patient data from acute, mental health and community trusts and GP practices to generate an integrated care record to provide a 'joined-up' care history. The practice used this data to manage patients, specifically those who were at high risk of admission. |

People with long-term conditions

Population group rating: Good

| Findings |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Patients with long-term conditions had 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. The practice employed a clinical pharmacist who undertook medicine reviews, including patients on polypharmacy. 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 could demonstrate how they identified patients with commonly undiagnosed conditions, for example diabetes, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), atrial fibrillation and hypertension. Adults with newly diagnosed cardio-vascular disease were offered statins. Patients with suspected hypertension were offered ambulatory blood pressure monitoring. |

- Patients with atrial fibrillation were assessed for stroke risk and treated appropriately.

| Diabetes Indicators | Practice | CCG average | England average | England comparison |
|---|--------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last IFCC-HbA1c is 64 mmol/mol or less in the preceding 12 months (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) <small>(QOF)</small> | 78.3% | 77.0% | 78.8% | No statistical variation |
| Exception rate (number of exceptions). | 6.8% (32) | 11.4% | 13.2% | N/A |
| The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last blood pressure reading (measured in the preceding 12 months) is 140/80 mmHg or less (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) <small>(QOF)</small> | 78.6% | 79.3% | 77.7% | No statistical variation |
| Exception rate (number of exceptions). | 2.3% (11) | 8.1% | 9.8% | N/A |
| The percentage of patients with diabetes, on the register, whose last measured total cholesterol (measured within the preceding 12 months) is 5 mmol/l or less (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) <small>(QOF)</small> | 79.7% | 78.7% | 80.1% | No statistical variation |
| Exception rate (number of exceptions). | 7.7% (36) | 8.9% | 13.5% | N/A |

| Other long-term conditions | Practice | CCG average | England average | England comparison |
|---|-------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| The percentage of patients with asthma, on the register, who have had an asthma review in the preceding 12 months that includes an assessment of asthma control using the 3 RCP questions, NICE 2011 menu ID: NM23 (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) <small>(QOF)</small> | 88.4% | 78.9% | 76.0% | Variation (positive) |
| Exception rate (number of exceptions). | 0.9% (2) | 2.6% | 7.7% | 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 (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) <small>(QOF)</small> | 95.6% | 93.0% | 89.7% | No statistical variation |
| Exception rate (number of exceptions). | 9.3% (7) | 9.5% | 11.5% | N/A |
| The percentage of patients with hypertension in whom the last blood pressure reading | 83.9% | 82.6% | 82.6% | No statistical variation |

| | | | | |
|--|---------------|-------|-------|--------------------------|
| measured in the preceding 12 months is 150/90mmHg or less (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) <small>(QOF)</small> | | | | |
| Exception rate (number of exceptions). | 1.4% (13) | 3.7% | 4.2% | 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 (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) <small>(QOF)</small> | 89.2% | 85.4% | 90.0% | No statistical variation |
| Exception rate (number of exceptions). | 11.9% (10) | 10.6% | 6.7% | N/A |

Families, children and young people

Population group rating: Good

| Findings |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Childhood immunisation uptake rates were above World Health Organisation (WHO) targets of 90%. 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. 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. Young people could access services for sexual health and contraception. |

| Child Immunisation | Numerator | Denominator | Practice % | Comparison to WHO target |
|---|-----------|-------------|------------|--------------------------------|
| The percentage of children aged 1 who have completed a primary course of immunisation for Diphtheria, Tetanus, Polio, Pertussis, Haemophilus influenza type b (Hib) ((i.e. three doses of DTaP/IPV/Hib) (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) <small>(NHS England)</small> | 58 | 64 | 90.6% | Met 90% minimum (no variation) |
| The percentage of children aged 2 who have received their booster immunisation for Pneumococcal infection (i.e. received Pneumococcal booster) (PCV booster) (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) <small>(NHS England)</small> | 74 | 81 | 91.4% | Met 90% minimum (no variation) |
| 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) (01/04/2017 to | 75 | 81 | 92.6% | Met 90% minimum (no variation) |

| | | | | |
|--|----|----|-------|---|
| 31/03/2018) (NHS England) | | | | |
| The percentage of children aged 2 who have received immunisation for measles, mumps and rubella (one dose of MMR) (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) (NHS England) | 78 | 81 | 96.3% | Met 95% WHO based target (significant variation positive) |

