

Dr Sirisena & Partners

Quality Report

Deans Lane Medical Centre
156 Deans Lane
Edgware
Middlesex HA8 9NT
Tel: 020 8906 3337
Website: <http://www.deanslanemedicalcentre.co.uk/>

Date of inspection visit: 15 June 2017

Date of publication: 14/08/2017

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 

Are services effective?

Good 

Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

Overall summary	Page 2
The five questions we ask and what we found	3
The six population groups and what we found	4

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	5
Why we carried out this inspection	5
How we carried out this inspection	5
Detailed findings	6

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out a focussed, desk based review inspection at Dr Sirisena and Partners on 15 June 2017. We found the practice to be good for providing safe and effective services and it is rated as good overall.

We previously conducted an announced comprehensive inspection of the practice on 8 November 2016. As a result of our findings, the practice was rated as requires improvement for providing safe and effective services and rated as good for providing responsive, caring and well led services, which resulted in an overall rating of requires improvement. At that time, we found that the provider had breached Regulation 12 (1) (Safe care and treatment) and Regulation 18 (Staffing) of the Health and Social Care Act 2008, due to the absence of pre-employment checks and recent basic life support training for one of the practice's two locum GPs. In addition, we did not see evidence that completed, two cycle clinical audits were being used to drive quality improvement.

The practice wrote to us to tell us what they would do to make improvements and meet the legal requirements. We undertook this focussed desk based inspection to check that the practice had followed their plan, and to confirm that they had met the legal requirements.

This report only covers our findings in relation to those areas where requirements had not been met. You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection by selecting the 'all reports' link for Dr Sirisena and Partners on our website at www.cqc.org.uk/location/1-551197997.

Our key findings across all the areas we inspected were as follows:

- The practice had taken action to ensure that there were appropriate pre-employment checks on file for locum GPs and that annual basic life support training had taken place.
- The practice was using clinical audit to improve patient outcomes and drive quality improvement activity.

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?

The practice is rated as good for providing safe services.

When we inspected in November 2016, we noted the absence of appropriate pre-employment checks on file for one of the practice's two locum GPs. At this inspection we saw evidence which confirmed that pre-employment checks were on file and that annual basic life support training had taken place.

Good



Are services effective?

The practice is rated as good for providing effective services.

When we inspected in November 2016, it was unclear how clinical audit was being used to drive improvements in patient outcomes. At this inspection we saw evidence that clinical audit was being used to improve patient outcomes and drive quality improvement.

Good



Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

We always inspect the quality of care for these six population groups.

Older people

The provider had resolved the concerns for safety and effective identified at our inspection on 8 November 2016 which applied to everyone using this practice, including this population group. The population group ratings have been updated to reflect this.

Good



People with long term conditions

The provider had resolved the concerns for safety and effective identified at our inspection on 8 November 2016 which applied to everyone using this practice, including this population group. The population group ratings have been updated to reflect this.

Good



Families, children and young people

The provider had resolved the concerns for safety and effective identified at our inspection on 8 November 2016 which applied to everyone using this practice, including this population group. The population group ratings have been updated to reflect this.

Good



Working age people (including those recently retired and students)

The provider had resolved the concerns for safety and effective identified at our inspection on 8 November 2016 which applied to everyone using this practice, including this population group. The population group ratings have been updated to reflect this.

Good



People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable

The provider had resolved the concerns for safety and effective identified at our inspection on 8 November 2016 which applied to everyone using this practice, including this population group. The population group ratings have been updated to reflect this.

Good



People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia)

The provider had resolved the concerns for safety and effective identified at our inspection on 8 November 2016 which applied to everyone using this practice, including this population group. The population group ratings have been updated to reflect this.

Good



Dr Sirisena & Partners

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

Our inspection team was led by a CQC Lead Inspector.

Why we carried out this inspection

We carried out a desk based review inspection of this service on 15 June 2017 under Section 60 of the Health and

Social Care Act 2008 as part of our regulatory functions. This was because the service was not meeting some legal requirements during our previous visit on 8 November 2016.

The inspection was conducted to check that improvements planned by the practice to meet legal requirements had been made.

How we carried out this inspection

During our desk based inspection we reviewed a range of information provided by the practice.

Are services safe?

Our findings

Overview of safety systems and processes

When we inspected in November 2016, the practice could not provide evidence of pre-employment checks for the locum GP working at the practice on the day of the inspection (including confirmation that basic life support training had taken place within 12 months). Shortly after

our inspection, we were sent details of the pre-employment checks undertaken by the practice but noted that the locum GP's annual basic life support certificate had lapsed by six months.

We asked the provider to take action and at this inspection we were shown evidence which confirmed that appropriate locum GP pre-employment checks were on file and that the locum GP's annual BLS training had now been completed.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Management, monitoring and improving outcomes for people

When we inspected in November 2016, we asked for evidence of quality improvement and were shown a two cycle clinical audit initiated in March 2016 to identify whether patients on anti-psychotic medications had had an annual blood test. The results highlighted that there was no evidence of increased blood test uptake following the audit's interventions and that there was a higher

proportion of patients who had not had their blood tests than had had blood tests. It was therefore unclear how the audit was being used to drive improvements in patient outcomes.

At this inspection, we were shown a further cycle of the audit which had taken place after our November 2016 inspection. The audit results showed that 11 of the 17 eligible patients had undertaken the recommended blood test. This was an improvement on the results of the previous audit cycle which had shown that a higher proportion of patients had not had blood tests than had had blood tests.