Care Quality Commission

Inspection Evidence Table

The Royal Well Surgery (1-555957231)

Inspection date: 31 October 2019

Date of data download: 30 October 2019

We carried out an inspection of this service due to the length of time since the last comprehensive inspection in February 2016. Following our review of the information available to us, including information provided by the practice, we focused our inspection on the following key questions: effective and well led. Because of the assurance received from our review of information, we carried forward the ratings for the following key questions: safe, caring and responsive.

Overall rating: add overall Good

Please note: Any Quality Outcomes Framework (QOF) data relates to 2018/19.

Effective Rating: Good

Effective needs assessment, care and treatment

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

	Y/N/Partial
The practice had systems and processes to keep clinicians up to date with current evidence-based practice.	Yes
Patients' immediate and ongoing needs were fully assessed. This included their clinical needs and their mental and physical wellbeing.	Yes
Patients presenting with symptoms which could indicate serious illness were followed up in a timely and appropriate way.	Yes
We saw no evidence of discrimination when staff made care and treatment decisions.	Yes
Patients' treatment was regularly reviewed and updated.	Yes
There were appropriate referral pathways to make sure that patients' needs were addressed.	Yes
Patients were told when they needed to seek further help and what to do if their condition deteriorated.	Yes
The practice used digital services securely and effectively and conformed to relevant digital and information security standards.	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) (01/07/2018 to 30/06/2019) (NHSBSA)	1.15	0.83	0.75	No statistical variation

Older people — Population group rating: Good

Findings

- The practice used a clinical tool to identify older patients who were living with moderate or severe frailty. Those identified received a full assessment of their physical, mental and social needs.
- 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.
- The practice carried out structured annual medication reviews for older patients.
- Staff had appropriate knowledge of treating older people including their psychological, mental and communication needs.
- Health checks, including frailty assessments, were offered to patients over 75 years of age.
- Influenza, shingles and pneumonia vaccinations were offered to relevant patients in this age group.

People with long-term conditions — Population group rating: Good

Findings

- Patients with long-term conditions were offered a structured annual review to check their health and medicines needs were being met. For patients with the most complex needs, the GP worked with other health and care professionals to deliver a coordinated package of care.
- Staff who were responsible for reviews of patients with long-term conditions had received specific training.
- GPs followed up patients who had received treatment in hospital or through out of hours services for an acute exacerbation of asthma. Patients with asthma were offered an asthma management plan.
- The practice shared clear and accurate information with relevant professionals when deciding care delivery for patients with long-term conditions.
- The practice could demonstrate how they identified patients with commonly undiagnosed conditions, for example diabetes, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), atrial fibrillation and hypertension.
- Adults with newly diagnosed cardio-vascular disease were offered statins.
- Patients with suspected hypertension were offered ambulatory blood pressure monitoring.
- Patients with atrial fibrillation were assessed for stroke risk and treated appropriately.
- Patients with COPD were offered rescue packs.

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 (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) (QOF)	88.5%	82.5%	79.3%	Tending towards variation (positive)
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	25.6% (93)	16.6%	12.8%	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 (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) (QOF)	88.1%	78.8%	78.1%	Tending towards variation (positive)
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	16.8% (61)	13.0%	9.4%	N/A

	Practice	CCG average	England average	England comparison
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 (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) (QOF)	85.1%	81.8%	81.3%	No statistical variation
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	22.3% (81)	17.2%	12.7%	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 (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) (QOF)	75.3%	76.2%	75.9%	No statistical variation
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	7.2% (31)	8.3%	7.4%	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 (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) (QOF)	92.1%	91.4%	89.6%	No statistical variation
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	20.8% (20)	12.8%	11.2%	N/A

Indicator	Practice	CCG average	England average	England comparison
The percentage of patients with hypertension	82.5%	84.1%	83.0%	No statistical

in whom the last blood pressure reading measured in the preceding 12 months is 150/90mmHg or less (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) (QOF)				variation
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	10.2% (92)	4.9%	4.0%	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 (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) (QOF)	91.3%	92.8%	91.1%	No statistical variation
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	6.0% (8)	5.7%	5.9%	N/A

Families, children and young people Population group rating: Good

Findings

- The practice had met the minimum 90% target for all four childhood immunisation uptake indicators. The practice had met the WHO based national target of 95% (the recommended standard for achieving herd immunity) for two of four 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.
- Staff had the appropriate skills and training to carry out reviews for this population group.

