

Registered pharmacy inspection report

Pharmacy Name: Rowlands Pharmacy, 28 Chester Road, WREXHAM, Clwyd, LL11 2SA

Pharmacy reference: 1079213

Type of pharmacy: Community

Date of inspection: 25/02/2020

Pharmacy context

The pharmacy is situated inside a GP medical centre, in a residential area of Wrexham, North Wales. The pharmacy premises are accessible for people, with adequate space in the retail area. The pharmacy sells a range of over-the-counter medicines and dispenses both private and NHS prescriptions. It has a consultation room available for private conversations. And it supplies medication in multi-compartment compliance aids for some people, to help them take the medicines at the right time. Some prescriptions are dispensed off-site at a hub pharmacy.

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
1. Governance	Standards met	1.2	Good practice	The pharmacy records and analyses adverse dispensing incidents to identify learning points which are then incorporated into day to day practice to help manage future risk.
		1.7	Good practice	All members of the pharmacy team receive regular training and assessment to make sure they know how to protect confidential information.
2. Staff	Standards met	N/A	N/A	N/A
3. Premises	Standards met	N/A	N/A	N/A
4. Services, including medicines management	Standards met	4.2	Good practice	The pharmacy effectively supports people taking high-risk medicines by making extra checks and providing counselling.
5. Equipment and facilities	Standards met	N/A	N/A	N/A

Principle 1 - Governance ✓ Standards met

Summary findings

The pharmacy manages the risks associated with its services and protects peoples' information. Members of the pharmacy team work to professional standards and are clear about their roles and responsibilities. They record their mistakes so that they can learn from them. And act to help stop the same sort of mistakes from happening again. The pharmacy keeps the records required by law, but some information is missing, which could make it harder to understand what has happened if queries arise.

Inspector's evidence

There were up to date standard operating procedures (SOPs) for the services provided, with sign off records showing that members of the pharmacy team had read and accepted them. Roles and responsibilities of staff were set out in SOPs. A member of the pharmacy team was able to clearly describe her duties. Dispensing errors were reported on the computer system and learning points were included. Near miss incidents were recorded on a log and were discussed with the pharmacy team member at the time they occurred. The near miss records were regularly reviewed for trends and patterns, with the outcome of the review fed back to the pharmacy team. Pregabalin and gabapentin stock had been separated because of several previous near miss incidents with these medicines.

The pharmacist clinically checked prescriptions prior to being accuracy checked by the accuracy checking pharmacy technician (ACPT). The pharmacist's initials were added to the prescription to indicate the clinical check had been done.

A complaints procedure was in place. And copies of a practice leaflet explaining the complaints process were present in the retail area. The pharmacist explained that she aimed to resolve complaints in the pharmacy at the time they arose, but she would refer to the pharmacy manager or head office if necessary. A customer satisfaction survey was carried out annually. Separately to the customer satisfaction survey some people had verbally provided negative feedback about the off-site dispensing of their repeat prescription. The pharmacy manager explained that the process for off-site dispensing had been clearly explained to each person who had provided negative feedback as they may not have fully understood the process, and there had been no further negative feedback received.

The company had professional indemnity insurance in place. The correct responsible pharmacist notice was displayed conspicuously. The emergency supply record, unlicensed medicines (specials) record, and the CD register were in order. CD running balances were kept and audited regularly. Patient returned CDs were recorded appropriately. The responsible pharmacist (RP) record had the time the RP ceased their duty missing on some occasions in the last six months. The private prescription record was in order up to the end of January 2020, but medicines supplied on private prescription during February 2020 had not yet been entered into the private prescription record.

Confidential waste was shredded. Confidential information was kept out of sight of the public. The pharmacy team completed information governance training when they commenced their employment and then received refresher training and assessment on an annual basis. Computers were all password protected and faced away from the customer. Assembled prescriptions awaiting collection were being stored in a manner that protected patient information from being visible. A privacy notice was

displayed, and a practice leaflet was present, with both explaining how the pharmacy intended to use patient's personal data.

The pharmacy team had read the safeguarding policy and the pharmacist had completed level 2 safeguarding training. There were details of local safeguarding contacts available.