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

Population group rating: Good

| Findings |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The practice had systems to inform eligible patients to have the meningitis vaccine, for example before attending university for the first time. Patients had access to appropriate health assessments and checks including NHS checks for patients aged 40 to 74. There was appropriate and timely follow-up on the outcome of health assessments and checks where abnormalities or risk factors were identified. Patients could book or cancel appointments online and order repeat medication without the need to attend the surgery. |

| Cancer Indicators | Practice | CCG average | England average | England comparison |
|--|----------|-------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| The percentage of women eligible for cervical cancer screening at a given point in time who were screened adequately within a specified period (within 3.5 years for women aged 25 to 49, and within 5.5 years for women aged 50 to 64) (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) (Public Health England) | 66.9% | 63.7% | 71.7% | No statistical variation |
| Females, 50-70, screened for breast cancer in last 36 months (3-year coverage, %) (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) (PHE) | 73.7% | 61.8% | 70.0% | N/A |
| Persons, 60-69, screened for bowel cancer in last 30 months (2.5-year coverage, %) (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) (PHE) | 52.6% | 42.0% | 54.5% | 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. (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) (PHE) | 64.3% | 79.2% | 70.2% | N/A |
| Number of new cancer cases treated (Detection rate: % of which resulted from a two week wait (TWW) referral) (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) (PHE) | 61.9% | 55.2% | 51.9% | No statistical variation |

People whose circumstances make them vulnerable

Population group rating: Good

Findings

- 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 held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including those with a learning disability.
- The practice had a system for vaccinating patients with an underlying medical condition according to the recommended schedule.
- The practice demonstrated that they had a system to identify people who misused substances.

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

Population group rating: Good

Findings

- The practice assessed and monitored the physical health of people with mental illness, severe mental illness, and personality disorder by providing access to health checks, interventions for physical activity, obesity, diabetes, heart disease, cancer and access to 'stop smoking' services.
- There was a system for following up patients who failed to attend for administration of long-term medication.
- When patients were assessed to be at risk of suicide or self-harm the practice had arrangements in place to help them to remain safe.
- Patients at risk of dementia were identified and offered an assessment to detect possible signs of dementia. When dementia was suspected there was an appropriate referral for diagnosis.
- Staff had received dementia training in the last 12 months.

| 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 (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) <small>(QOF)</small> | 90.7% | 88.6% | 89.5% | No statistical variation |
| Exception rate (number of exceptions). | 1.8% (1) | 7.1% | 12.7% | N/A |
| The percentage of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses whose alcohol consumption has been recorded in the preceding 12 months (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) <small>(QOF)</small> | 100.0% | 90.4% | 90.0% | Variation (positive) |

| | | | | |
|---|-------------|-------|-------|--------------------------|
| Exception rate (number of exceptions). | 1.8% (1) | 5.8% | 10.5% | 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 (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) (QOF) | 77.2% | 84.1% | 83.0% | No statistical variation |
| Exception rate (number of exceptions). | 3.4% (2) | 4.1% | 6.6% | N/A |

Monitoring care and treatment

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

| Indicator | Practice | CCG average | England average |
|---|----------|-------------|-----------------|
| Overall QOF score (out of maximum 559) | 552.5 | 536.7 | 537.5 |
| Overall QOF exception reporting (all domains) | 4.3% | 5.9% | 5.8% |

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

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

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The practice had a programme of quality improvement which included practice initiated audits and CCG-led medicine optimisation audits. We reviewed two complete cycle audits undertaken in the past 12 months as evidence. We saw that the practice had identified that a series of routine blood tests (24) undertaken between June and September 2018 had a raised potassium level. The practice discussed the findings with the laboratory biochemist and looked at when and where the samples were stored prior to collection. It was ascertained that the phlebotomist was storing the blood samples in the specimen fridge. The laboratory advised not to store these blood samples in the fridge prior to collection. A repeat audit undertaken between September and October 2018 showed that only one blood sample had a raised potassium level. |
|--|

