

## GP Insight Report

Little Horton Lane Medical Centre - Mall

(Also known as Dr KP Mall, Dr IM Raja, Dr A Khokhar)

CQC ID: 1-539786850

This report details the CQC view of 11 Insight indicators, drawing on existing and established national data sources (e.g. Quality and Outcomes Framework, GP Patient Survey), to support our monitoring and decision making. The new model for ongoing monitoring, GP Insight, will identify where good care has been maintained or improved, as well as where care has deteriorated.

Please note this is a static report which is based on the most recent data CQC had access to at the time of analysis. This is detailed further within the report.

During Spring 2017, CQC undertook a verification process with GP practices to validate their data. Following feedback, we have revised our report, by updating the information on the contextual page and removing the display of inspection ratings.

#### How your report is structured:

- **Contextual Information** provides a summary of the practice profile including local population demographics as well as practice staffing information and CCG level information.
- **Summary level information** details how the practice is doing on 3 of the 5 key questions (Effective, Responsive and Caring domains). This page provides a brief overview of the 11 indicators.
- **Indicator level data** details how the practice compares against the England average and also shows practice results. GP Insight assesses a practice's data against all the other practices in England. We assess relative performance using a z-score (also known as a standardised score), a statistical tool which shows the deviation from the mean. It gives us a statistical measurement of a practice's performance in relation to the average, and measures this in standard deviations. We calculate a z-score for each indicator, thereby highlighting the practices which significantly vary from the average. A positive z-score indicates that the practice's performance is below the England average, and a negative (minus) z-score indicates that it is above the England average. Typically we consider that z-scores which are +2 or more and -2 or less are at significant levels, warranting further enquiry. 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. Terms assigned to z score ranges will differ depending on the indicator. Further explanation of this is available in our FAQ document and our Indicators and Methodology guidance document. The indicator level pages also detail numerator and denominator descriptors as well as commentary and caveats extracted from the notes section of NHS England's MyNHS publication.
- **Glossary** provides a breakdown of some of the key terminology used within this report.

We have supporting documents setting out the definition and full methodology for each indicator, a paper on the statistical methodology and a Frequently Asked Questions document; these documents can be found by looking at the GP Insight pages on the CQC's website ([www.cqc.org.uk/GPInsight](http://www.cqc.org.uk/GPInsight)).

Please note: The CCG name presented on page 3 of this report is the Clinical Commissioning Group which was recorded as the commissioning organisation for the practice in April 2017. However, the CCG data we have used throughout this report pertains to the time when it was collated in November 2016. There may be some differences where the CCG has changed between these two time periods.


PRACTICE BACKGROUND    **FACTS AND FIGURES**    APPENDIX

INTRODUCTION    **CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION**


**Practice Profile and Local Demographics**

Little Horton Lane Medical Centre - Mall is located within the Bradford Local Authority and is 1 of 24\* practices serving the NHS Bradford City CCG area.

**Practice Local Demographics**



**Deprivation**



People living in more deprived areas tend to have greater need for health services. The lower the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) decile (see above), the more deprived an area is.

<b>Practice Name</b>	Little Horton Lane Medical Centre - Mall		
<b>Practice CQC ID</b>	1-539786850		
<b>Practice Organisation Data Services Code</b>	B83025		
<b>CCG</b>	NHS Bradford City CCG**		
<b>Practice Contract Type</b>	PMS: Personal Medical Services		
<b>Regulated Activities</b>	Diagnostic and screening procedures; Maternity and midwifery services; Treatment of disease, disorder or injury		
<b>Average Payment per Weighted Patient</b> <small>Source: NHS Digital, NHS Payments to General Practice 01/04/2015 - 31/03/2016</small>	<b>Practice</b>	<b>CCG</b>	<b>England</b>
	£146.66	£170.24	£142.63
<b>Practice List Size</b> <small>Source: NHS Digital, Number of Patients Registered at a GP Practice May 2017</small>	4,270 (2,232 male, 2,038 female)		
<b>Practice Staffing Data</b> <small>Source: NHS Digital, General and Personal Medical Services, England September 2016</small>	<b>8.0*** FTE Total Staff, of which:</b>		
	GPs <i>excl. Registrars, Locums, Retainers</i>	2.1	
	Nurses	0.4	
	Direct Patient Care Staff	0.9	
	Admin and Non Clinical	4.6	
<small>NB: NS = data not supplied by practice EST = data supplied was of poor quality. A value is estimated but not published at practice level</small>			
<small>*This may be an approximation as it is based on practices in CQC's register with a valid Organisation Data Services code **This CCG was recorded as the commissioning organisation for the practice in April 2017 ***The four staffing types may not add up to the FTE Total due to rounding</small>			