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) (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) (NHS England)	61	67	91.0%	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)	69	73	94.5%	Met 90% minimum

(01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) (NHS England)				
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) (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) (NHS England)	70	73	95.9%	Met 95% WHO based target
The percentage of children aged 2 who have received immunisation for measles, mumps and rubella (one dose of MMR) (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) (NHS England)	70	73	95.9%	Met 95% WHO based target

Note: Please refer to the CQC guidance on Childhood Immunisation data for more information: https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-providers/gps/how-we-monitor-gp-practices

Working age people (including those recently retired and students) — Population group rating: Good

Findings

- 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)	71.0%	N/A	80% Target	Below 80% target
Females, 50-70, screened for breast cancer in last 36 months (3 year coverage, %) (01/04/2017 to 31/03/2018) (PHE)	77.6%	75.1%	72.1%	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)	58.3%	61.5%	57.3%	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)	55.6%	71.3%	69.3%	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)	47.1%	53.9%	51.9%	No statistical variation

Any additional evidence or comments
The practice told us that they had tried to encourage patients' take up of cervical cancer screening. They submitted a proposal (July 2019) to Public Health England for funding to improve access to cervical screening appointments for all the patients at the St Pauls medical centre (where The Royal Well is one of five practices). Unfortunately, this was not successful. Women were offered appointments at different times throughout the week and there was a female sample-taker available. Non-attenders were flagged on the practice's electronic record so that clinicians could discuss the test opportunistically if the patient attended for any other reason. The practice showed unverified data that there had been an increase in the number of smear tests the practice had conducted over the year April 2018 to March 2019. However, the formal data for that period does not become available until December 2019.

People whose circumstances make them vulnerable

Population group rating: Good

Findings
• Same day appointments and longer appointments were offered when required. • All patients with a learning disability were offered an annual health check. • End of life care was delivered in a coordinated way which took into account the needs of those whose circumstances may make them vulnerable. • The practice had a system for vaccinating patients with an underlying medical condition according to the recommended schedule. • The practice demonstrated that they had a system to identify people who misused substances. • The practice reviewed young patients at local residential homes.

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. • 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 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.
- All staff had received dementia training in the last 12 months.
- Patients with poor mental health, including dementia, were referred to appropriate services.

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 (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) (QOF)	94.9%	90.9%	89.4%	No statistical variation
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	13.3% (12)	16.3%	12.3%	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 (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) (QOF)	96.2%	91.9%	90.2%	No statistical variation
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	12.2% (11)	14.5%	10.1%	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 (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) (QOF)	82.0%	86.8%	83.6%	No statistical variation
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	2.2% (2)	7.3%	6.7%	N/A

Any additional evidence or comments

Overall the practice's QOF exception reporting rate was unexceptional, being in line with local and national data. However, there were areas were the exception reporting was significantly higher than national averages.

The percentage of patients, who were excepted, with diabetes, on the register, in whom the last IFCC-HbA1c was 64 mmol/mol or less in the preceding 12 months was 26% as opposed to a national exception reporting rate of 13%.

The percentage of patients, who were excepted, with diabetes, on the register, whose last measured total cholesterol measured within the preceding 12 months) was 5 mmol/l or less was 22% as opposed to a national exception reporting rate of 13%.

The percentage of patients, who were excepted, with hypertension in whom the last blood pressure reading measured in the preceding 12 months is 150/90mmHg or less was 10% as opposed to a national exception reporting rate of 4%.

The practice was aware of the QOF exception reporting data that was outside of the expected range. The practice showed us QOF for the previous year (ending March 2018). to March 2019. This data showed that for diabetic indicators above the exception rate had fallen by 2% in both cases, though for hypertension indicator above the rate had risen by 1%.

The GP specialist advisor looked at some records for those who had been excepted, in both diabetes and hypertension, and the care and treatment were appropriate. Patients were contacted at least three times and asked to attend, or undertake, the activity being excepted. We were satisfied that the exception reporting we looked at was properly conducted.

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)	558.4	No Data	539.2
Overall QOF score (as a percentage of maximum)	99.9%	No Data	96.4%
Overall QOF exception reporting (all domains)	8.2%	No Data	No Data

	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
Quality improvement activity was targeted at the areas where there were concerns.	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

The practice conducted an audit of the prescribing of broad-spectrum antibiotics in July 2019. This identified that not all the prescriptions were issued in accordance with guidance from the local clinical commissioning group (CCG) or the recognised formularies. The results were discussed at the weekly clinical meeting. An initial review of the CCG antibiotic prescribing data, which identified individual practices, showed a reduction in the prescribing of broad-spectrum antibiotics at the Royal Well surgery. A second audit cycle was planned to better identify where the changes had happened in the practice, so that there could be further improvements.

There had been an audit of the management of coeliac disease to establish if patients were having the range of annual blood tests, and accompanying treatments, recommended by the British Society of Gastroenterology. The first audit cycle identified 11 patients as having coeliac disease. In only four

cases had all the appropriate blood tests been completed. Other patients had had only partial tests or no tests. Letters were sent to the patients and a system initiated at the practice to ensure the patients were re-called every year, as well as recording new patients, with coeliac disease in the system. A second cycle audit in November 2018 showed that all 11 patients had had the appropriate tests and one new patient with coeliac disease was awaiting a test.