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. This included specific training for nurses on immunisation and on sample taking for the cervical screening programme. | Yes |
| The learning and development needs of staff were assessed. | Yes |

| | |
|--|-----|
| The practice had a programme of learning and development. | Yes |
| Staff had protected time for learning and development. | Yes |
| There was an induction programme for new staff. | Yes |
| Induction included completion of the Care Certificate for Health Care Assistants employed since April 2015. | Yes |
| Staff had access to regular appraisals, one to ones, 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 |
|---|-------------|
| The contractor has regular (at least 3 monthly) multidisciplinary case review meetings where all patients on the palliative care register are discussed (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) (QOF) | Yes |
| We saw records that showed that all appropriate staff, including those in different teams and organisations, were involved in assessing, planning and delivering care and treatment. | Yes |
| Care was delivered and reviewed in a coordinated way when different teams, services or organisations were involved. | Yes |
| Patients received consistent, coordinated, person-centred care when they moved between services. | Yes |
| For patients who accessed the practice's digital service there were clear and effective processes to make referrals to other services. | Yes |

Helping patients to live healthier lives

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

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

Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:

Staff we spoke with told us they encouraged and supported patients to be involved in monitoring and managing their own health and they utilised the patient care navigator, who was allocated to the practice, to help signpost patients to health, social care and voluntary sector services.

| Smoking Indicator | Practice | CCG average | England average | England comparison |
|---|-------------|-------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| The percentage of patients with any or any combination of the following conditions: CHD, PAD, stroke or TIA, hypertension, diabetes, COPD, CKD, asthma, schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder or other psychoses whose notes record smoking status in the preceding 12 months (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) <small>(QOF)</small> | 99.2% | 95.9% | 95.1% | Variation (positive) |
| Exception rate (number of exceptions). | 0.1% (2) | 0.6% | 0.8% | N/A |

Consent to care and treatment

The practice always obtained consent to care and treatment in line with legislation and guidance.

| | Y/N/Partial |
|---|-------------|
| Clinicians understood the requirements of legislation and guidance when considering consent and decision making. We saw that consent was documented. | Yes |
| Clinicians supported patients to make decisions. Where appropriate, they assessed and recorded a patient's mental capacity to make a decision. | Yes |
| The practice monitored the process for seeking consent appropriately. | Yes |
| <p>Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clinicians we spoke with understood the requirements of legislation and guidance when considering consent and decision making. Clinicians had a good understanding of the Mental Capacity Act and had received training. Staff were aware of the need to request consent to share records with referrals in line with General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) principles. | |

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 |
| Patients were given appropriate and timely information to cope emotionally with their care, treatment or condition. | Yes |

| CQC comments cards | |
|--|----|
| Total comments cards received. | 30 |
| Number of CQC comments received which were positive about the service. | 27 |
| Number of comments cards received which were mixed about the service. | 3 |
| Number of CQC comments received which were negative about the service. | 0 |

| Source | Feedback |
|--------------------|--|
| CQC Comments cards | All 30 comment cards received contained positive feedback and patients indicated that they were happy with the service and staff were caring, kind, polite and helpful. Patients said they were treated with dignity and respect. Three comment cards contained mixed responses which included difficulty sometimes getting through to the surgery by telephone. |

National GP Survey results

Note: The questions in the 2018 GP Survey indicators have changed. Ipsos MORI have advised that the new survey data must not be directly compared to the past survey data, because the survey methodology changed in 2018.

| Practice population size | Surveys sent out | Surveys returned | Survey Response rate% | % of practice population |
|--------------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| 5550 | 295 | 130 | 44.1% | 2.34% |

| 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 (01/01/2018 to 31/03/2018) | 87.1% | 85.6% | 89.0% | No statistical variation |

| 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 treating them with care and concern (01/01/2018 to 31/03/2018) | 84.5% | 82.8% | 87.4% | 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 (01/01/2018 to 31/03/2018) | 94.2% | 93.1% | 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 (01/01/2018 to 31/03/2018) | 82.3% | 78.2% | 83.8% | No statistical variation |

