

Mr Shitel Patel

# Fishermead Dental Surgery

## Inspection Report

88 Penryn Avenue  
Fishermead  
Milton Keynes  
Buckinghamshire  
MK6 2BG  
Tel:01908 606404  
Website:N/A

Date of inspection visit: 22 August 2017  
Date of publication: 17/10/2017

### Overall summary

We carried out a focused inspection of Fishermead Dental Surgery on 22 August 2017.

The inspection was led by a CQC inspector who was supported by a specialist dental adviser.

We carried out the inspection to follow up concerns we originally identified during a comprehensive inspection at this practice on 11 October 2016 under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as part of our regulatory functions.

At a comprehensive inspection we always ask the following five questions to get to the heart of patients' experiences of care and treatment:

- Is it safe?
- Is it effective?
- Is it caring?
- Is it responsive to people's needs?
- Is it well-led?

When one or more of the five questions is not met we require the service to make improvements and send us an action plan. We then inspect again after a reasonable interval, focusing on the areas where improvement was required.

At the previous comprehensive inspection we found the registered provider was providing safe, effective, caring and responsive care in accordance with relevant regulations. We judged the practice was not providing well-led care in accordance with regulation 17 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014. You can read our report of that inspection by selecting the 'all reports' link for Fishermead Dental Surgery on our website [www.cqc.org.uk](http://www.cqc.org.uk).

We also reviewed the key question of safe as we had made recommendations for the provider relating to this key question. We noted that improvements had been made.

#### **Our findings were:**

##### **Are services well-led?**

We found this practice was providing well-led care in accordance with the relevant regulations.

The provider had made improvements to put right the shortfalls and deal with the regulatory breach we found at our inspection on 11 October 2016.

# Summary of findings

## The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

### **Are services safe?**

The provider had taken steps to improve the safety of the service. Significant incidents were reported, investigated and discussed at staff meetings.

Rubber dams were available and used by dentists to protect patients undergoing root canal treatment.

Decontamination of dental equipment was carried out in line with national guidance.

### **Are services well-led?**

The provider had made improvements to the management of the service. Risks to the health, safety and welfare of patients had been addressed. Infection control audit was used as an effective tool to highlight where improvements could be made. The practice had addressed areas in the treatment rooms which were difficult to clean. The practice had addressed the availability of emergency medicines and equipment which were found to be in line with national guidance.

Practice policies were updated and the staff were acting mostly in accordance with the policies.

**No action**



# Are services safe?

## Our findings

At our previous inspection on 11 October 2016 we judged the practice was providing safe care in accordance with the relevant regulations. We had made recommendations to the provider relating to this key question. At the inspection on 22 August 2017 we noted the practice had made further improvements:

- Prescription pads were secured and logged in line with guidance issued by NHS Protect.
- Rubber dams were in use to protect patients undergoing root canal treatment.
- Most surfaces in the treatment areas were free from damage and cleanable.
- The practice had a Legionella risk assessment completed in October 2016. This stated that water temperatures should be checked monthly. We found

that the practice were completing these checks quarterly. We raised this with the practice principal who made arrangements to amend the frequency of the check immediately following the inspection.

- We observed the decontamination process to clean and sterilise dental instruments and found that it mostly followed national guidance. Where we noted that instruments were rinsed under running water which might create an aerosol of contaminated material the practice took immediate steps to address this.
- Significant events were recorded and investigated in line with the practice policy and were discussed at staff meetings to prevent reoccurrence.

These improvements showed the provider had taken action to address the shortfalls we found when we inspected on 11 October 2016.

# Are services well-led?

## Our findings

At our inspection on 11 October 2016 we judged it was not providing well led care and told the provider to take action as described in our requirement notice. At the inspection on 22 August 2017 we noted the practice had made the following improvements to meet the requirement notice:

- Infection control audits were used effectively as a tool to highlight areas where improvements could be made. We were shown an audit completed in April 2017 this had identified shortfalls, which had been addressed.
- Improvements had been made to ensure clinical areas were cleanable. Window blinds had been replaced and the practice had a plan in place to remove them from the treatment room. Clinical flooring had been replaced and a plan was in place to repair a small tear in the dental chair.

- Medicines and equipment for use in a medical emergency were in line with recommended guidance and a system was in place to ensure they remained in date and available for use.
- Practice policies had been updated and we observed that staff were mostly working in accordance with their policies.

The practice had also made further improvements:

- Radiograph audits were completed for individual dentists.
- The practice had implemented a referral log.
- The practice whistleblowing policy had been revised to include the contact details for an external organisation that concerns could be raised to.

These improvements showed the provider had taken action to address the shortfalls we found when we inspected on 11 October 2016