

Care Quality draft assessment for Timperley Health Centre - WestwoodGeneral Practice

Overview

Overall Rating: Good ●

The service is performing well and meeting our expectations.

Summary

Safe	Good ●	Read this section
Effective	Good ●	Read this section
Caring	Good ●	Read this section
Responsive	Good ●	Read this section
Well-led	Good ●	Read this section

Overall Service Commentary

Date of Assessment: 29 April 2026. Timperley Health Centre – Dr Westwood is a GP practice and delivers services to approximately 6400 people under a contract held with NHS England. It is in a health centre building that it shares with another GP practice. According to the latest available data, the ethnic make-up of the service area is approximately 82.6% White, 10.5% Asian, 3.1% Mixed, 1.8% Black and 2.0% Other.

Information published by the Office for Health Improvement and Disparities shows deprivation within the service population group is in the 10th decile (10 of 10). The lower the decile, the more deprived the service population is relative to others.

This was a focused assessment. We undertook this assessment due to the length of time since our last assessment. We assessed 10 quality statements from across all 5 key questions. This assessment considered the demographics of the people using the service, the context the service was working within and how this impacted service delivery. Where relevant, further commentary is provided in the quality statements section of this report. Staff kept facilities clean and maintained equipment appropriately to ensure people were kept safe. They assessed and managed the risk of infection well and took steps to control the risk of it spreading. There were enough staff with the right skills, qualifications and experience.

Staff supported people to live healthier lives, monitoring their care and treatment to ensure they received positive and consistent outcomes.

Staff treated people with kindness, empathy and compassion, and respected their privacy and dignity.

People could access care, treatment and support when they needed it. Leaders and staff were alert to discrimination and inequality that could disadvantage groups of people who used the service and sought ways to address any barriers.

The service had a clear vision and strategy, which considered the needs of the people who used their service and the wider community. Staff understood their individual roles and responsibilities. Leaders accounted for the actions, behaviours and performance of staff through clear and effective governance processes.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Overall People's Experience

As part of our assessment, we reviewed feedback from people who used the service to understand their views and experience of the service. This included reviewing friends and family test responses, email, letters and cards from patients, and reviewing other feedback available to us. This included speaking with people using the service at the time of our assessment. People were positive about the quality of their care and treatment. They described how staff treated them with kindness and compassion and respected their privacy. This was mirrored in the results of recent surveys, including the 2025 National GP Patient Survey, which showed most people were satisfied.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Safe

Rating: Good ●

Percentage Score: 75.00 %

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

This service is safe

Commentary

We looked for evidence people were protected from abuse and avoidable harm. At our last assessment, we rated this key question as good. At this assessment, the rating remains the same.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Safe

Safe environments

Overall Score



► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score:
A horizontal row of four circles representing a score of 3 out of 4. The first circle contains the number 1, the second contains 2, the third contains 3 and is filled with a dark purple color, and the fourth contains 4.

The service detected and controlled potential risks in the care environment. They made sure equipment, facilities and technology supported the delivery of safe care.

The service had contracts to ensure the premises was maintained. Staff and leaders completed health and safety risk assessments and undertook audits to ensure they had identified and addressed all risks. The service had a business continuity plan which was regularly reviewed and outlined how the service should continue to operate in the event of a disruption.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Safe

Safe and effective staffing

Overall Score



► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score:
A horizontal row of four circles representing a score from 1 to 4. The first circle contains the number 1, the second contains 2, the third contains 3 and is highlighted with a dark purple background, and the fourth contains 4.

The service made sure there were enough qualified, skilled and experienced staff, who received effective support, supervision and development. They worked together well to provide safe care that met people’s individual needs. The service employed a range of clinical and non-clinical roles, which included GPs, practice nurse and a healthcare assistant. Long term locum doctors have been at the practice for a long time, giving continuity and meaning patients know them. Leaders ensured staff were up to date with their training which the service had deemed mandatory and operated within their agreed areas of competence. The service followed safe recruitment procedures when employing staff, which were in line with national legislation. This included

identity checks, review of qualifications, obtaining of professional references and a criminal records check.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Safe

Infection prevention and control

Overall Score



► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score:
A horizontal row of four circles representing a score from 1 to 4. The first circle contains the number 1, the second contains 2, the third contains 3 and is filled with a dark purple color, and the fourth contains 4.

The service assessed and managed the risk of infection. They detected and controlled the risk of it spreading and shared concerns with appropriate agencies promptly.

The service had cleaning schedules available, which outlined how staff should clean the building and its equipment. The service demonstrated how these were monitored for completion to maintain oversight of cleaning arrangements. During our onsite visit, the service's premises and a sample of equipment reviewed was noted to be visibly clean. The service’s infection prevention and control lead conducted regular risk assessments and independent audits were done by the local council to ensure compliance and acted where necessary to mitigate any identified risks. Staff had completed relevant training in infection prevention and control.

Effective

Rating: Good 

Percentage Score: 75.00 %

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

This service is effective

Commentary

We looked for evidence staff involved people in decisions about their care and treatment and provided them with advice and support. Staff regularly reviewed people's care and worked with other services to achieve this. At our last assessment, we rated this key question as good. At this assessment, the rating remains the same.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Effective

Supporting people to live healthier lives

Overall Score



► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score:    

The service supported people to manage their health and wellbeing to maximise their independence, choice and control. The service supported people to live healthier lives and where possible, reduce their future needs for care and support. For example they partnered with a local hospital trust to promote lung health check for people who are most at risk.

