

# Registered pharmacy inspection report

**Pharmacy Name:** Boots, Cheapside, LANGPORT, Somerset, TA10  
9PW

**Pharmacy reference:** 1036329

**Type of pharmacy:** Community

**Date of inspection:** 14/08/2019

## Pharmacy context

The pharmacy is located in Langport, a small town in Somerset. The pharmacy dispenses NHS and private prescriptions. It supplies medicines in multi-compartment devices for people to use in their own homes to help them remember to take their medicines. It also offers advice on the management of minor illnesses and long-term conditions. The pharmacy also offers flu vaccinations and services for drug misusers.

## Overall inspection outcome

✓ **Standards met**

**Required Action:** None

Follow this link to [find out what the inspections possible outcomes mean](#)

## Summary of notable practice for each principle

Principle	Principle finding	Exception standard reference	Notable practice	Why
<b>1. Governance</b>	Standards met	1.2	Good practice	Pharmacy team members record their errors and learn from them to stop them happening again. The pharmacy reviews its practices to make them safer and more efficient.
<b>2. Staff</b>	Standards met	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>3. Premises</b>	Standards met	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>4. Services, including medicines management</b>	Standards met	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>5. Equipment and facilities</b>	Standards met	N/A	N/A	N/A

## Principle 1 - Governance ✓ Standards met

### Summary findings

The pharmacy identifies and manages risks well. It reviews its practices to make them safer and more efficient. Team members record their errors and learn from them to stop them happening again. Staff are clear about their roles and responsibilities. They work in a safe and professional way. The pharmacy asks people for their views and acts appropriately on the feedback. It has appropriate insurance for its services. The pharmacy keeps up-to-date records as required by the law. The pharmacy keeps people's private information safe and explains how it will be used. Pharmacy team members know how to protect the safety of vulnerable people.

### Inspector's evidence

The pharmacy had good processes in place to monitor and reduce risks. Near misses were routinely recorded on a paper log and contained details of the error and a brief reflection on the cause and the learning points. The pharmacy had upgraded to a new patient medication record (PMR) system (Columbus) two weeks prior to the inspection. The store manager described how products were now scanned after they had been labelled and dispensed. This had reduced selection errors as the PMR alerted the dispenser when the product did not match the item labelled. Near misses since the upgrade had involved the dispensing of the incorrect quantity of medicine or data entry issues. The store manager and responsible pharmacist (RP) had alerted all staff to the need to check items dispensed against the prescription rather than the label to reduce these errors.

Dispensing incidents were recorded on the pharmacy incident and error reporting system (PIERs). The RP said that when errors were identified, they were discussed as a team to identify the potential contributing factors. Following an error where the incorrect strength of a liquid medicine had been supplied, both the RP and the store manager had completed learning to ensure they were familiar with the different products and strengths available to prevent a reoccurrence. Shelf-edge alerts had been placed at the locations of selected drugs, including amitriptyline and amlodipine, as part of the company's 'look-alike, sound-alike' (LASA) campaign. Laminated signs were displayed on computer terminals listing the twelve drugs highlighted as high risk by the superintendent's office. All staff were briefed to say the name of LASA drugs out loud when picking to try and reduce errors. The pharmacy had recently added alerts to the locations of pregabalin and gabapentin following company-wide incidents. The team used the 'Pharmacist Information Forms' (PIFs) that were attached to all prescriptions to alert the pharmacist to these drugs and the strength dispensed.

A monthly patient safety report was completed which contained a review of all near misses and dispensing incidents and led to the generation of an action plan to reduce errors. The action plans generated through the patient safety report were shared with all team members through a team huddle and through individual briefings. The most recent action plan had encouraged staff to improve the quality of near miss reporting and ensure a reflection on the cause was included. The pharmacy team received and reviewed the monthly professional standard document supplied by the company's head office. A locally produced clinical governance document was also reviewed which outlined common themes across the region.

Standard operating procedures (SOPs) were up to date and had been recently reviewed and adopted by the regular RP. Staff had signed the SOPs to show that they had read and understood them. Roles and responsibilities of the pharmacy team members were detailed in the RP SOPs. A pharmacy advisor

could describe the activities that could not be undertaken in the absence of the RP.

Feedback was obtained by a yearly Community Pharmacy Patient Questionnaire (CPPQ) survey, and by handing customers cards inviting them to complete an online survey. 73.2% of people completing the most recent CPPQ survey had rated the service provided by the pharmacy as very good or excellent. The store manager shared some feedback received by the online survey with the inspector which praised the actions of the RP following a Medicines Use Review (MUR). A complaints procedure was available in the practice leaflet which was displayed in the retail area.

Professional indemnity and public liability insurances were provided by the XL Insurance Company SE with an expiry of 31 July 2020. RP records were maintained in a log and the correct RP certificate was displayed. Records of emergency supplies and private prescriptions were held on the PMR system and were in order. Records of the supply of unlicensed special medicines were kept and certificates of conformity contained the details of to whom the product had been supplied. Controlled drug (CD) registers were generally maintained as required by law. Records of the receipt of CDs did not contain the address of the supplier. Balance checks were completed weekly. A random stock balance check of Zomorph 30mg capsules was inaccurate, with more in the cupboard than in the register. The RP quickly identified that this was stock that had been received the morning which had not yet been entered. Patient returns were recorded in a separate register and were destroyed promptly, and records were kept with two signatures.