PRACTICE BACKGROUND	FACTS AND FIGURES	APPENDIX
---------------------	-------------------	----------

SUMMARY	SAFE	EFFECTIVE	CARING	RESPONSIVE	WELL-LED
---------	------	-----------	--------	------------	----------

**Latest indicators of Performance (1/2)**

Indicator	Key Question	Performance
QOFGP182: Cervical Cancer Screening	Effective	Comparable to other practices 77.5% screened, of 877 eligible women
MYNHSCIM3: Childhood Vaccinations up to Age 2	Effective	In line with national standard 9.1 score out of 10. Achieved 90% coverage for 4/4 sub-indicators
HYP006: High Blood Pressure Management	Effective	Comparable to other practices 79.3% with recommended measurement, out of 430 patients
AF007: Stroke Prevention: Medication for patients with atrial fibrillation	Effective	Comparable to other practices 85.0% treated, out of 20 patients
QOFGP102: Diabetes - Managing Blood Glucose Level (HbA1c)	Effective	Comparable to other practices 68.4% within a recommended level, out of 332 patients
MYNHSCAN3: Cancer detection rate	Effective	Comparable to other practices 50.0% detected by practice, out of 14 new diagnoses
QOFGP110: Mental Health – Comprehensive Care Planning	Effective	Comparable to other practices 87.5% with a plan, out of 40 patients

PRACTICE BACKGROUND	FACTS AND FIGURES	APPENDIX			
SUMMARY	SAFE	EFFECTIVE	CARING	RESPONSIVE	WELL-LED

**Latest indicators of Performance (2/2)**


Indicator	Key Question	Performance
DEM004: Dementia - Face to Face Reviews	Effective	Comparable to other practices 90.9% reviewed by GP, out of 11 patients diagnosed
GPHLIAP: Antibiotic Prescribing	Effective	Comparable to other practices 1.06 items per standardised prescribing unit
GPPS029: Patient Experience - Confidence and Trust in GP	Caring	Comparable to other practices 88.4% had confidence, of 54 respondents
GPPS030: Patient Satisfaction with GP Practice Opening Times	Responsive	Comparable to other practices 64.0% were satisfied, of 55 respondents

PRACTICE BACKGROUND    **FACTS AND FIGURES**    APPENDIX

SUMMARY    SAFE    **EFFECTIVE**    CARING    RESPONSIVE    WELL-LED

**QOFGP182: Cervical Cancer Screening**

**Practice result compared against CCG and England**



**Practice data for indicator**

Females screened	680
Total number of eligible females	877
Percentage screened	77.5%

**Descriptive statistics - England**

Lower Quartile	79.1%
Median	81.4%
Upper Quartile	84.3%

**For this indicator the practice is**

**Comparable to other practices**  
Practice z score against national average = 1.0

**Indicator Information**

**Period:** 01/04/2015 - 31/03/2016    **Link:** <http://qof.digital.nhs.uk/>

**Numerator:** Number of women aged 25-64 whose notes record a cervical screening test within the preceding 5 years.

**Denominator:** Total number of females aged 25-64

**Commentary:** This is one of the few cancers that is preventable because pre-cancerous cell changes can be picked up before they have a chance to develop into cancer. Practices should aim to deliver the nationally expected threshold of 80 percent. Those practices achieving this level would be considered as an example of good practice.

