

Further information...

For further information about the Duty of Candour or to read the 'Just Culture' guide, visit the intranet theme of the month section under Risk & Patient Safety.

A just culture guide

Supporting consistent, constructive and fair evaluation of the actions of staff involved in patient safety incidents

This guide explains a common sense approach when staff involved in a patient safety incident require specific medical report or intervention to protect patient safety. Action singling out an individual is rarely appropriate. A just culture must have clear causes and mitigate wider action.

An important part of a just culture is being able to explain the investigation will be taken if an incident occurs. A just culture guide can be used by all parties to explain how they will respond to an incident, including the just culture principles, the accident reporting policies, and as a communication tool to help staff, patients and families understand the appropriate response to an incident. The principles of a just culture should differ according to the circumstances in which an error was made. As well as protection from unfair targeting, it is important to prevent people from having the tendency to treat wider patient safety issues as individual blame.

Start here - Q1. deliberate harm test

1a. Was there any intention to cause harm?

1b. If Yes Recommendation: Follow organisational guidance for appropriate management action. This could include contacting relevant regulatory bodies, suspending or terminating the individual, and addressing wider organisational issues. Wider investigation will be needed to understand how and why patients were not protected from the actions of the individual.

1c. If No Go to next question - Q2. health test

2a. Are there indications of substance abuse?

2b. Are there indications of physical ill health?

2c. Are there indications of mental ill health?

2d. If No to all go to next question - Q3. foresight test

3a. Are there agreed protocols/accepted practice in place that apply to the action/omission in question?

3b. Was the protocol/accepted practice workable and in routine use?

3c. Did the individual knowingly depart from these protocols?

3d. If Yes to all go to next question - Q4. substitution test

4a. Are there indications that other individuals from the same peer group have comparable experience and qualifications, working below in the same or similar circumstances?

4b. Was the individual trained in what relevant training was provided to their peer group?

4c. Did more senior members of the team fail to provide supervision that normally would?

4d. If No to all go to next question - Q5. mitigating circumstances

5a. Were there any significant mitigating circumstances?

5b. If Yes Recommendation: Action directed at the individual may not be appropriate. Following organisational guidance, which is likely to include wider HR advice in a minor degree of mitigation applies. The patient safety incident investigation should include the wider actions needed to improve safety for future patients.

Based on the work of Professor James Reason and the National Patient Safety Agency's Incident Decision Tree

Improvement.nhs.uk

Supported by:

Academy of Medical Royal Colleges and Faculties, **avma**, Care Quality Commission, General Medical Council, National Clinical Audit and Feedback for 5 years up, Nursing & Midwifery Council, **NHS England**, **Nursing and Midwifery**, Royal College of Nursing

collaboration trust respect innovation courage compassion