Principle 2 - Staffing ✓ Standards met

Summary findings

The pharmacy has enough team members to manage its workload safely. The team members are trained and work effectively together. They are comfortable about providing feedback to their manager and receive feedback about their own performance. The pharmacy enables its team members to act on their own initiative and use their professional judgement, to the benefit of people who use the pharmacy's services.

Inspector's evidence

There was a regular pharmacist, an accuracy checking pharmacy technician (ACPT) who was the pharmacy manager, a second ACPT and four dispensers on duty. This was the usual staffing level. The pharmacy team worked well together and managed the workload adequately. The pharmacy team participated in ongoing training using the e-learning platform "moodles". The team members had completed a training module on information governance in January 2020. A member of the pharmacy team logged into her e-learning account which showed that she was up to date with mandatory training. She said that it was difficult to find the time to complete non mandatory training and this was carried out when the workload permitted. A training event had been arranged by the regional leader, for the team members to attend when the pharmacy was closed. The areas covered in the training event included over-the-counter medicines and service provision.

The pharmacy team were aware of a whistle blowing policy in place and knew how to report concerns about a member of the team if needed. Details outlining the policy were available for the team to refer to. The pharmacy team members had received an appraisal with the pharmacy manager in the last year, with copies present. The pharmacy team members said that the pharmacy manager was very approachable, supportive and they were more than happy to ask her or the pharmacist questions when needed.

A member of the pharmacy team covering the medicines counter was clear about her role. She knew what questions to ask when making a sale and when to refer the patient to a pharmacist. She was clear which medicines could be sold in the presence and absence of a pharmacist and was clear what action to take if she suspected a customer might be abusing medicines such as co-codamol which she would refer to the pharmacist for advice. The pharmacist said that there were targets in place for the number of prescription items dispensed and off-site dispensing. She said that the very recent addition of a consultation room during a complete refit of the premises would allow the pharmacy to provide professional services such as medicines use review (MUR) and discharge medicine review (DMR), which would lead to additional targets being set.

Principle 3 - Premises ✓ Standards met

Summary findings

The pharmacy is clean and tidy. It is a suitable place to provide healthcare. It has a consultation room so that people can have a conversation in private.

Inspector's evidence

The pharmacy was clean and tidy. It had a waiting area. The temperature in the pharmacy was controlled by air conditioning units. Lighting was good. The pharmacy team cleaned the floor, dispensing benches and sinks regularly, and a record was kept.

The pharmacy premises had recently undergone a complete refit that included the construction of a consultation room. The premises were maintained in an adequate state of repair. Maintenance problems were reported to a facilities management company. A WC with wash hand basin and antibacterial hand wash was available for the team in the GP medical centre. The consultation room was uncluttered and clean in appearance. This was kept locked until access was required.

Principle 4 - Services ✓ Standards met

Summary findings

The pharmacy's services are accessible to most people and they are managed, so people receive their medicines safely. The pharmacy takes extra care when supplying some higher-risk medicines. It sources and stores medicines safely and carries out some checks to help make sure that medicines are in good condition and suitable to supply.

Inspector's evidence

The pharmacy, consultation room and pharmacy counter were accessible to all, including patients with mobility difficulties and wheelchairs. There was a selection of healthcare leaflets in the retail area. The opening hours were displayed. The pharmacy had a prescription retrieval area where assembled prescriptions awaiting collection were stored tidily on hanging rails. Schedule 2 CD prescriptions were highlighted with a CD sticker attached to the assembled prescription bag, to act as a prompt for team members to check the date on the prescription when handing out. Prescriptions containing schedule 3 or 4 CDs that were awaiting collection were highlighted with the expiry date written on the prescription.

