

**GP, OOH, Urgent Care, Dental, Online Providers,
Independent health care and Defence Inspections
Quality Tool**

Location as recorded in CRM:	ECG on Demand
INS Number:	INS2-5578312381
Date of inspection visit:	9 July 2019
Inspector:	

	Name	Date received / commenced	Date returned / completed
Specialist Advisor ('SpA')		11 July 2019	15 July 2019
Specialist Advisor ('SpA')			
Other (eg second inspector/ medicines management)			
Peer Reviewer ('PR'):		11 July 2019	11 July 2019
Inspection Manager ('IM'):	Claire Martin	17/07/2019	17/07/2019



SPA feedback
email.docx

Agreed wording for email to be sent out with report for SpA to review

If you have comments that you want clarification on at any level within the QA process please detail here. This covers the sufficiency of evidence to make valid judgements, agreement with the ratings decisions (if there are ratings), comments on any musts/shoulds and requirement notices/enforcement action proposed and on how the report (and evidence table if applicable) is written. If you do not make any comments here it is assumed that you have reviewed all of the above and have no comments/clarifications or suggested changes to make.

Note: Reviewers can refer to their comments using tracked changes and inspectors can reference comments received via email (eg from SPA)- please indicate if you have done this and ensure these are added to CRM.

SPA – Comments noted on the report

Other –

Peer reviewer – A well written report – please see comments and tracked changes attached. There are a few areas that need revision for clarity; especially around the O/S features. If you move forward with one domain outstanding it will need to go to HOI

Inspection manager –
Ready for panel

Lead Inspector - If you have not responded to the comments/clarification or made any of the changes suggested above – please give your rationale below

If you have a breach of regulation recommended please complete the relevant embedded decision tree section of the quality tool here. Please note MRR notes will be required as part of the key panel documentation for those services rated as potential special measures.

GP+ decision tree



Decision tree.docx

Dental MRR Assessment



20180614 MRR
Inspectors assessme

Dental Notable Practice



20181201 Dental
notable Practice fori

Inspection Manager authorisation for report (and evidence table if applicable) to be sent to provider without going to National Quality Panel – please fill boxes with Y for Yes to complete authorisation and to provide audit trail. Inspector must attach the quality tool to CRM. *(If this is an independent health care report please note interim additional quality control arrangements in place until April 2019 set out in quality framework/guidance)*

IM Sign off

Minimal changes are needed and I agree with the ratings/judgements made - there is no need for additional quality review	Y
On this basis I am authorising the report to be sent out for factual accuracy comments	Y

Additional Quality Review

	Yes	No
Does the report need to go to national quality panel? (see submission criteria at appendix 1)		
Does the report need HOI sign off (see submission criteria at appendix 1)		

HOI sign off (if meets submission criteria)

Minimal changes are needed and I agree with the ratings/judgements made	
On this basis I am authorising the report to be sent out for factual accuracy comments	

HOI sign off (post FACAC for reports subject to special measures)

No FACAC comments received or there are only minor/grammatical changes which do not alter the ratings – I agree the report to go for publication	
--	--

The rest of the quality tool is for national quality panel notes only.

Please detail any specific queries/issues that you would like panel to be made aware of

National Quality Panel Notes and Actions *(please indicate which)*

Date of panel	Wednesday, 31 July 2019
----------------------	-------------------------

List of Panel members	<p>B Cole (HOI North East & Chair), S Banga (HOI East of England & Dentistry), J Hall (National Clinical Advisor), T Ballard (National Clinical Advisor 13.45-14.05), Alan Stephenson (Inspection Manager London), Mary Collier (Medicines Manager), [REDACTED] (Policy), [REDACTED] (Directorate Support).</p> <p>Observer: [REDACTED] (National Professional Dental Advisor), [REDACTED] (Senior Analyst- S&I)</p> <p>Note – please also add any possible panel member conflicts of interests and how they have been dealt with here</p>
------------------------------	---

Proposed ratings/judgements
<p>Overall Outstanding Safe: Good Effective: Outstanding Caring: N/A Responsive: Outstanding Well led: Outstanding</p>

Suggested changes amendments to the report (Page and Paragraph number)
<p>Safe- Good The panel members agreed with the rating of Good. No comments</p> <p>Effective- Good The panel members agreed to change the rating from Outstanding to Good as the no evidence to support the rating.</p> <p>Caring- N/A</p> <p>Responsive- Good The panel members agreed to change the rating from Outstanding to Good as there is no evidence to support the rating, however there are some outstanding features.</p> <p>Well-Led – Good The panel members agreed to change the rating from Outstanding to Good.</p> <p>CI Letter</p>

On page 3 the inspector to pull out 2 outstanding features which stands out from the five bullet points.

