

Denta Clinic Ltd

58 Oaklands Park Avenue

Inspection report

58 Oaklands Park Avenue Ilford IG1 1TG Tel: 02085535283 www.mndclinic.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 17 June 2021 Date of publication: 01/07/2021

Overall summary

We carried out this announced inspection on 17 June 2021 under section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as part of our regulatory functions. We planned the inspection to check whether the registered provider was meeting the legal requirements in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 and associated regulations. The inspection was led by a Care Quality Commission, (CQC), inspector who was supported by a specialist dental adviser.

To get to the heart of patients' experiences of care and treatment, we usually ask five key questions, however due to the ongoing pandemic and to reduce time spent on site, only the following three questions were asked:

- Is it safe?
- Is it effective?
- Is it well-led?

These are three of the five questions that form the framework for the areas we look at during the inspection.

Our findings were:

Are services safe?

We found this practice was providing safe care in accordance with the relevant regulations.

Are services effective?

We found this practice was providing effective care in accordance with the relevant regulations.

Are services well-led?

Summary of findings

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

Background

58 Oaklands Park Avenue is in The London Borough of Redbridge and provides private dental treatment to adults and children. The provider- Denta Clinic Ltd is registered as an organisation with the Care Quality Commission (CQC) to provide the regulated activities of treatment of disease, disorder or injury, surgical procedures and diagnostic and screening procedures from one location i.e. 58 Oaklands Park avenue, Ilford, IG1 1TG.

The practice is situated across two floors. The first floor consists of two surgeries, a separate decontamination room, an office, staff room, patient toilet and an open-plan reception area/waiting room. The ground floor houses the compressor unit, a separate storage area for clinical waste, Orthopantomogram (OPG) X-ray area, staff toilet and a personal protective equipment (PPE) donning and doffing area for staff.

The practice is accessible by Transport for London rail and bus services and is within easy access to local amenities including banks, supermarkets and a post office. The practice is not suitable for people who use wheelchairs and those with pushchairs as there is no lift on the premise to access treatment rooms on the first floor. Paid parking spaces, including dedicated parking for people with disabilities, are available near the practice.

The dental team is made up six dentists, an oral surgeon, dentist, three dental nurses-two of whom are trainees and one receptionist. They are supported by a self-employed compliance lead and the two practice owners.

The practice is owned by an organisation and as a condition of registration must have a person registered with the CQC as the registered manager. Registered managers have legal responsibility for meeting the requirements in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 and associated regulations about how the practice is run. The registered manager at 58 Oaklands Park Avenue is one of the owners who is also a registered dental nurse.

The practice is open between 9.00am and 6.00pm Monday to Friday and Saturday 10am to 6.00pm. During out of hours, patients are advised to contact a dedicated phone number for advice and or treatment.

During the inspection we spoke with one dentist, one dental nurse, one receptionist, the compliance lead and one of the practice owners. We looked at practice policies and procedures and other records about how the service is managed.

Our key findings were:

- The practice appeared to be visibly clean and well-maintained.
- The provider had infection control procedures which had incorporated the most recent Covid-19 standard operating procedures (SOP).
- Staff knew how to deal with emergencies. Appropriate medicines and life-saving equipment were available.
- The provider had systems to help them manage risk to patients and staff.
- The provider had safeguarding processes and staff knew their responsibilities for safeguarding vulnerable adults and children.
- The provider had staff recruitment procedures which reflected current legislation.
- The clinical staff provided patients' care and treatment in line with current guidelines.
- Staff treated patients with dignity and respect and took care to protect their privacy and personal information.
- Staff provided preventive care and supported patients to ensure better oral health.

Summary of findings

- The appointment system took account of patients' needs.
- The provider had effective leadership and a culture of continuous improvement.
- Staff felt involved and supported and worked as a team.
- The provider asked staff and patients for feedback about the services they provided.
- The provider dealt with complaints positively and efficiently.
- The provider had information governance arrangements.

There were areas where the provider could make improvements. They should:

- Improve the whistleblowing policy to include contact details of external organisations staff can raise concerns with if they are not confident doing so internally.
- Take action to ensure staff nominated to undertake the role of fire warden/marshal duties are trained to do so.

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We asked the following question(s).

Are services safe?	No action	\checkmark
Are services effective?	No action	✓
Are services well-led?	No action	✓

Are services safe?