**Caveats affecting this indicator:** Please note the data used for this indicator will include women who may have otherwise have been excluded from cervical screening ( e.g. those with hysterectomy, complete removal of the cervix).

PRACTICE BACKGROUND		FACTS AND FIGURES		APPENDIX	
SUMMARY	SAFE	EFFECTIVE	CARING	RESPONSIVE	WELL-LED

### MYNHSCIM3\*: Childhood Vaccinations up to Age 2

\*Please note this is an experimental indicator provided by NHS England. There are data quality issues relating to completeness which are being worked through by NHS England. Please view our FAQs for further detail.

Sub-indicators	Percentage Vaccinated*	Compare to 90% standard
MYNHSCIMA: Percentage of children aged 1 with full course of recommended vaccines	90.0%	Above standard
MYNHSCIMB: Percentage of children aged 2 with pneumococcal conjugate booster vaccine	92.5%	Above standard
MYNHSCIMC: Percentage of children aged 2 with Haemophilus influenza type b and Meningitis C booster vaccine	92.5%	Above standard
MYNHSCIMD: Percentage of children aged 2 with Measles, Mumps and Rubella vaccine	90.0%	Above standard

Source: NHS England - 01/04/2015 - 31/03/2016

Practice data for indicator	
Score out of 10	9.1
90% coverage achieved in	4/4 sub-indicators

Descriptive statistics - England	
England average score	9.1
National expected coverage of vaccinations	90%

For this indicator the practice is/has

In line with national standard

#### Indicator Information

**Period:** 01/04/2015 - 31/03/2016    **Link:** <https://www.england.nhs.uk/statistics/statistical-work-areas/child-immunisation/>

**Numerator:** Composite based on the following 4 sub indicators: Sub indicator 1 of 4: 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) Sub indicator 2 of 4: The percentage children aged 2 who have received their booster immunisation for Pneumococcal infection (i.e. received Pneumococcal booster) (PCV booster) Sub indicator 3 of 4: 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) Sub indicator 4 of 4: The percentage of children aged 2 who have completed immunisation for measles, mumps and rubella (one dose of MMR)

**Denominator:** Maximum immunisation for all 4 sub indicators (400)

**Commentary:** Higher values are better but it is generally understood that achieving high uptake rates is more difficult for practices with patients from hard-to-reach groups such as homeless, traveller and migrant populations. This wider context should therefore be considered when comparing values.


**Caveats affecting this indicator:** The national expectation is that 90% of children will receive each of the 4 vaccinations. Caution: a score of 9/10 on the composite indicator does not necessarily mean all four standards have been met. Individual sub-indicators should be consulted.

PRACTICE BACKGROUND    **FACTS AND FIGURES**    APPENDIX

SUMMARY    SAFE    **EFFECTIVE**    CARING    RESPONSIVE    WELL-LED

**HYP006: High Blood Pressure Management**

**Practice result compared against CCG and England**



**Practice data for indicator**

Patients with recommended measurement	341
Total eligible patients	430
Percentage with recommended measurement	79.3%

**Descriptive statistics - England**

Lower Quartile	80.4%
Median	83.5%
Upper Quartile	86.6%

**For this indicator the practice is**

**Comparable to other practices**  
Practice z score against national average = 0.8

**Indicator Information**

**Period:** 01/04/2015 - 31/03/2016    **Link:** <http://qof.digital.nhs.uk/>

**Numerator:** Number of patients with hypertension in whom the last blood pressure reading measured in the preceding 12 months is 150/90mmHg or less

**Denominator:** Total number of patients with hypertension

**Commentary:** This indicator measures the intermediate health outcome of a blood pressure of 150/90 mmHg or less in patients with hypertension. This intermediate outcome can reduce risk of cardiovascular disease (CVD) and can be achieved through lifestyle advice and the use of drug therapy. Practices with higher values are performing better on this indicator. The national level of expectation for this indicator is 80%

