

Launceston Close Surgery

Quality Report

9-10 Launceston Close
Winsford
Cheshire
CW7 1LY

Tel: 01606 544744

Website: www.launcestonclosesurgery.nhs.uk

Date of inspection visit: 2 August 2016

Date of publication: 19/09/2016

This report describes our judgement of the quality of care at this service. It is based on a combination of what we found when we inspected, information from our ongoing monitoring of data about services and information given to us from the provider, patients, the public and other organisations.

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good



Are services safe?

Good



Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

Overall summary	Page 2
The five questions we ask and what we found	3

Detailed findings from this inspection

Why we carried out this inspection	4
Detailed findings	5

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection of this practice on 25 June 2015. A breach of legal requirements was found. After the comprehensive inspection, the practice wrote to us to say what they would do to meet the legal requirements in relation to the breach. We undertook this focused inspection to check that they had followed their plan and to confirm that they now met legal requirements. This report only covers our findings in relation to those requirements. You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for Launceston Close Surgery on our website at www.cqc.org.uk

Our key findings were as follows:

- Action had been taken to ensure the recruitment procedures were improved and the required information in respect of workers was obtained.

The areas where the provider should make improvements are:

- Make a record of information about any physical or mental conditions which are relevant (after reasonable adjustments) to the role the person is being employed to undertake.

Professor Steve Field (CBE FRCP FFPH FRCGP)
Chief Inspector of General Practice

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

Improvements had been made to the recruitment procedure and the required information in respect of workers was obtained to ensure the suitability of staff for employment.

Good



Launceston Close Surgery

Detailed findings

Why we carried out this inspection

We undertook an announced focused inspection of Launceston Close Surgery on 2 August 2016. This

inspection was carried out to check that improvements to meet legal requirements planned by the practice after our comprehensive inspection on 25 June 2015 had been made. We inspected the practice against one of the five questions we ask about services: is the service safe? This is because the service was not meeting legal requirements in relation to recruitment checks of staff.

Are services safe?

Our findings

At the comprehensive inspection of the practice on 25 June we looked at a sample of recruitment records and found there was no evidence that two of the GPs had received a Disclosure and Barring service (DBS) check (these checks provide employers with an individual's full criminal record and other information to assess the individuals suitability for the post). At this inspection a DBS check had been undertaken for both GPs.

At the comprehensive inspection of the practice on 25 June 2015 we also found that satisfactory information about any

physical or mental health conditions which were relevant to the person's ability to carry out their role (after reasonable adjustments were made) was not recorded. There were also no references for one member of staff. At this inspection a reference was available for this staff member from their last employer. We checked the employment records of the only member of staff to be recruited since our visit in June 2015. We found evidence of a DBS check and two references. The practice manager confirmed that physical and mental suitability for employment (following reasonable adjustments) had been considered but that this had not been recorded.