Prescriptions for warfarin, methotrexate and lithium were highlighted with a "see pharmacist" sticker attached to the assembled prescription bag. This was to enable the pharmacist to provide the appropriate counselling when handing out the prescription. The pharmacist gave an example that information obtained from people who were prescribed high risk medicines, such as the latest INR results for those prescribed warfarin, was added to the computer patient medication record (PMR). The pharmacy team were aware of the risks associated with the use of valproate during pregnancy. An audit of valproate had been carried out and two people who met the risk criteria had been identified. The pharmacy did not have patient information resources to supply with valproate, which meant they may not be able to supply all of the necessary information if valproate was dispensed. Clinical interventions made by a pharmacist were routinely documented on the pharmacy computer with notes indicating what the intervention was and what the outcome was for the patient. For example, a patient had been prescribed etodolac and naproxen on a prescription. The pharmacist had contacted the GP who had then removed the etodolac from the patient's prescription.

The work flow in the pharmacy was organised into separate areas with dispensing bench space and designated checking areas for the pharmacist and ACPT. Dispensed by and checked by boxes were initialled on the medication labels to provide an audit trail. Baskets were used to separate prescriptions, to reduce the risk of medicines becoming mixed up during dispensing.

The pharmacy had some people's repeat prescriptions being dispensed offsite at a hub, referred to by the pharmacy team as offsite dispensing solutions (ODS). An ACPT provided a detailed explanation and demonstration of how this service worked in practice. Once the prescription was received from the GP it was clinically checked by a pharmacist and accuracy checked by the ACPT. The accuracy check involved checking that the prescription data had been correctly inputted before it was sent to the hub. An audit trail for these tasks was kept on the computer. Each stage of the process was clearly defined, and the pharmacy team were able to track this. If a prescription request was sent to the hub from the pharmacy on a Tuesday it was assembled and received back in the pharmacy on a Thursday. The pharmacy team informed people of the timescales and turnaround times for their repeat prescriptions

to be dispensed offsite and if necessary, prescriptions were dispensed locally by the branch. Once the assembled prescription was received back from the hub, it was matched up with the respective prescription form and placed in the retrieval area. Fridge medicines and CDs were dispensed locally by the pharmacy and not the hub. The pharmacy supplied medicines in multi-compartment compliance aids for some people. The assembled compliance aids awaiting collection had individual medicine descriptions added, but no patient information leaflets included. So, people may not always have the most up to date information about their treatment.

Stock medications were sourced from licensed wholesalers and specials from a licensed manufacturer. Stock was stored tidily. CDs were stored appropriately. Patient returned CDs were destroyed using denaturing kits. The pharmacy team were aware of the Falsified Medicines Directive (FMD). 2D barcode scanners had been installed at each computer terminal. The pharmacy had FMD computer software installed but the pharmacy team were not currently decommissioning all FMD compliant prescription medicines. Therefore, the pharmacy was not yet complying with legal requirements. There were two clean medicines fridges, equipped with thermometers. The minimum and maximum temperatures were being recorded daily. Fridge medicines were dispensed into clear bags and an assembled prescription for insulin was stored in the fridge in a clear bag. A member of the pharmacy team explained that the insulin box was shown to the patient upon collection to confirm it was what they were expecting.

The medication stock had been divided up into sections for date checking purposes, with different sections date checked periodically. Short dated medicines were highlighted. No out-of-date stock medicines were seen from a number that were sampled. The date of opening for liquid medicines with limited shelf life was added to the medicine bottles. Alerts and recalls were received via email from the NHS and MHRA. These were read, acted on by a member of the pharmacy team and a record was kept.

Principle 5 - Equipment and facilities ✓ Standards met

Summary findings

The pharmacy has the equipment it needs to provide services safely. It is used in a way that protects privacy. And the electrical equipment is regularly tested for safety purposes.

Inspector's evidence

The up-to-date BNF and BNFc were present. The pharmacy team used the internet to access websites for up to date information. For example, Medicines Complete. Any problems with equipment were reported to the head office. All electrical equipment appeared to be in working order. According to the PAT test stickers attached, the electrical equipment had been PAT tested in June 2019.

There was a selection of liquid measures with British Standard and Crown marks. The pharmacy had equipment for counting loose tablets and capsules, including tablet triangles. Computers were password protected and screens were positioned so that they weren't visible from the public areas. A cordless telephone was present and it was used to hold private conversations with people when needed.

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.