**Caveats affecting this indicator:** No specific caveats




PRACTICE BACKGROUND    **FACTS AND FIGURES**    APPENDIX

SUMMARY    SAFE    **EFFECTIVE**    CARING    RESPONSIVE    WELL-LED

**AF007: Stroke Prevention: Medication for patients with atrial fibrillation**

**Practice result compared against CCG and England**



**Practice data for indicator**

Number of patients treated	17
Patients with atrial fibrillation	20
Percentage treated	85.0%

**Descriptive statistics - England**

Lower Quartile	81.8%
Median	87.4%
Upper Quartile	92.8%

**For this indicator the practice is**

**Comparable to other practices**  
Practice z score against national average = 0.2

**Indicator Information**

**Period:** 01/04/2015 - 31/03/2016    **Link:** <http://qof.digital.nhs.uk/>

**Numerator:** Number of patients with atrial fibrillation with a record of a CHA2DS2-VASc score of 2 or more treated with anti-coagulation drug therapy

**Denominator:** Total number of patients with atrial fibrillation

**Commentary:** Atrial Fibrillation (AF) is a common and significant cause of morbidity and mortality. The age-specific prevalence of AF is rising, presumably due to improved survival of patients with CHD. One per cent of a typical practice population will be in AF; five per cent of patients aged 65 or over and nine percent of patients aged 75 or over. AF is associated with a five-fold increase in risk of stroke. Practices with higher values are considered to be doing well on this indicator.


**Caveats affecting this indicator:** The denominator excludes patients that may have been exception reported by the practice. Examples of exceptions include where three or more attempts have been made to contact the patient without success, or those patients where an intervention is not clinically appropriate e.g. those who have an allergy, contra-indication or have experienced an adverse reaction. There are a number of other exception criteria.

PRACTICE BACKGROUND    **FACTS AND FIGURES**    APPENDIX

SUMMARY    SAFE    **EFFECTIVE**    CARING    RESPONSIVE    WELL-LED

**QOFGP102: Diabetes - Managing Blood Glucose Level (HbA1c)**

**Practice result compared against CCG and England**



**Practice data for indicator**

Patients within recommended level	227
Patients on diabetes register	332
Percentage within recommended level	68.4%

**Descriptive statistics - England**

Lower Quartile	72.4%
Median	78.7%
Upper Quartile	84.4%

**For this indicator the practice is**

**Comparable to other practices**  
Practice z score against national average = 1.4

**Indicator Information**

**Period:** 01/04/2015 - 31/03/2016    **Link:** <http://qof.digital.nhs.uk/>

**Numerator:** Number of patients with diabetes on the register, in whom the last IFCC HbA1c is 64 mmol/mol or less in the preceding 12 months

**Denominator:** Total number of patients on the diabetes register.

**Commentary:** Practices with higher percentage values for this indicator are better at managing glycaemic control within type 2 diabetic patients. The national level of expectation is 83%. There is a near linear relationship between glycaemic control and death rate in patients with type 2 diabetes (i.e. lower levels of HbA1c are on average better for patients). Scientific studies have shown a one per cent higher HbA1c to be independently associated with 28 per cent higher risk of death. However, aggressive treatment strategies also present risks. Given that there is strong evidence to support tight glycaemic control in type 1 diabetes, which is reflected in current NICE and SIGN guidelines, this indicator aims to balance risks and benefits for patients with type 2 diabetes.


**Caveats affecting this indicator:** There are a range of thresholds that apply in the management of blood glucose (HbA1c) levels and this selected indicator is intended only as indicative of blood glucose management in diabetic patients.

PRACTICE BACKGROUND    **FACTS AND FIGURES**    APPENDIX

SUMMARY    SAFE    **EFFECTIVE**    CARING    RESPONSIVE    WELL-LED

**MYNHSCAN3: Cancer detection rate**

**Practice result compared against CCG and England**



**Practice data for indicator**

Patients detected and had a 2 week referral	7
Patients with a new diagnosis	14
Percentage detected	50.0%

**Descriptive statistics - England**

Lower Quartile	39.1%
Median	47.7%
Upper Quartile	56.1%

**For this indicator the practice is**

**Comparable to other practices**  
Practice z score against national average = -0.1

**Indicator Information**

**Period:** 01/04/2014 - 31/03/2015    **Link:** <http://fingertips.phe.org.uk/cancerservices>

**Numerator:** The number of patients recorded by GP practices as having a 2 week cancer referral in the year of interest who were subsequently diagnosed as having cancer.