Our findings

We found this practice was providing safe care in accordance with the relevant regulations.

Safety systems and processes, including staff recruitment, equipment and premises and radiography (X-rays)

Staff had clear systems to keep patients safe.

Staff knew their responsibilities if they had concerns about the safety of children, young people and adults who were vulnerable due to their circumstances. The provider had safeguarding policies and procedures to provide staff with information about identifying, reporting and dealing with suspected abuse. We saw evidence that staff had received safeguarding training. Staff knew about the signs and symptoms of abuse and neglect and how to report concerns, including notification to the CQC.

The provider had a system to highlight vulnerable patients and patients who required other support such as with mobility or communication, within dental care records.

The provider had an infection prevention and control policy and procedures. They followed guidance in The Health Technical Memorandum 01-05: Decontamination in primary care dental practices, (HTM 01-05), published by the Department of Health and Social Care. Staff completed infection prevention and control training and received updates as required.

The provider had arrangements for transporting, cleaning, checking, sterilising and storing instruments in line with HTM 01-05. The records showed equipment used by staff for cleaning and sterilising instruments was validated, maintained and used in line with the manufacturers' guidance. The provider had suitable numbers of dental instruments available for the clinical staff and measures were in place to ensure they were decontaminated and sterilised appropriately.

The staff had systems in place to ensure that patient-specific dental appliances were disinfected prior to being sent to a dental laboratory and before treatment was completed.

We saw staff had procedures to reduce the possibility of Legionella or other bacteria developing in the water systems, in line with a risk assessment. All recommendations in the assessment had been actioned and records of water testing and dental unit water line management were maintained.

We saw effective cleaning schedules to ensure the practice was kept clean. When we inspected we saw the practice was visibly clean.

The provider had policies and procedures in place to ensure clinical waste was segregated and stored appropriately in line with guidance.

One of the owners was the infection control lead and carried out infection prevention and control audits twice a year with the support of the dental nurses. The latest audit showed the practice was meeting the required standards.

The provider had an "underperformance and whistleblowing policy"; however it did not include details of organisations staff could whistle blow to if they had concerns about reporting internally. Staff we spoke with on the day felt confident they could raise concerns without fear of recrimination.

The dentists used dental dam in line with guidance from the British Endodontic Society when providing root canal treatment. In instances where dental dam was not used, such as for example refusal by the patient, and where other methods were used to protect the airway, we saw this was documented in the dental care record and a risk assessment completed.

Are services safe?

The provider had a recruitment policy dated 1 March 2021 which we checked and found they followed procedure to help them employ suitable staff. These reflected the relevant legislation. We looked at eight staff recruitment records. These showed the provider followed their recruitment procedure.

We observed that clinical staff were qualified and registered with the General Dental Council and had professional indemnity cover.

Staff ensured facilities and equipment were safe, and that equipment was maintained according to manufacturers' instructions, including electrical appliances.

A fire risk assessment was carried out in line with the legal requirements. We saw there were fire extinguishers and fire detection systems throughout the building and fire exits were kept clear. We noted the practice did not have fire alarms installed (one of the risk assessment's recommendations); the practice owner told us they had installed additional smoke detectors as the fire alarms were not financially viable. Staff had received training in fire safety, however those who were nominated fire marshals/wardens had not completed specific training to undertake this role.

The practice had arrangements to ensure the safety of the digital X-ray equipment and we saw the required radiation protection information was available.

We saw evidence the dentists justified, graded and reported on the radiographs they took. The provider carried out radiography audits every year following current guidance and legislation.

Clinical staff completed continuing professional development in respect of dental radiography.

We observed that the practice used a hand-held X-ray machine which was last serviced on 17 March 2021. We saw that this machine was stored in a locked cupboard when not in use and the battery was removed. Staff had received training in the use of it and appropriate safeguards were in place for patients and staff.

Risks to patients

The provider had implemented systems to assess, monitor and manage risks to patient safety.

The practice's health and safety policies, procedures and risk assessments were reviewed regularly to help manage potential risk. The provider had current employer's liability insurance which expires on 29 July 2021; they had systems to ensure this was renewed in a timely manner.

We looked at the practice's arrangements for safe dental care and treatment. The staff followed the relevant safety regulation when using needles and other sharp dental items. A sharps risk assessment had been undertaken and was updated annually.