All staff had completed training on information governance and the General Data Protection Regulation. Patient data and confidential waste was dealt with in a secure manner to protect privacy. A privacy policy and a fair data use statement were displayed in the patient area and confidential waste was segregated appropriately. Verbal consent was obtained from patients prior to accessing their summary care record and a note was placed on the PMR stating the reason for access. NHS Smartcards were used appropriately, although none of the three staff working at the time of the inspection had a working smartcard. A dispenser who was on an extended break and completed the electronic prescription download that morning and was due to return to the pharmacy in the afternoon.

All staff were trained to an appropriate level on safeguarding. The RP had completed the Centre for Pharmacy Postgraduate Education (CPPE) level 2 safeguarding training. The remaining staff had completed level 1 e-Learning provided by the company. Local contacts for the escalation of concerns were available on an app downloaded by all team members. Staff were aware of the signs requiring referral and gave examples of when they had made appropriate referrals.

## Principle 2 - Staffing ✓ Standards met

### Summary findings

The pharmacy has enough staff. Team members are well trained for their roles. They keep their skills and knowledge up to date and are supported in their development. Team members suggest and make changes to improve their services. They communicate well with each other.

### Inspector's evidence

Staffing levels were adequate on the day of the inspection and consisted of the RP, and NVQ2 level pharmacy advisors, one of whom was the store manager. A third pharmacy advisor was working but had taken an extended break and was not seen during the inspection. The team had a good rapport and felt they could manage the workload with no undue stress and pressure. The staff had clearly defined roles and accountabilities, and tasks and responsibilities were allocated to individuals on a daily basis. Rotas were completed in advance to plan for absences, which were usually covered rearranging shifts, or by part-time staff increasing their hours. In an emergency, the manager would call on support from other local stores.

The pharmacy team reported that they were allocated protected time to learn during working hours. Resources accessed included the 30-minute tutors supplied by the company, e-Learning and CPPE packages and revised SOPs. Staff were set yearly development plans and received regular ad-hoc feedback on their performance. Staff were seen to offer appropriate advice when selling medicines over the counter and were observed referring to the pharmacist when additional information was required.

The staff felt able to raise concerns and give feedback to the store manager and the RP, both of whom they found to be receptive to ideas and suggestions. Team members were aware of the escalation process for concerns and a whistleblowing policy was in place. The RP described that he felt supported by the store manager and the stores in the wider area. He was in regular communication with pharmacists working in nearby stores. The RP said the targets set were manageable and that they did not impede his professional judgement. He would only undertake services such as MURs that were clinically appropriate.

## Principle 3 - Premises ✓ Standards met

### Summary findings

The pharmacy provides a safe, secure and professional environment for people to receive healthcare. The pharmacy has a soundproofed room where people can have private conversations with members of the pharmacy team.

### Inspector's evidence

The pharmacy was located on the main street of a small town. A retail area led to a healthcare counter, and through to a small dispensary. To the rear of the dispensary was a room housing small kitchen and the lavatory. A consultation room was available on the shop floor. The room was soundproof and conversations could not be overheard. The consultation room was unlocked when not in use, but no confidential information was stored in the consultation room.

The dispensary was of an adequate size but had very limited bench space for the assembly of prescriptions. There was a dedicated area for checking. As there was nowhere to store the crates that medicines were delivered in, these were stacked neatly in the middle of the dispensary. Medicines were stored on the shelves in a generic and alphabetical manner. Shelves would be cleaned when the date checking was carried out. The ambient temperature was suitable for the storage of medicines. The lighting throughout the store was appropriate for the delivery of pharmacy services. Cleaning was undertaken by pharmacy staff and the pharmacy was clean on the day of the inspection. The benches were clear of clutter.

## Principle 4 - Services ✓ Standards met

### Summary findings

The pharmacy is accessible and advertises its services well. Medicines are supplied safely and the pharmacy gives additional advice to people receiving high-risk medicines. It makes a record of this additional advice to demonstrate that it has been given. The pharmacy delivers medicines to people safely and keeps appropriate records of this. The pharmacy obtains its medicines from reputable suppliers. It stores them securely and regularly checks that they are still suitable for supply. The pharmacy deals with medicines returned by people appropriately.

### Inspector's evidence

The pharmacy had step-free access and an automatic door. The consultation room was wheelchair accessible. Adjustments could be made for people with disabilities, such as producing large print labels. A hearing loop was available. Services provided by the pharmacy were advertised in the pharmacy and the RP was accredited to provide all promoted services.

A range of health-related posters and leaflets were displayed and advertised details of services offered both in store and locally. A pharmacy advisor described how if a patient requested a service not offered by the pharmacy, she would refer them to other nearby pharmacies, calling ahead to ensure the service could be provided there. A sign-posting folder was available with details of local agencies and support networks. Further up-to-date signposting resources were accessed online.