**Denominator:** The number of patients who have a date of first treatment in the year of interest recorded on the cancer waiting times system

**Commentary:** This indicator gives an estimation of the GP practice's detection rate, by showing how many cases of cancer for people registered at a practice were detected by that practice and referred via the two-week wait pathway. Practices with high detection rates will improve early diagnosis and timely treatment of patients which will positively impact survival rates.


**Caveats affecting this indicator:** Practices with denominators ≤4 have been suppressed.

PRACTICE BACKGROUND    **FACTS AND FIGURES**    APPENDIX

SUMMARY    SAFE    **EFFECTIVE**    CARING    RESPONSIVE    WELL-LED

**QOFGP110: Mental Health – Comprehensive Care Planning**

**Practice result compared against CCG and England**



**Practice data for indicator**

Patients with a care plan	35
Total number of patients	40
Percentage with a care plan	87.5%

**Descriptive statistics - England**

Lower Quartile	89.6%
Median	93.1%
Upper Quartile	96.3%

**For this indicator the practice is**

**Comparable to other practices**  
Practice z score against national average = 0.2

**Indicator Information**

**Period:** 01/04/2015 - 31/03/2016    **Link:** <http://qof.digital.nhs.uk/>

**Numerator:** Number of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses who have a comprehensive care plan agreed and documented in the records

**Denominator:** Total number of patients with schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder and other psychoses

**Commentary:** This indicator reflects good professional practice and is supported by NICE clinical guidelines. Up to half of patients who have a serious mental illness are seen only in a primary care setting. Patients on the mental health disease register should have a documented primary care consultation that acknowledges, especially in the event of a relapse, a plan for care. This consultation may include the views of their relatives or carers where appropriate. Practices with higher values are considered to be doing well on this indicator. The national level of expectation for this indicator is 90%.


**Caveats affecting this indicator:** The denominator excludes patients that may have been exception reported by the practice. Examples of exceptions include where three or more attempts have been made to contact the patient without success, or those patients where an intervention is not clinically appropriate e.g. those who have an allergy, contra-indication or have experienced an adverse reaction. There are a number of other exception criteria.

PRACTICE BACKGROUND    **FACTS AND FIGURES**    APPENDIX

SUMMARY    SAFE    **EFFECTIVE**    CARING    RESPONSIVE    WELL-LED

**DEM004: Dementia - Face to Face Reviews**

**Practice result compared against CCG and England**



**Practice data for indicator**

Patients reviewed by GP	10
Patients with dementia diagnosis	11
Percentage of dementia patients reviewed by GP	90.9%

**Descriptive statistics - England**

Lower Quartile	78.9%
Median	85.7%
Upper Quartile	93.7%

**For this indicator the practice is**

**Comparable to other practices**  
Practice z score against national average = -0.6

**Indicator Information**

**Period:** 01/04/2015 - 31/03/2016    **Link:** <http://qof.digital.nhs.uk/>

**Numerator:** Number of patients diagnosed with dementia whose care plan has been reviewed in a face-to-face review in the previous 12 months

**Denominator:** Total number of patients diagnosed with dementia

**Commentary:** Dementia is a syndrome characterised by an insidious but ultimately catastrophic progressive global deterioration in intellectual function and is a main cause of late life disability. The prevalence of dementia increases with age and is estimated to be approximately 20 per cent at the age of 80. The face-to-face review focuses on support needs of the patient and their carer. It covers four key issues: the physical and mental health of the patient; the information needs of the carer; the impact of caring on the carer; and communication arrangements with secondary care. Patients diagnosed with dementia are expected to be offered annual appointments specifically to review their diagnosis and care plan. Ideally the first appointment will be within six months of diagnosis. Practices achieving higher values on this indicator are better. The national level of expectation is 70%

**Caveats affecting this indicator:** The denominator excludes patients that may have been exception reported by the practice. Examples of exceptions include where three or more attempts have been made to contact the patient without success, or those patients where an intervention is not clinically appropriate e.g. those who have an allergy, contra-indication or have experienced an adverse reaction. There are a number of other exception criteria.