Staff focussed on identifying risks to people's health, including those in the last 12 months of their lives and those with caring responsibilities. Staff supported national priorities and initiatives to improve population health, including stopping smoking and tackling obesity.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Effective

Monitoring and improving outcomes

Overall Score

   

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score:    

The service routinely monitored people's care and treatment to continuously improve it. They ensured outcomes were positive, consistent and met the expectations of people themselves.

The service met national targets for the uptake of childhood immunisations. They worked with people who missed appointments to make sure they could book again when it most suited them. The service performed better than the England average in relation to new cancer cases treated resulting from an urgent suspected cancer referral.

Caring

Rating: Good ●

Percentage Score: 75.00 %

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

This service is caring

Commentary

We looked for evidence the service involved people and treated them with compassion, kindness, dignity and respect. At our last assessment, we rated this key question as good. At this assessment, the rating remains the same.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Caring

Kindness, compassion and dignity

Overall Score



► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

People's Experience

Score: A horizontal row of four circles containing the numbers 1, 2, 3, and 4. The circle with the number 3 is filled with a dark purple color, while the others are light purple.

The service always treated people with kindness, empathy and compassion and respected their privacy and dignity. Staff treated colleagues from other organisations with kindness and respect.

The service had arrangements to promote people's privacy. The service performed better than the national average in the results of the 2025 National GP Patient Survey. This showed people felt listened to and felt they were treated with kindness. For example, 98.8% of respondents to the survey felt during their last appointment they were involved as much as they wanted to be in decisions about their care and treatment, compared to a national average of 91.2%. This was mirrored in feedback from patients in the friends and family test cards, letters and emails we saw.

Responsive

Rating: Good A solid green circle.

Percentage Score: 75.00 %

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

This service is responsive

Commentary

We looked for evidence the service met people's needs, and staff treated people equally and without discrimination. At our last assessment, we rated this key question as good. At this assessment, the rating remains the same.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Responsive

Equity in access

Overall Score



► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score:
A horizontal row of four circles, each containing a number from 1 to 4. The circles are light purple. The circle with the number 3 is filled with a darker purple, indicating the current score.

The service made sure people could access the care, support and treatment they needed when they needed it.

The service performed better than the national average in the results of the 2025 National GP Patient Survey. This showed people could access the service when they needed it in a way that suited their needs, such as by telephone, in person or through the service's website. For example, 96.4% of respondents to the survey described their overall experience of contacting this service as being good, compared to a national average of 52.9%. In response to feedback from people who used the service, staff had made changes to improve access. This included the service providing wheelchairs and walking

frames for those that may benefit from them and parking space for mobility scooters. People that had no identification or proof of address were helped to register and access services in person. Treatment rooms were all on the ground floor, and an automatic door had been fitted to the entrance to ensure ease of access to the service. There were a mix of chairs in the waiting room including with armrests to make sitting and standing easier.

[↑ Back to top](#)

Responsive

Equity in experiences and outcomes

Overall Score



► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score:
A horizontal row of four circles representing a score. The first circle contains the number 1, the second contains 2, the third contains 3 and is highlighted with a dark purple background, and the fourth contains 4.

Staff and leaders actively listened to information about people who were most likely to experience inequality in experience or outcomes. They tailored their care, support and treatment in response to this.

Staff treated people equally and without discrimination. Leaders proactively sought ways to address any barriers to improving people’s experience and worked with local services, to address any local health inequalities. For example, Staff would visit local veteran’s group to explain services that were available to them, and assist with registering and using the NHS App. Staff understood the importance of providing an inclusive approach to care and made adjustments to support equity in people’s experience and outcomes.

Staff followed processes to ensure people could register at the service, including those in vulnerable circumstances such as homeless people. Staff used systems to capture and review feedback from people who used the service, which included those who did not speak English or have access to the internet. This was reflected in the feedback shared from people who used the service, which was positive.

Well-led

Rating: Good ●

Percentage Score: 75.00 %

► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

This service is well-led

Commentary

We looked for evidence that service leadership, management and governance assured high-quality, person-centred care; supported learning and innovation; and promoted an open, fair culture. At our last assessment, we rated this key question as good. At this assessment, the rating remains the same.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Well-led

Shared direction and culture

Overall Score



► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score:



The service had a shared vision, strategy and culture. This was based on transparency, equity, equality, human rights, diversity, inclusion and engagement. Staff and leaders understood the challenges and the needs of people and their communities.

All staff were aware of the service’s vision and strategy. Leaders monitored and reviewed progress against the delivery of their strategy. The service was aware of local challenges which affected their service, such as the changes in GP provision locally and worked with partner agencies to address these challenges. Staff and leaders actively promoted equality and diversity and worked to identify the causes of any workforce inequalities. They demonstrated a positive and compassionate listening culture that focused on learning and development.

↑ [Back to top](#)

Well-led

Governance, management and sustainability

Overall Score



► [How do we score this?](#)

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people’s care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score:
A horizontal row of four circles containing the numbers 1, 2, 3, and 4. The circle with the number 3 is filled with a dark purple color, while the circles with 1, 2, and 4 are light purple.

The service had clear responsibilities, roles, systems of accountability and good governance. They used these to manage and deliver good quality, sustainable care, treatment and support. They acted on the best information about risk, performance and outcomes, and shared this securely with others when appropriate.

All staff we spoke with were clear on their individual roles and responsibilities. Leaders proactively supported staff and regularly met with them to complete appraisals and performance reviews. The provider had established governance processes in relation to the quality statements we reviewed during this assessment, which were appropriate for their service. Staff could access all required policies and procedures, which were kept up to date and reflected latest guidance. Leaders held regular meetings with staff, during which they discussed emerging risks and potential improvements to the service. Leaders clearly recorded any actions that arose from these meetings and shared these with staff. Staff took confidentiality and information security seriously. Staff submitted data and notifications to external agencies as required.