

Alliance Dental Care Limited

White House Dental Clinic

Inspection Report

33, Langney Road
Eastbourne
BN21 3QD

Tel: 01323 725224

Website: <http://www.whdental.com>.

Date of inspection visit: 31 May 2019

Date of publication: 28/06/2019

Overall summary

We carried out this unannounced inspection on 31 May 2019 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 CQC inspector who was supported by a specialist dental adviser.

To get to the heart of patients' experiences of care and treatment, we always ask the following five questions:

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

These questions form the framework for the areas we look at during the inspection.

Our findings were:

Are services safe?

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

Are services effective?

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

Are services caring?

We found that this practice was providing caring services in accordance with the relevant regulations.

Are services responsive?

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

Are services well-led?

We found that this practice was not providing well-led care in accordance with the relevant regulations.

Background

The White House Dental Clinic is in Eastbourne and provides NHS and private treatment to adults and children. The location is in the process of moving to a new building in the Eastbourne area. An application has been received and is being process by CQC.

There is no level access for people who use wheelchairs and those with pushchairs. Car parking spaces, including blue badge holders, are available near the practice in local shopping centre.

The dental team includes 5 dentists, 1 dental nurse, 4 trainee dental nurses, 1 dental hygienist, 2 registered managers and 2 receptionists. The practice has 5 treatment rooms.

The practice is owned by a company and as a condition of registration must have a person registered with the

Summary of findings

Care Quality Commission 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. Currently there are two registered managers at White House dental clinic. At the present time Ms Charlotte Robertson is registered manager in control of the location.

During the inspection we spoke with 2 dentists, 1 dental nurse, 1 dental hygienist, 1 receptionist and the practice manager. We looked at practice policies and procedures and other records about how the service is managed.

The practice is open: 09.00 to 17.00 Monday to Friday

Our key findings were:

- The practice is about to move to different location.
- The provider had some infection control procedures which reflected published guidance.
- Staff knew how to deal with emergencies. Appropriate medicines and life-saving equipment were available.
- The practice had some systems to help them manage risk to patients and staff.
- The provider had some suitable safeguarding processes and staff knew their responsibilities for safeguarding vulnerable adults and children.
- The provider had some staff recruitment procedures.
- 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 were providing preventive care and supporting patients to ensure better oral health.
- The appointment system took account of patients' needs.
- The provider had some effective leadership and culture of continuous improvement.

- Staff felt involved and supported and worked well 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 some suitable information governance arrangements.

We identified regulations the provider was not complying with. They must:

- Establish effective systems and processes to ensure good governance in accordance with the fundamental standards of care.

Full details of the regulation/s the provider was/is not meeting are at the end of this report.

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

- Review the practice's systems for environmental cleaning taking into account the guidelines issued by the Department of Health - Health Technical Memorandum 01-05: Decontamination in primary care dental practices. In particular the use and storage of mop heads.
- Review the suitability of the premises and ensure all areas are fit for the purpose for which they are being used. (In particular the ground floor surgery)
- Review the fire safety risk assessment and ensure that any actions required are complete and ongoing fire safety management is effective.
- Review the current staffing arrangements to ensure all dental care professionals are adequately supported by a trained member of the dental team when treating patients in a dental setting taking into account the guidance issued by the General Dental Council.

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?

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

The practice had systems and processes to provide safe care and treatment. They used learning from incidents and complaints to help them improve.

Staff received training in safeguarding people, but were confused about how to recognise the signs of abuse and how to report concerns.

Staff were qualified for their roles and the practice completed some recruitment checks.

The practice had suitable arrangements for dealing with medical and other emergencies.

Are services effective?

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

The dentists assessed patients' needs and provided care and treatment in line with recognised guidance. The dentists discussed treatment with patients so they could give informed consent and recorded this in their records.

The practice had clear arrangements when patients needed to be referred to other dental or health care professionals.

The provider supported staff to complete training relevant to their roles and but did not have systems to help them monitor this.

Are services caring?

We found that this practice was providing caring services in accordance with the relevant regulations.

We saw that staff protected patients' privacy and were aware of the importance of confidentiality. Patients said staff treated them with dignity and respect.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

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

The practice's appointment system took account of patients' needs. Patients could get an appointment quickly if in pain.