PRACTICE BACKGROUND    **FACTS AND FIGURES**    APPENDIX

SUMMARY    SAFE    **EFFECTIVE**    CARING    RESPONSIVE    WELL-LED

**GPHLIAP: Antibiotic Prescribing**

**Practice result compared against CCG and England**

Level of result	Items per standardised prescribing unit
Practice	1.06
CCG Average	1.15
England Average	1.01

**Practice data for indicator**

Antibacterial items prescribed	2,159
Specific Therapeutic group Age-sex Related Prescribing Unit	2,044
Items per standardised prescribing unit	1.06

**Descriptive statistics - England**

Lower Quartile	0.86
Median	1.01
Upper Quartile	1.16

**For this indicator the practice is**

**Comparable to other practices**  
**Practice z score against national average = 0.2**

Source: NHS Business Services Authority - 01/07/2015 - 30/06/2016

**Indicator Information**

**Period:** 01/07/2015 - 30/06/2016    **Link:** Quarterly data extract obtained from NHS Business Services Authority (BSA). Hyperlink not available

**Numerator:** Total number of items for Antibacterial drugs (BNF 5.1)

**Denominator:** Total number of oral antibacterial (BNF 5.1 sub-set) items based STAR\_PU (based on the latest quarter within the time period of the numerator).

**Commentary:** GP practices can play an important role in ensuring that prescriptions of antibiotics are appropriate. Over-use and inappropriate use of antibiotics is a problem as it can lead to the spread of antimicrobial resistance. Antibiotic resistance has increased year on year (2010-13) and along side this, the number of bloodstream infections caused by resistant bacteria has also increased. For more information see the UK 5-year Antimicrobial Resistance Strategy available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/uk-5-year-antimicrobial-resistance-strategy-2013-to-2018>. Very low prescribing of antibiotics could indicate that patients' health may be compromised if they are not prescribed antibiotics when presenting with symptoms that would merit timely intervention.


**Caveats affecting this indicator:** Values for practices that do not have four consecutive quarters of data have been suppressed, as they can not be compared like for like with other practices or the England average.

PRACTICE BACKGROUND    **FACTS AND FIGURES**    APPENDIX

SUMMARY    SAFE    EFFECTIVE    **CARING**    RESPONSIVE    WELL-LED

**GPPS029: Patient Experience - Confidence and Trust in GP**

**Practice result compared against CCG and England**



**Practice data for indicator**

Respondents have confidence/trust*	48
Total number of respondents*	54
Percentage answering positively	88.4%

**Descriptive statistics - England**

Lower Quartile	88.7%
Median	92.7%
Upper Quartile	95.5%

**For this indicator the practice is**

**Comparable to other practices**  
Practice z score against national average = 0.7

**Indicator Information**

**Period:** 01/07/2015 - 31/03/2016    **Link:** <https://gp-patient.co.uk/>

**Numerator:** Total respondents who answered "Yes, definitely" or "Yes, to some extent" to question 22 "Do you have confidence and trust in your GP?"

**Denominator:** Total responses to question 22 "Do you have confidence and trust in your GP?"

**Commentary:** Extensive research has shown the quality of the relationship between clinicians and patients to be key to both patient experience of healthcare, and improved clinical outcomes. (see Kelley et al 2014). GMC guidance emphasises that patients must be able to "trust doctors with their lives and health". Practices with higher values are considered to be doing well against this indicator.