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

| Any additional evidence |
|--|
| The practice sought patient feedback through the NHS Friends and Family Test (FFT). Results for the period September 2018 to February 2019 showed that 89% of patients would be extremely likely or likely to recommend the service. |

Involvement in decisions about care and treatment

Staff helped patients to be involved in decisions about care and treatment.

| | Y/N/Partial |
|---|-------------|
| Staff communicated with patients in a way that helped them to understand their care, treatment and condition, and any advice given. | Yes |
| Staff helped patients and their carers find further information and access community and advocacy services. | Yes |

| Source | Feedback |
|---------------------------|---|
| Interviews with patients. | Patients said they felt listened to, involved in their treatment and care and treated with dignity and respect. |

National GP 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 (01/01/2018 to 31/03/2018) | 91.6% | 89.9% | 93.5% | 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: | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> British Sign Language (BSL) interpreters were available and the practice had a hearing loop. | |

| Carers | Narrative |
|--|--|
| Percentage and number of carers identified. | The practice had identified 87 carers, which was 1.5% of the practice population. |
| How the practice supported carers. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The practice told us they identified carers at the point of registration, on an on-going basis through clinical consultations and with the care navigator. There was a carers' noticeboard in the waiting area and information on the practice website, which had the functionality to translate to other languages. The practice offered extended appointments and influenza vaccination for carers. We saw that 100% of carers on the register had had an influenza vaccination this season. |
| How the practice supported recently bereaved patients. | The practice would offer telephone support, a consultation or home visit. The practice told us they would signpost patients to the appropriate support services. |

Privacy and dignity

The practice respected patients' privacy and dignity.

| | Y/N/Partial |
|--|-------------|
| Curtains were provided in consulting rooms to maintain patients' privacy and dignity during examinations, investigations and treatments. | Yes |
| Consultation and treatment room doors were closed during consultations. | Yes |

| | |
|---|-----|
| 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 |
| Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a glass partition between the reception desk and the waiting room and confidential calls could be taken away from the reception desk. • Staff we spoke with told us they followed the practice's confidentiality policy when discussing patients' treatments. This was to ensure that confidential information was kept private, for example, patient information was never on view. • We saw that equality and diversity training was included for all staff as part of the mandatory training schedule. | |

Responsive

Rating: Good

Responding to and meeting people's needs

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

| | Y/N/Partial |
|--|-------------|
| 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 |
| The practice provided effective care coordination for patients who were more vulnerable or who had complex needs. They supported them to access services both within and outside the practice. | Yes |
| Care and treatment for patients with multiple long-term conditions and patients approaching the end of life was coordinated with other services. | Yes |

Practice Opening Times

| Day | Time |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Opening times: | |
| Monday | 9am to 6pm |
| Tuesday | 9am to 6pm |
| Wednesday | 9am to 6pm |
| Thursday | 9am to 6pm |
| Friday | 9am to 6pm |
| Appointments available: | |
| Monday | 9am to 12 noon and 3.30pm to 5.30pm |
| Tuesday | 9am to 12 noon and 3.30pm to 5.30pm |
| Wednesday | 9am to 12 noon and 3.30pm to 5.30pm |
| Thursday | 9am to 12 noon and 3.30pm to 5.30pm |
| Friday | 9am to 12 noon and 3.30pm to 5.30pm |

When the surgery was closed patients were directed to call NHS 111. The practice offered extended hours appointments on Tuesday from 7am to 8am and Thursday from 6.30pm to 7.30pm. Patients could also access GP and practice nurse appointments from 6.30pm-8pm on Monday to Friday and from 8am-8pm on Saturdays and Sundays at five hub surgeries within Brent. Patients could book appointments via the practice team when the surgery was open or via NHS 111. We saw details regarding the hub surgeries and out-of-hours provision was advertised in the surgery and on the practice website.

