

# Mortimer Surgery

## Quality Report

72 Victoria Road,  
Mortimer Common,  
Reading,  
Berkshire,  
RG7 3SQ.

Tel: 0118 933 2436

Website: [www.mortimersurgery.co.uk](http://www.mortimersurgery.co.uk)

Date of inspection visit: 12 August 2015

Date of publication: 08/10/2015

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
Areas for improvement	4

### Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	5
Background to Mortimer Surgery	5
Why we carried out this inspection	5
How we carried out this inspection	5
Detailed findings	7

## Overall summary

### Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced focused inspection of the Mortimer Surgery, 72 Victoria Road, Mortimer Common, Reading, Berkshire, RG7 3SQ on 12 August 2015. We carried out this inspection to check that the practice had made improvements and were meeting regulations. Our previous inspection in November 2014 had found breaches of regulations relating to the safe delivery of services. The ratings for the practice have been updated to reflect our findings.

We found the practice had made significant improvement since our last inspection in November 2014 and they were meeting regulations that had previously been breached.

In August 2015 we found concerns which led us to issue requirement notices to this practice. The concerns were:

- Not all recruitment and employment information required by the regulations was documented in all staff members' personnel files.
- Medicine management and dispensing systems were not reviewed and did not reflect national guidelines.

Following the inspection the practice sent us an action plan detailing how they would improve and address the

concerns we identified. We found the practice had made improvements since our last inspection on 12 November 2014 and they were meeting the regulations relating to the recruitment of staff and management of medicines that had previously been breached.

Specifically the practice:

- Operated safe systems in relation to the recruitment of staff.
- Changed their management and monitoring of medicines to improve safety
- Increased staffing in the dispensary

We have changed the rating for this practice to reflect these changes. The practice is now rated good for the provision of safe, effective, caring, responsive and well led services.

However there is an area the provider should consider making further improvements:

- Ensure the dispensary staff have the necessary skills and ongoing training to perform their roles appropriately.

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?**

At our last inspection in November 2014 we found the practice was not undertaking all staff checks required when recruiting employees or keeping appropriate records. We also found concerns in relation to the management of medicines. In addition the levels of staffing in the dispensary were considered to be unsafe. In August 2015 we checked improvements had been made. We found that references were now sought as standard policy when employing new staff. There was a new process for checking that newly recruited staff would receive health checks related to their roles. Dispensary staffing levels had been increased to improve the processing of medicines. New monitoring and management processes were also in place to improve the handling of medicines.

Good



# Summary of findings

## Areas for improvement

### Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

- Ensure the dispensary staff have the necessary skills and on-going training to perform their roles appropriately.

# Mortimer Surgery

## Detailed findings

### Our inspection team

#### Our inspection team was led by:

A CQC pharmacy inspector and the information collated by a CQC inspector.

## Background to Mortimer Surgery

The practice provides medical services to over 11,700 registered patients in Mortimer, Berkshire and is a dispensing practice. The practice serves an older than average practice population and with low deprivation scores. Mortimer Surgery has a high number of patients registered who are over 65 year old. Local demographic data indicates the practice serves a population which is one of the more affluent areas in England. The practice has been extensively extended and modernised to meet patient needs, in the recent years. All consulting and treatment rooms are located on the ground floor.

Care and treatment is delivered by seven GPs, with four male and three female GPs, practice nurses, a dispensary team, health care assistants/phlebotomist. In addition, the practice is supported by midwives who are based at a different location. The practice also works closely with district nurses. Mortimer Surgery also provides access or facilities to other medical services, such as physiotherapy, counselling and chiropody.

The practice is involved with the local and clinical commissioning group (CCG); one of the GP partners has an active role in the CCG. The practice has a Primary Medical Services (PMS) contract.

The practice is a GP training practice, which looks after GP registrars as well as medical students in years four and five of the Oxford and Wessex Deanery.

This was a focussed inspection.

The practice provides services from:

Mortimer Surgery

72 Victoria Road

Mortimer Common

Reading, Berkshire

RG7 3SQ

## Why we carried out this inspection

### Why we carried out this inspection

We carried out an inspection on 12 November 2014 and published a report setting out our judgements. We found improvements were required regarding providing safe services. We asked the provider to send a report and evidence of the changes they had made to comply with the regulations. We visited the practice on 12 August 2015 and reviewed additional information provided after the inspection.

This review was planned to check whether the provider is meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008, to look at the quality of the service under the Care Act 2014. We have followed up to make sure the necessary changes have 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.

# Detailed findings

## How we carried out this inspection

### How we carried out this inspection

We reviewed information given to us by the practice, including records of staff recruitment checks and a recruitment policy. We revisited Mortimer Surgery as part of this review the changes made in relation to medicines management.

# Are services safe?

## Our findings

### Medicines management

At our last inspection in November 2014, we were concerned some Controlled Drug requisition orders (at the request of the provider) were not signed by a GP, the management and records for computer generated prescriptions were not following best practice, independent second dispensing checks were not always undertaken due to staffing levels and the monitoring of medicine refrigerators was incomplete.

We received an action plan from the provider informing us of the actions they had taken to meet regulations.

At the inspection on the 12 August 2015 practice staff showed and explained that the practice had changed pharmaceutical wholesaler for controlled drugs to ensure that the ordering and supply complied with the legislation. When ordering controlled drugs the dispensary staff produced from the computer ordering system a printed controlled drugs requisition order that was then signed by a GP. On receipt of the Controlled Drugs, the delivery driver would collect the appropriate signed controlled drugs requisition order.

Practice staff showed and explained how computer generated prescriptions were tracked within the practice. This tracking included receipt and distribution of blank computer prescriptions and repeat prescriptions before and after the GP had reviewed and signed the prescriptions.

We were told by practice staff that the number of dispensary staff had been increased and the service had

installed a computer based checking system. This had reduced the number of significant dispensing errors from four per the previous year to none since the computer based checking system had been installed.

The service had reviewed the monitoring of medicines refrigerators and in addition to the refrigerators internal thermometer; battery powered “data loggers” were being used to monitor the refrigerator temperatures.

### Staffing and recruitment

In November 2014 we found the practice had not sought references as proof of conduct for staff they employed. Health checks were not in place to ensure staff were safe to work with patients and that they received any support to perform their roles. We found the staffing levels in the dispensary team were low. Dispensary team told us this often led to stressful environment for staff. This meant the current system presented high risk for mistakes being made, as the practice was not carrying out second checks on their dispensing.

In August 2015 we found the staffing levels in the dispensary had been increased to allow second dispensing checks to be undertaken. A computer based checking system had also been installed. The Dispensary team told us this had reduced both their levels of stress and the number of dispensing errors. We saw evidence that staff had references sought to ensure their conduct in previous roles was appropriate. We saw that a policy had been introduced to provide a robust checking system for new staff to ensure they were physically and mentally fit to perform their work. The changes to recruitment procedures and staff checks meant that patients were protected from staff who may not be safe to perform regulated activities.