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, 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
The contractor has regular (at least 3 monthly) multidisciplinary case review meetings where all patients on the palliative care register are discussed (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) (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
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, tackling obesity.	Yes

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 (01/04/2018 to 31/03/2019) (QOF)	91.6%	94.9%	95.0%	No statistical variation
Exception rate (number of exceptions).	0.9% (14)	1.0%	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
Policies for any online services offered were in line with national guidance.	Yes

Well-led Rating: Good

Leadership capacity and capability

There was compassionate, inclusive and effective leadership at all levels

	Y/N/Partial
Leaders demonstrated that they understood the challenges to quality and sustainability.	Yes

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

Vision and strategy

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

	Y/N/Partial
The 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
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 that they felt highly valued at the practice. There was a scheme of

	meetings that allowed staff to voice their views. Staff said that they were listened to. Where they voiced concerns or made suggestions for improvement these were discussed. They were either adopted or reasons why they were considered impracticable were explained.

Governance arrangements

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

	Y/N/Partial
There were governance structures and systems which were regularly reviewed.	Yes
Staff were clear about their roles and responsibilities.	Yes
There were appropriate governance arrangements with third parties.	Yes

Managing risks, issues and performance

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

	Y/N/Partial
There were comprehensive assurance systems which were regularly reviewed and improved.	Yes
There were processes to manage performance.	Yes
There was a 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
We examined a range of quality and safety assurance systems. There were, for example, effective systems for, recruitment, induction, fire safety, fire evacuation drills, environmental risk assessments, health and safety risk assessments and legionella bacterium control.	

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

If the practice offered online services:

	Y/N/Partial
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
There were systems to identify and follow up any unusual access.	Yes

Engagement with patients, staff and external partners

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

	Y/N/Partial
Patient views were acted on to improve services and culture.	Yes
The practice had an active Patient Participation Group.	No
Staff views were reflected in the planning and delivery of services.	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 Patient Participation Group (PPG) had ceased to be active as members moved on. There was a new PPG in development. This had moved beyond the planning stage. A constitution had been drafted and an initial five members of the group had been identified. The date for an inaugural PPG meeting had been fixed. In the absence of a PPG the practice still canvassed patients' views, for example through patients' comments. A patient had commented on the lack of coat hanging facilities in the toilets and practice had rectified this

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 was a GP training practice. As such the partners were very aware of the most recent changes to best practice within the profession and this was always available to clinical staff. We saw clinical meeting minutes where the GP discussed knowledge they had gained as a result of being trainers. In addition, GPs told us how the knowledge of the GP registrars, fresh from the learning environment, was disseminated at frequent clinical meetings.

Notes: CQC GP Insight

GP Insight assesses a practice's data against all the other practices in England. We assess relative performance for the majority of indicators using a "z-score" (this tells us the number of standard deviations from the mean the data point is), giving us a statistical measurement of a practice's performance in relation to the England average. We highlight practices which significantly vary from the England average (in either a positive or negative direction). We consider that z-scores which are higher than +2 or lower than -2 are at significant levels, warranting further enquiry. Using this technique we can be 95% confident that the practices performance is genuinely different from the average. It is important to note that a number of factors can affect the Z score for a practice, for example a small denominator or the distribution of the data. This means that there will be cases where a practice's data looks quite different to the average, but still shows as no statistical variation, as we do not have enough confidence that the difference is genuine. There may also be cases where a practice's data looks similar across two indicators, but they are in different variation bands.

The percentage of practices which show variation depends on the distribution of the data for each indicator, but is typically around 10-15% of practices. The practices which are not showing significant statistical variation are labelled as no statistical variation to other practices.

N.B. Not all indicators in the evidence table are part of the GP insight set and those that aren't will not have a variation band.

The following language is used for showing variation:

Variation Bands	Z-score threshold
Significant variation (positive)	≤-3
Variation (positive)	>-3 and ≤-2
Tending towards variation (positive)	>-2 and ≤-1.5
No statistical variation	<1.5 and >-1.5
Tending towards variation (negative)	≥1.5 and <2
Variation (negative)	≥2 and <3
Significant variation (negative)	≥3

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

- Child Immunisation indicators. These are scored against the World Health Organisation target of 95% rather than the England average. Note that practices that have "Met 90% minimum" have not met the WHO target of 95%.

- The percentage of respondents to the GP patient survey who responded positively to how easy it was to get through to someone at their GP practice on the phone uses a rules based approach for scoring, due to the distribution of the data. This indicator does not have a CCG average.

- The percentage of women eligible for cervical cancer screening at a given point in time who were screened adequately within a specified period (within 3.5 years for women aged 25 to 49, and within 5.5 years for women aged 50 to 64). This indicator does not have a CCG average and is scored against the national target of 80%.

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

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