Suggested changes amendments to the evidence tool (Page and Paragraph number)

Not Applicable.

Changes to proposed ratings or key question judgements including rationale for these agreed by Panel

Effective- Good

The panel members agreed to change the rating from Outstanding to Good as the no evidence to support the rating.

Caring- N/A

Responsive- Good

The panel members agreed to change the rating from Outstanding to Good as there is no evidence to support the outstanding rating.

Well-Led – Good

The panel members agreed to change the rating from Outstanding to Good.

Final agreed ratings or key question judgements approved by panel

Overall: Good

Safe: Good

Effective: Good

Caring: N/A

Responsive: Good

Well Led: Good

Any other actions for region, inspection manager or inspector to take forward

Once the report has been updated by the inspector in light of panel comments this can go out for FACAC.

The following post FACAC section only needs to be completed for:

- locations going into special measures
- if draft report went to national quality panel and ratings changes are proposed as a result of FACAC

FACAC Review National Quality Panel Notes and Actions (please indicate which)

Date of panel	11 September 2019
----------------------	-------------------

List of Panel members	<p>J Williamson (DCI Central & Chair - only from 10am till 11.40am), J Thompson (HOI North West), J Ortega (Head of Integrated Care and SE Region GP Inspection & Chair from 11.40am-15.00pm), [REDACTED] (National Clinical Advisor), Tracie McGuire (Inspection Manager Midlands), Victoria Lea (Regional Medicines Manager - South), [REDACTED] (Directorate Support).</p> <p>Notes completed [REDACTED]</p> <p>Observer: [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] will provide the policy support if required.</p>
------------------------------	--

Suggested changes amendments to the report (Page and Paragraph number)
<p>Inspector to take out points from the letter for items that are not outstanding features. Small wording changes were discussed and accepted but these do not change the ratings, change in rating below to track over to the report.</p>

Suggested changes amendments to the evidence tool (Page and Paragraph number)
<p>Panel discussed points raised at FAC but agreed they didn't change the ratings. Point about the development of the software was discussed at length by panel and was felt that this should move to well led</p> <p>After discussion there was found to be an outstanding quality in safe, outstanding quality in responsive and two outstanding qualities in well led, due to this the well led rating was felt to now be outstanding from good.</p>

Changes to proposed ratings or key question judgements post FACAC including rationale for these agreed by Panel
<p>Well led changed good to outstanding due to the two outstanding qualities in this section.</p>
Final agreed ratings or key question judgements post FACAC approved by panel
<p>Overall: Good</p> <p>Safe: Good</p> <p>Effective: Good</p> <p>Caring: N/A</p> <p>Responsive: Good</p> <p>Well Led: Outstanding</p>

Any other actions for region, inspection manager or inspector to take forward
N/A

Appendix 1

Criteria for submission to National Quality Panel

- All GP, urgent care, defense medical services and provider at scale location reports with a outstanding or inadequate (Primary care at scale provider reports will be reviewed by a se
- Independent health and online primary medical reports with site visit up to 31/3/2018 where enforcement action is proposed
- Independent health and online primary medical reports with site visits from 1 April 2019 with overall outstanding, inadequate and RI ratings
- Dental reports where effective key question is not met; the safe key question is not met and enforcement action is proposed; possible notable practice has been identified (NOTE: Locations with joint medical and dental services reports should be seen together on the same panel)
- Reports which were outstanding overall on last inspection but proposed to reduce to good or RI on re-inspection
- Reports where there have been 3 or more overall RI ratings
- Reports with a second overall RI rating and with one quality rating in a key question or population group of inadequate
- Reports with one quality rating in a key question or population group of inadequate for this inspection and the previous inspection (potential special measures slow route)
- All reports from locations that undertake circumcisions
- Reports where ratings decisions have been made that do not align with our ratings aggregation principles
- Any report for a comprehensive inspection where a key question and/or population group has not been rated
- Reports for locations subject to special measures that have been through factual accuracy, have received FACAC comments and are ready to be published. (Where no FACAC response has been received or there are only minor/grammatical changes reports **do not** need to return to national panel and can be signed off by the Head of Inspection)
- Reports that have been to quality panel and following factual accuracy ratings changes are proposed
- Reports that have not been to quality panel but following factual accuracy the proposed ratings changes mean they now meet the criteria for submission to this level
- Six months follow up reports of any locations rated as in special measures/Inadequate whether there is a change in the rating or not
- Any other report where a head of inspection has identified that national quality panel consideration is needed
- Reports for providers where a reactive provider led assessment has been undertaken

Criteria for HOI sign off prior to sending for factual accuracy

- Reports with one key question/population group rated outstanding or inadequate
- Reports with two repeat RI ratings
- Independent healthcare reports with a requirement notice (inspections up to 31/3/2018)