The provider had a system in place to ensure clinical staff had received appropriate vaccinations, including vaccination to protect them against the Hepatitis B virus, and that the effectiveness of the vaccination was checked.

Sepsis prompts were available to staff; however, posters were not displayed throughout the practice. This helped ensure staff made triage appointments effectively to manage patients who present with dental infection and where necessary refer patients for specialist care

Staff knew how to respond to a medical emergency and had completed training in emergency resuscitation and basic life support every year. Emergency equipment and medicines were available as described in recognised guidance. We found staff kept records of their checks of these to make sure they were available, within their expiry date, and in working order.

The provider had risk assessments alongside the products data sheets to minimise the risk that can be caused from substances that are hazardous to health.

Information to deliver safe care and treatment

Are services safe?

Staff had the information they needed to deliver safe care and treatment to patients. The provider ensured all clinicians had a NHS.net email address which was used to send/receive secure mails.

We discussed with the dentist how information to deliver safe care and treatment was handled and recorded. We looked at dental care records with clinicians to confirm our findings and observed that individual records were typed and managed in a way that kept patients safe. Dental care records we saw were complete, legible, were kept securely and complied with General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) requirements. Archived paper records were stored in a fire-proof locked cabinet in a room on the ground floor.

The provider had systems for referring patients with suspected oral cancer under the national two-week wait arrangements. These arrangements were initiated by National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) to help make sure patients were seen quickly by a specialist.

Safe and appropriate use of medicines

The provider had systems for appropriate and safe handling of medicines.

There was a stock control system of the antimicrobials and analgesics which were held on site. This ensured that medicines were not mis-used, did not pass their expiry date and enough medicines were available if required.

The dentists were aware of current guidance with regards to prescribing medicines.

Antimicrobial prescribing audits were carried out annually. We reviewed the most recent audit undertaken on 27 March 2021 which indicated that the dentists were following current guidelines.

Track record on safety, and lessons learned and improvements

The provider had implemented systems for reviewing and investigating when things went wrong. There were comprehensive risk assessments in relation to safety issues. Staff monitored and reviewed incidents. This helped staff to understand risks which led to effective risk management systems in the practice as well as safety improvements.

In the previous 12 months there had been no safety incidents. Staff told us that any safety incidents would be investigated, documented and discussed with the rest of the dental practice team to prevent such occurrences happening again.

The provider had a system for receiving and acting on safety alerts. Staff learned from external safety events as well as patient and medicine safety alerts. We saw they were shared with the team and acted upon if required.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

We found this practice was providing effective care in accordance with the relevant regulations.

Effective needs assessment, care and treatment

The practice had systems to keep dental professionals up to date with current evidence-based practice. We saw clinicians assessed patients' needs and delivered care and treatment in line with current legislation, standards and guidance supported by clear clinical pathways and protocols.

The practice offered dental implants. These were placed by two visiting clinicians who had undergone appropriate post-graduate training in the provision of dental implants. We saw the provision of dental implants was in accordance with national guidance.

Helping patients to live healthier lives

The practice provided preventive care and supported patients to ensure better oral health in line with the Delivering Better Oral Health toolkit.

The dentists prescribed high concentration fluoride products if a patient's risk of tooth decay indicated this would help

The dentists, where applicable, discussed smoking, alcohol consumption and diet with patients during appointments. The practice had a selection of dental products for sale and provided leaflets to help patients with their oral health.

Records showed patients with severe gum disease were recalled at more frequent intervals for review and to reinforce home care preventative advice.

Consent to care and treatment

Staff obtained consent to care and treatment in line with legislation and guidance. The practice team understood the importance of obtaining and recording patients' consent to treatment. The staff were aware of the need to obtain proof of legal guardianship or Power of Attorney for patients who lacked capacity or for children who are looked after. The dentists gave patients information about treatment options and the risks and benefits of these, so they could make informed decisions. We saw this documented in patients' records.

The practice's consent policy included information about the Mental Capacity Act 2005. All staff had received training in mental capacity and demonstrated they understood their responsibilities under the act when treating adults who might not be able to make informed decisions. The policy also referred to Gillick competence, by which a child under the age of 16 years of age may give consent for themselves in certain circumstances. Staff were aware of the need to consider this when treating young people under 16 years of age.

Staff described how they involved patients' relatives or carers when appropriate and made sure they had enough time to explain treatment options clearly.