National GP Survey results

| Practice population size | Surveys sent out | Surveys returned | Survey Response rate% | % of practice population |
|--------------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| 5550 | 295 | 130 | 44.1% | 2.34% |

| Indicator | Practice | CCG average | England average | England comparison |
|--|----------|-------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who stated that at their last general practice appointment, their needs were met (01/01/2018 to 31/03/2018) | 92.4% | 91.3% | 94.8% | No statistical variation |

Older people

Population group rating: Good

Findings

- All 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.

People with long-term conditions

Population group rating: Good

Findings

- Patients with multiple conditions had their needs reviewed in one appointment.
- The practice liaised regularly with the local district nursing team and community matrons to discuss and manage the needs of patients with complex medical issues.
- Care and treatment for people with long-term conditions approaching the end of life was coordinated with other services.

Families, children and young people

Population group rating: Good

Findings

- We found there were systems to identify and follow up children living in disadvantaged circumstances and who were at risk, for example, children and young people who had a high number of accident and emergency (A&E) attendances. Records we looked at confirmed this.
- All parents or guardians calling with concerns about a child were offered a same day appointment when necessary.

Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

Population group rating: **Good**

Findings

- The needs of this population group had been identified and the practice had adjusted the services it offered to ensure these were accessible, flexible and offered continuity of care. For example, the practice provided extended hours on Tuesday from 7am to 8am and on Thursday 6.30pm to 7.30pm and telephone consultations for those unable to attend during work hours.
- Patients could access GP hubs in the evening and at the weekend which could be booked via the practice.

People whose circumstances make them vulnerable

Population group rating: **Good**

Findings

- The practice held a register of patients living in vulnerable circumstances including those with a learning disability.
- The practice adjusted the delivery of its services to meet the needs of patients with a learning disability. We saw that the practice had 28 patients on its learning disabilities register, 100% of which had had their annual review.
- People in vulnerable circumstances were easily able to register with the practice, including those with no fixed abode.
- The practice hosted a weekly clinic with a local organisation who supported adults and children in a time of crisis, for example victims of modern slavery, women and children who have experienced domestic abuse and young carers.
- The practice had actively approached the Social Isolation in Brent Initiative (SIBI) who signpost people over the aged of 18 who are isolated to the wealth of clubs, groups, classes and activities in Brent. We saw that the practice had produced an activity map and leaflet to publicise local social activities in the community. The practice told us they were the first surgery in Brent to engage with SIBI and it was hoped the pilot project would expand to other surgeries.

People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

Population group rating: **Good**

Findings

- Priority appointments were allocated when necessary to those experiencing poor mental health.
- Staff interviewed had a good understanding of how to support patients with mental health needs and those patients living with dementia.
- The practice was aware of support groups within the area and signposted their patients to these accordingly.

Timely access to the service

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

National GP Survey results

| | Y/N/Partial |
|---|-------------|
| Patients with urgent needs had their care prioritised. | Yes |
| The practice had a system to assess whether a home visit was clinically necessary and the urgency of the need for medical attention. | Yes |
| Appointments, care and treatment were only cancelled or delayed when absolutely necessary. | Yes |
| Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: | |
| When a request for a home visit was received, reception staff took details of the request and added it to the clinical system. The GPs would determine whether a visit was necessary and prioritise need. | |

| 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 (01/01/2018 to 31/03/2018) | 56.6% | N/A | 70.3% | No statistical variation |
| The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who responded positively to the overall experience of making an appointment (01/01/2018 to 31/03/2018) | 71.2% | 63.3% | 68.6% | 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 (01/01/2018 to 31/03/2018) | 69.7% | 65.0% | 65.9% | No statistical variation |
| The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who were satisfied with the type of appointment (or appointments) they were offered (01/01/2018 to 31/03/2018) | 78.6% | 67.4% | 74.4% | No statistical variation |

Any additional evidence

The practice had reviewed the national GP patient survey and were aware that patients sometimes had difficulty getting through to the practice by telephone. The practice told us they were in the process of installing new telephone software which integrated with its clinical system and could potentially streamline the appointment process and improve patient experience by enabling rapid patient identification through telephone number recognition, having a call queuing facility and relaying urgent and health-related messages.

