

Dr Uden & Partners

Quality Report

Bampton Surgery
Landells
Bampton
OX18 2LJ
Tel: 01993 850257
Website: www.bamptonmedicalpractice.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: We have not revisited Dr Uden & Partners as part of this review because they were able to demonstrate that they were meeting the standards without the need for a visit.
Date of publication: 16/12/2016

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

Are services safe?

Good



Summary of findings

Contents

Summary of this inspection

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

Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	4
Why we carried out this inspection	4
How we carried out this inspection	4
Detailed findings	5

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

During our comprehensive inspection of Dr Uden & Partners in March 2016 we found concerns relating to the provision of safe services, which included issues with cleaning standards, training and security checks for chaperones and infection control. These concerns resulted in the practice being rated as requires improvement for the delivery of safe services.

The practice sent us an action plan describing how they planned to make changes to address the issues that led to our concerns.

We carried out a desk top review on 2 December 2016 to ensure these changes had been implemented and that the service was meeting regulations. The rating for the practice has been updated to reflect our findings. We found the practice had made improvements in the provision of safe services since our last inspection on 16 March 2016 and they were meeting the requirements of the regulation.

Specifically the practice had:

- Improved cleaning standards and were performing audits with the cleaning team.
- Replaced the out of date spill kits.
- Included infection control and handwashing training on the new staff induction checklist.
- Reviewed their chaperone and Disclosure and Barring Service checks policies to ensure appropriately trained and security checked personnel were being offered as chaperones.

In addition to the above, we saw evidence that emergency equipment had been calibrated and all nurses had received, or had a date booked to receive, an appraisal. The practice list of identified carers remained at 1% and we saw evidence of information available to carers. In addition, all carers were routinely offered an annual flu vaccination.

We have updated the ratings for this practice to reflect these changes. The practice is now rated as good for the provision of safe services.

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?

We found the practice had made improvements in the safe provision of services since our last inspection on 16 March 2016 and they were meeting the requirements of the regulation that was in breach. The practice is rated as good for providing safe services.

Specifically the practice had:

- Improved cleaning standards and were performing routine audits with the cleaning team.
- Replaced the out of date spill kits.
- Included infection control and handwashing training on the new staff induction checklist.
- Reviewed their chaperone and Disclosure and Barring Service checks policies to ensure appropriately trained personnel were being offered as chaperones.

Good



Dr Uden & Partners

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

This desktop review was undertaken by a CQC Inspector.

Why we carried out this inspection

We carried out a comprehensive inspection on 16 March 2016 and published a report setting out our judgements. We asked the provider to send a report of the changes they would make to comply with the regulation they were not

meeting. We undertook a follow up inspection in December 2016 to make sure the necessary changes had been made and found the provider is now meeting the fundamental standards included within this report.

This report should be read in conjunction with the full inspection report.

How we carried out this inspection

We reviewed information and evidence sent to us by the practice. We have not revisited Dr Uden & Partners as part of this review because the practice was able to demonstrate they were meeting the regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008 without the need for an inspection.

Are services safe?

Our findings

When we inspected Dr Uden & Partners in March 2016 we identified concerns that lead to the practice being found in breach of regulations. Specifically:

- The practice operated inconsistent cleaning standards in some clinical areas and not all staff received infection control training upon induction. Action identified from annual infection control audits had not been completed.
- Spill kits were found to be past their expiry dates.
- Non-clinical staff acting as chaperones had not received appropriate training or a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check to enable them to discharge their chaperone role.

We also found:

- Some emergency equipment had not been calibrated regularly within the appropriate time frame.

During this review we found the practice had made progress by addressing the areas of concern identified at their previous inspection.

Overview of safety systems and processes

As part of our desk top review, the practice provided evidence that:

- All staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a DBS check. (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable). The practice had implemented a revised chaperone and DBS policy and had decided to offer clinical personnel as chaperones in the first instance. Two non-clinical personnel had been identified and appropriately trained to act as chaperones in the event no clinical personnel were available. We saw evidence of the DBS checks for these staff.
- Cleaning audits had been undertaken and we saw evidence that action was taken to address any improvements identified as a result.
- There was an infection control protocol in place and staff were offered training upon induction. The spill kits had been replaced.
- Emergency equipment had been calibrated and we saw evidence this had been added to a yearly schedule for reviews.