Dispensing tubs were used to store prescriptions and medicines to prevent transfer between patients as well as organise the workload. There were designated areas to dispense walk-in prescriptions and those collected from the GP practice. The labels of dispensed items were initialled when dispensed and checked.

Coloured laminates were used to highlight fridge items and CDs in schedule 2 and 3. Prescriptions for schedule 4 CDs were annotated to highlight the 28-day expiry. Prescriptions containing high-risk medicines or paediatric medicines were also highlighted with laminates. The RP described that he checked if patients receiving lithium, warfarin and methotrexate had had blood tests recently, and gave additional advice as needed. Laminates were used to highlight prescriptions that had been identified by the RP as requiring additional counselling by the pharmacist. Records of results were made on the patient medication record (PMR), as were details of significant interventions. Substance misuse services were provided for four people. The RP described how he would liaise with the prescriber or the key worker to report erratic pick-ups and to discuss any other concerns about users of the service.

The pharmacy had completed the audit of people at risk of becoming pregnant whilst taking sodium valproate as part of the Valproate Pregnancy Prevention Programme. Stickers were available for staff to highlight the risks of pregnancy to women receiving prescriptions for valproate. Information booklets and cards were available to be given to eligible women.

Multi-compartment compliance aids were prepared by the pharmacy for 15 people based in the community. This number was capped due to the space and staffing resource in the pharmacy. Additional requests for compliance aids were referred to another local branch of the chain. The pharmacy used a proforma to decide if a compliance aid was the most appropriate solution for a person requesting it. The pharmacy could offer reminder charts and medicine administration record sheets as

an alternative. A sample of compliance aids was inspected. Each compliance aid had an identifier on the front, and dispensed and checked signatures were completed, along with a description of tablets. Patient information leaflets (PILs) were supplied each month. 'When required' medicines were dispensed in boxes and a pharmacy advisor was aware of what could and could not be placed in trays. A record of any changes made was kept on the patient information sheet, which was available for the pharmacist during the clinical checking process.

The dispensary shelves used to store stock were organised and tidy. The stock was arranged alphabetically. Date checking was undertaken each week and the entire dispensary was checked every 3 months. Spot checks revealed no date expired stock or mixed batches. Prescriptions containing omissions were appropriately managed, and the prescription was kept with the balance until it was collected. Stock was obtained from reputable sources including Alliance and AHH. Specials were obtained from Alliance Specials. Invoices were seen to this effect. Records of recalls and alerts were seen and were annotated with the outcome and the date actioned.

Staff were aware of the Falsified Medicines Directive (FMD). They could check the anti-tampering device on each medicine was intact during the dispensing process. But they weren't verifying nor decommissioning stock at the time of the inspection. The updated PMR system had the capability to be FMD compliant. The pharmacy's SOPs were being updated to reflect the changes FMD would bring to the pharmacy's processes.

CDs were stored in accordance with legal requirements in an approved cabinet. Denaturing kits were available for safe destruction of CDs. Expired CDs were clearly marked and segregated in the cabinet. Patient returned CDs were recorded in a register and destroyed with a witness with two signatures were recorded. The dispensary fridge was clean, tidy and well organised and records of temperatures were maintained. The maximum and minimum temperatures were within the required range of 2 to 8 degrees Celsius.

Logs were kept of deliveries made to people in their own homes with appropriate signatures. Confidentiality was maintained when obtaining signatures. The RP described the process followed in the event of failed deliveries to ensure that patients received their delivery in a timely manner, particularly those considered to be vulnerable, and this was found to be adequate.

Patient returned medication was dealt with appropriately. Confidential patient information was removed or obliterated from patient returned medication. A hazardous waste bin available for the disposal of cytotoxic and cytostatic medicines.



## Principle 5 - Equipment and facilities ✓ Standards met

### Summary findings

The pharmacy uses appropriate equipment and facilities to provide its services. It keeps these clean and tidy.

### Inspector's evidence

Validated crown-stamped measures were available for liquids, with separate measure marked for the use of controlled drugs only. A range of clean tablet and capsule counters were present, with a separate triangle clearly marked for cytotoxics. All equipment, including the dispensary fridge, was in good working order and PAT test stickers were visible and were in date. The dispensary sinks were clean and in good working order.

Reference sources were available and the pharmacy could also access up-to-date information on the internet. Computers were positioned so that no information could be seen by members of the public and phone calls were taken away from public areas. Dispensed prescriptions were stored in a retrieval system on shelves with no details visible to people waiting.

### What do the summary findings for each principle mean?

Finding	Meaning
✓ Excellent practice	The pharmacy demonstrates innovation in the way it delivers pharmacy services which benefit the health needs of the local community, as well as performing well against the standards.
✓ Good practice	The pharmacy performs well against most of the standards and can demonstrate positive outcomes for patients from the way it delivers pharmacy services.
✓ Standards met	The pharmacy meets all the standards.
Standards not all met	The pharmacy has not met one or more standards.