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. | 7 |
| Number of complaints we examined. | 1 |
| Number of complaints we examined that were satisfactorily handled in a timely way. | 1 |
| 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a complaint lead and a policy, which was accessible to staff, written in line with recognised guidance. • Information about how to complain was available for patients, for example, on its website. • There was a system in place to record verbal complaints to ensure all opportunities to learn from feedback was captured. • Complaints were discussed in practice meetings as a standing agenda item and we saw evidence of minutes of meetings. | |

Well-led

Rating: Good

At the last inspection in April 2018 we rated the practice good overall and requires improvement for providing well-led services because the provider was failing to ensure systems and processes were operated effectively to improve the quality and safety of services. In particular:

- The provider had failed to address risk assessment outcomes in a timely manner.
- The provider had failed to ensure patient risk registers were up-to-date.
- There was no written business plan and strategy in line with health and social priorities to meet the needs of its practice population.

At this inspection, we found that the provider had satisfactorily addressed these concerns.

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 |
| <p>Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The practice displayed its mission statement for patients and staff: 'We aim to provide a safe and high-quality patient-centred clinical service in a caring and supportive manner. We will continually strive to improve the quality and range of services we offer and to ensure all patients and their carers have a positive experience. Our aim is to treat our patients with equality, respect and dignity and involve them in decision making about their treatment and care at all times. We want to educate our patients in order to enhance self-care and holistic care in the overall community.' Its mission was underpinned by the five core values of respect, accountability, openness, fairness and honesty. | |

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 |
| The practice's speaking up policies were in line with the NHS Improvement Raising Concerns (Whistleblowing) Policy. | Yes |
| <p>Explanation of any answers and additional evidence:</p> <p>Staff told us there was an open culture at the practice and they felt confident to speak up to the GPs and management team.</p> | |

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

| Source | Feedback |
|------------------|--|
| Staff interviews | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff told us they were proud to work as part of a small team which focused on patient-centred and compassionate care Staff told us they felt listened to and respected and that the practice worked as a team. |

Governance arrangements

There were clear responsibilities, roles and systems of accountability to support good governance and management.

| | Y/N/Partial |
|--|-------------|
| There were governance structures and systems which were regularly reviewed. | Yes |
| Staff were clear about their roles and responsibilities. | Yes |
| There were appropriate governance arrangements with third parties. | Yes |
| Explanation of any answers and additional evidence: | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The practice demonstrated a meeting structure which included monthly clinical and whole team practice meetings. There were practice-specific policies including, child and adult safeguarding, infection and prevention control and significant events. All staff we spoke with knew how to access the policies. The practice had nominated designated leads, for example safeguarding, infection prevention and control and complaints. | |

Managing risks, issues and performance

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

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

Appropriate and accurate information

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

| | Y/N/Partial |
|--|-------------|
| Staff used data to adjust and improve performance. | Yes |
| Performance information was used to hold staff and management to account. | Yes |
| Our inspection indicated that information was accurate, valid, reliable and timely. | Yes |
| There were effective arrangements for identifying, managing and mitigating risks. | Yes |
| Staff whose responsibilities included making statutory notifications understood what this entails. | Yes |

Engagement with patients, the public, staff and external partners

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

| | Y/N/Partial |
|--|-------------|
| Patient views were acted on to improve services and culture. | Yes |
| Staff views were reflected in the planning and delivery of services. | Yes |
| The practice worked with stakeholders to build a shared view of challenges and of the needs of the population. | Yes |

Feedback from Patient Participation Group.

| Feedback |
|---|
| The practice had an active Patient Participation Group (PPG) who met quarterly and included approximately 28 members. We saw from minutes of meetings that they were well attended and included senior doctors and management team. We spoke with two members of the PPG on the day of the inspection who told us they felt valued and included in the development of the practice and said the practice kept them up-to-date with changes and new initiatives. Particularly, various speakers were invited to the meetings, for example AGE UK to talk about services available. |

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

| |
|---|
| The practice engaged with the CCG and local practices in local current and future initiatives which included the Primary Care Home (an approach to strengthening and redesigning primary care to focus on local population needs and provide care closer to patients' homes). |
|---|

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.
- 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.

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>

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.