Monitoring care and treatment

The practice kept detailed dental care records containing information about the patients' current dental needs, past treatment and medical histories. The dentists assessed patients' treatment needs in line with recognised guidance.

The provider had quality assurance processes to encourage learning and continuous improvement. Staff kept records of the results of these audits, the resulting action plans and improvements.

Effective staffing

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to carry out their roles; in particular, the dental nurse we spoke with demonstrated strong understanding of the HTM 01-15 guidance.

Staff new to the practice had a structured induction programme. We confirmed clinical staff completed the continuing professional development required for their registration with the General Dental Council.

Co-ordinating care and treatment

Staff worked together and with other health and social care professionals to deliver effective care and treatment.

The dentists confirmed they referred patients to a range of specialists in primary and secondary care for treatment the practice did not provide.

Are services well-led?

Our findings

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

On the day of the inspection, the owner demonstrated a transparent and open culture in relation to people's safety. There was strong leadership and emphasis on continually striving to improve. Systems and processes were embedded, and staff worked together in such a way that the inspection did not highlight any major issues or omissions. The information and evidence presented during the inspection process was clear and well documented. They could show how they sustain high-quality sustainable services and demonstrate improvements over time.

Leadership capacity and capability

We found the owners, compliance lead and clinical staff had the capacity, values and skills to deliver high-quality, sustainable care.

They were knowledgeable about issues and priorities relating to the quality and future of the service. They understood the challenges and were addressing them, for example, the provider described the challenges they faced upon their return to work following the first lockdown due to the ongoing pandemic and how they had to implement additional protocols and standards to assure staff.

Management were visible and seemed personable and approachable. Staff told us they worked closely with them to make sure they prioritised compassionate and inclusive leadership.

We saw the provider had effective processes to develop leadership capacity and skills, including planning for the future leadership of the practice.

Culture

The practice had a culture of high-quality sustainable care.

Staff stated they felt respected, supported and valued. They were proud to work in the practice.

Staff discussed their training needs at an annual appraisal. They also discussed learning needs, general wellbeing and aims for future professional development. We saw evidence of completed appraisals in the staff folders.

We saw the provider had systems in place to deal with staff poor performance.

Openness, honesty and transparency were demonstrated when responding to incidents and complaints. For example, we saw that the provider logged and investigated feedback and concerns left on public forums about the practice; minutes we checked showed these were discussed at practice meetings. The provider was aware of and had systems to ensure compliance with the requirements of the Duty of Candour.

Staff told us they could raise concerns and they had confidence that these would be addressed.

Governance and management

Staff had clear responsibilities, roles and systems of accountability to support good governance and management.

The owners and the compliance lead had overall responsibility for the management and clinical leadership of the practice. One of the owners was responsible for the day to day running of the service. Staff knew the management arrangements and their roles and responsibilities.

Staff talked to us about their routine "morning huddles" which were used to inform and update staff about the day ahead and raise or address any concerns.

Are services well-led?

The provider had a system of clinical governance in place which included policies, protocols and procedures that were accessible to all members of staff and were reviewed on a regular basis.

We saw there were clear and effective processes for managing risks, issues and performance.

Appropriate and accurate information

Staff acted on appropriate and accurate information.

The provider had information governance arrangements and staff were aware of the importance of these in protecting patients' personal information.

Engagement with patients, the public, staff and external partners

The provider gathered feedback from staff through meetings, surveys, and informal discussions. Staff were encouraged to offer suggestions for improvements to the service and said these were listened to and acted on.

Continuous improvement and innovation

The practice had a mission statement which was to be the "best practice" who prioritised safe, high quality and compassionate care.

The provider had systems and processes for learning, continuous improvement and innovation.

The provider had quality assurance processes to encourage learning and continuous improvement. These included audits of dental care records, radiographs and infection prevention and control. Staff kept records of the results of these audits and the resulting action plans and improvements.

The owners showed a commitment to learning and improvement and valued the contributions made to the team by individual members of staff. For instance, the trainee dental nurses had been given the opportunity to complete non-mandatory training. There were also plans to purchase a new clinical communication software to enable practice staff to discuss and share information in a secure environment.

Staff completed 'highly recommended' training as per General Dental Council professional standards. We saw evidence the provider supported and encouraged staff to complete continuing professional development.