**Caveats affecting this indicator:** This indicator is subject to the following factors: Practices whose values are suppressed in the published data have been removed from this analysis prior to any analysis of the data taking place. Practices that have denominators below the value of 10 have been removed from this analysis prior to any analysis of the data taking place. The results of the survey for each GP practice have been weighted to adjust the data to account for potential differences between the demographic profile of all eligible patients in a practice and the patients who actually complete a questionnaire. More information about the weighting of the data can be found at <https://gp-patient.co.uk/faq/weighted-data>


\* these are weighted figures which have been rounded up

PRACTICE BACKGROUND    **FACTS AND FIGURES**    APPENDIX

SUMMARY    SAFE    EFFECTIVE    CARING    **RESPONSIVE**    WELL-LED

**GPPS030: Patient Satisfaction with GP Practice Opening Times**

**Practice result compared against CCG and England**



**Practice data for indicator**

Respondents are satisfied*	35
Total number of respondents*	55
Percentage answering positively	64.0%

**Descriptive statistics - England**

Lower Quartile	71.0%
Median	76.9%
Upper Quartile	82.7%

**For this indicator the practice is**

**Comparable to other practices**  
Practice z score against national average = 1.4

**Indicator Information**

**Period:** 01/07/2015 - 31/03/2016    **Link:** <https://gp-patient.co.uk/>

**Numerator:** Total respondents who answered "Very satisfied" or "Fairly satisfied" to question 25 "How satisfied are you with the hours that your GP surgery is open?"

**Denominator:** Total responses to question 25 "How satisfied are you with the hours that your GP surgery is open?"

**Commentary:** Patients place a high priority on having good access to GPs. A number of issues relate to access and availability; of these, information about opening times routinely emerges as an important issue for patients (see Britain Thinks, 2015). Furthermore, research has found that patient satisfaction with access, as reported in measures such as this, tend to be associated with better clinical outcomes (Kings' Fund, 2012). Practices with higher values are considered to be doing well against this indicator.

**Caveats affecting this indicator:** This indicator is subject to the following factors: Practices whose values are suppressed in the published data have been removed from this analysis prior to any analysis of the data taking place. Practices that have denominators below the value of 10 have been removed from this analysis prior to any analysis of the data taking place. The results of the survey for each GP practice have been weighted to adjust the data to account for potential differences between the demographic profile of all eligible patients in a practice and the patients who actually complete a questionnaire. More information about the weighting of the data can be found at <https://gp-patient.co.uk/faq/weighted-data>

\* these are weighted figures which have been rounded up



Column Heading	Explanation
Key Question	Which of CQC's 5 key questions the indicator answers
Indicator Code	The internal CQC unique code assigned to the indicator (e.g. GPHLIAP)
Indicator description	A brief description of the indicator detailing what the indicator is looking at. Fuller description will be available under 'Indicator Information' on the indicator level pages of the report.
Numerator	The numerator and denominator components of an indicator will vary in description depending on the nature of the indicator
Denominator	
Commentary	Provides supportive information to aid understanding of the indicator. More detailed information will be available in the Indicator & Methodology guidance ( <a href="http://www.cqc.org.uk/GPInsight">www.cqc.org.uk/GPInsight</a> )
Caveats	Caveats describe any caution that must be observed when interpreting the data, e.g. completeness of data and suppression etc.
Descriptive Statistics – England	Descriptive Statistics help to detail the spread of data for an indicator. In this report three points are presented (lower quartile, median and upper quartile), that divide the data set into four equal groups. A practice's indicator value can be compared to these quartile values to gain a picture as to where it sits within the spread of data.
Z score	A statistical measurement of a score's relationship to the mean in a group of scores. More detailed information will be available in the Statistical Methodology guidance ( <a href="http://www.cqc.org.uk/GPInsight">www.cqc.org.uk/GPInsight</a> )
England and CCG Average	The average (a number expressing the central or typical value in a set of data) value for that indicator based on the sum totals of all practices. The report will provide two averages: an England average based on all practices as well as a CCG average which is based on all practices within the practice's commissioning CCG.