

St James Surgery

Quality Report

St James Surgery
Gains lane
Devizes
SN10 1QU
Tel: 01380 711879
Website: www.stjamessurgerydevizes.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: The evidence provided by the practice, enabled the commission to conduct this inspection without the need for a visit.
Date of publication: 01/12/2016

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

Overall rating for this service

Good



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
Background to St James Surgery	4
Why we carried out this inspection	4
How we carried out this inspection	4
Detailed findings	6

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

In February 2016, during an announced comprehensive inspection of St James Surgery, we found issues relating to the practice's control and assessment of its risk of legionella. Legionella is a harmful bacteria which can grow in some water systems, if the environmental conditions are right.

During the inspection, the practice was unable to produce a legionella risk assessment. This was in breach of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 Regulations. As a result the practice was rated as requires improvement for safe, and good for effective, caring, responsive and well led. The practice had an overall rating of good.

We carried out a focused inspection of the practice in September 2016. The provider sent us a risk assessment of their management of legionella. The practice also provided a written scheme evidencing the control for legionella. The written scheme of control explained how the risk of legionella would be managed within the practice.

We found the practice had made improvements since our last inspection in February 2016, and that it was now meeting the regulation relating to assessing the risk of legionella, which had previously been breached.

Following this focused inspection we have rated the practice as good for providing safe services. The overall rating for the practice remains good.

This report should be read in conjunction with the full inspection report of 9 February 2016. A copy of the full inspection report can be found at www.cqc.org.uk.

At this inspection we found that:

- The practice had instructed an independent company to assess the risk of legionella in the practice.
- Using the legionella risk assessment, completed by an independent company, the practice had produced a legionella risk assessment.
- Based on the legionella risk assessment, the practice had produced a written scheme of control for legionella.
- The practice was now able to provide evidence that it was following its own legionella risk assessment, and outlined any intended steps it would take to reduce the risk of legionella.

Systems were now in place to reduce and minimise the risk of legionella to both staff and patients.

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?

Since our last inspection- a comprehensive inspection undertaken in February 2016, the practice was found to have undertaken work to address previous issues with regards to assessing the risk of legionella by:

- Instructing an independent company to assess the risk of legionella in the practice.
- Producing a legionella risk assessment, and demonstrating examples that appointed staff members were now following this.
- Producing a written scheme of control for the management of legionella.
- Outlining future steps that would be taken to minimise risk of legionella in the practice.
- Ensuring systems were now in place to reduce and minimise the risk of legionella to both staff and patients.

Good



St James Surgery

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

Our follow up desk top inspection was undertaken by a CQC Assistant Inspector.

Background to St James Surgery

St James Surgery is located in a purpose built building near the centre of the market town of Devizes, in Wiltshire. All of the consulting rooms are on the ground floor. The practice has a registered population of approximately 6,600 patients. Data shows minimal income deprivation among the practice population. There are a higher number of patients aged over 45 than the national average.

There are three GP partners and one salaried GP. Two are female and two are male. There is a nurse manager, two practice nurses, two health care assistants and a phlebotomist. (A phlebotomist takes blood samples.) The practice manager is supported by a team of nine staff. The practice is a training practice and at the time of our inspection they had one GP trainee working with them. The practice is registered as a partnership between the three partner GPs.

The practice is open between 8am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Appointments with GPs are from 8.30am to 11.30am and 2pm to 6pm. Extended surgery hours are offered from 6.30pm to 7.45pm on Mondays only. The practice has opted out of providing out of hours services to their patients. The out of hours service is provided by MEDIVIVO and is accessed by calling NHS 111. This practice had not been previously inspected. On the day of our inspection the practice registration under the CQC (Registration)

Regulations 2009 was incorrect. One of the partners was registered as the registered manager but not as a partner. The practice had been doing surgical procedures and had not realised they were not registered for this. We were told they would not be conducting any further minor surgery until they were registered for this and we saw evidence that the practice was in the process of making the necessary changes to their registration.

The practice delivers its services from St James Surgery, Gains Lane, Devizes, Wiltshire, SN10 1QU.

Why we carried out this inspection

We carried out a comprehensive inspection on 9 February 2016 and published a report setting out our judgements. The practice was overall rated as good. However, it was found to be requires improvement in the safe domain. This was due to a legionella risk assessment not being carried out on the premises.

We undertook a focused inspection on 9 September 2016, to check that the practice had taken the actions they told us they would make. We also undertook this inspection to check that the practice was complying with the regulations they were not meeting at the previous inspection. We have followed up to make sure the necessary changes had been made and found the provider was now meeting the fundamental standards included within this report. This report should be read in conjunction with the full inspection report. A copy of the full inspection report can be found at www.cqc.org.uk.

Detailed findings

How we carried out this inspection

We undertook a focused desk top inspection of St James Surgery on 9 September 2016. This was carried out to check that the practice had completed the actions they told us they would take to comply with the regulations we found had been breached during an inspection in February 2016.

To complete this desk top inspection we:

- Reviewed the legionella risk assessment produced by the practice.
- Reviewed the written scheme of control for the management of legionella.
- Analysed the steps the practice had taken to reduce the risk of legionella.

Because this was a focused follow up inspection we looked at one of the five key questions we always ask:

- Is it safe?

Are services safe?

Our findings

When we inspected in February 2016, we reviewed the policies and procedures in place to protect staff and patients from Legionella. Legionella is a harmful bacteria which can grow in some water systems, if the environmental conditions are right. We found that the practice did not have a risk assessment for legionella, and as a result did not have a system in place to minimise this risk.

Following publication of our report of the inspection, the practice provided an action plan of the changes they would implement. Subsequently they provided us with evidence that they had employed an independent company to assess the risk of legionella. The practice also supplied a written scheme of control; this was a document which explained how the risk of legionella would be managed. We undertook a desk based review in September 2016 of the evidence provided, to ensure that improvements had been completed. From our desk based inspection we found:

Monitoring risks to patients

- Risks to patients were assessed and well managed. The practice had employed an independent company to assess the risk of legionella in the practice. As a result, a risk assessment report was produced highlighting the areas of concern and recommended steps of action that the practice could take to minimise this risk.
- The practice had produced a written scheme of control for the management of legionella. This explained the roles and responsibilities of staff with regards to minimising the risk of legionella. The written scheme of control gave further information to staff, as to how both the hot and cold water systems should be monitored. Finally, the scheme also stated the necessary record keeping which would need to accompany any monitoring performed by the practice.
- As a result of the legionella risk assessment, and the previous inspection, the practice had reviewed their water system. The practice had also supplied details of intended improvements to the water system, which included quotes from contractors. The practice also supplied minutes from team meetings, evidencing how staff had been informed of their roles and responsibilities.
- The evidence provided, suggested that the practice had taken steps to demonstrate it was now compliant with the Health and Social Care regulations previously breached.