The practice took patients views seriously. They valued compliments from patients and responded to concerns and complaints quickly and constructively.

Are services well-led?

We found that this practice was not providing well-led care in accordance with the relevant regulations. We have told the provider to take action (see full details of this action in the Requirement Notices/ Enforcement Actions section at the end of this report).

The practice had some arrangements to ensure the smooth running of the service. These included systems for the practice team to discuss the quality and safety of the care and treatment provided. There was a clearly defined management structure and staff felt supported and appreciated.

The practice team kept complete patient dental care records which were, clearly written or typed and stored securely.

Summary of findings

The provider monitored some clinical and non-clinical areas of their work to help them improve and learn. This included asking for and listening to the views of patients and staff.

White House Dental Clinic

Detailed findings



Are services safe?

Our findings

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

The practice had clear systems to keep patients safe.

Staff interviewed were not knowledgeable about their responsibilities if they had concerns about the safety of children, young people and adults who were vulnerable due to their circumstances. The practice had safeguarding policies and procedures to provide staff with information about identifying, reporting and dealing with suspected abuse. However, this had an incorrect phone number. We saw evidence that staff received safeguarding training. However staff were confused about the signs and symptoms of abuse and neglect and how to report concerns. There were also unaware they needed to notify the CQC. The registered manager confirmed that all staff have had updated safeguarding training including modern day slavery and Female Genital Mutilation.

The practice had a system to highlight vulnerable patients on records e.g. children with child protection plans, adults where there were safeguarding concerns, people with a learning disability or a mental health condition, or who require other support such as with mobility or communication.

The practice had a whistleblowing policy. Staff felt confident they could raise concerns without fear of recrimination.

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

The practice had a recruitment policy and procedure to help them employ suitable staff and had checks in place for agency and locum staff. These reflected the relevant legislation. We looked at 5 staff recruitment records. These showed the practice was not following their recruitment procedure. There were staff who had a DBS applied for at the point of employment but it had not been received.

We noted that clinical staff were qualified and registered with the General Dental Council (GDC) and had professional indemnity cover.

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

Records showed that fire detection equipment, such as smoke detectors and emergency lighting, were regularly tested and firefighting equipment, such as fire extinguishers, were regularly serviced. There were areas of fire risk identified on inspection that were not identified on the risk assessment. The registered manager confirmed that a fire risk assessment and action needed would be taking place as soon as possible.

The practice had suitable arrangements to ensure the safety of the X-ray equipment and had the required information in their radiation protection file.

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

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

Risks to patients

There were some 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 practice had current employer's liability insurance.

We looked at the practice's arrangements for safe dental care and treatment. The staff followed 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 the vaccination to protect them against the Hepatitis B virus, and that the effectiveness of the vaccination was checked. If a member of staff had not received all vaccinations at the point of carry out clinical duties then a risk assessment was undertaken.



Are services safe?

Staff knew how to respond to a medical emergency and completed training in emergency resuscitation and basic life support (BLS) every year. BLS with airway management. Immediate Life Support training for sedation needed to be completed by all staff.

Emergency equipment and medicines were available as described in recognised guidance. Staff kept records of their checks of these to make sure these were available, within their expiry date, and in working order.

A dental nurse worked with the dentists when they treated patients in line with GDC Standards for the Dental Team. A risk assessment was in place for when the dental hygienist worked without chairside support.

The provider had suitable risk assessments to minimise the risk that can be caused from substances that are hazardous to health.

The practice had an infection prevention and control policy and procedures. We noted that some staff were not following 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. This was in relation to open pouches stored in surgery draws prior to being used. These draws were within the splash range. Staff completed infection prevention and control training and received updates as required.

The practice had systems in place to ensure that any work was disinfected prior to being sent to a dental laboratory and before treatment was completed. Post inspection the registered manager confirmed staff were spoken with and all infection procedure were now in place and being monitored.

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

We saw cleaning schedules for the premises. We noted that the cleaning mops were dirty and were stored with the heads down on the floor. The mop heads were changed at the time of inspection. We noted a number of areas in the five surgery's which required high dusting. The registered manager confirmed that a deep clean had been undertaken since the inspection.

The provider had policies and procedures in place to ensure clinical waste was segregated and stored appropriately in line with guidance. We noted that clinical waste bins were very full at the time of inspection.

The practice carried out infection prevention and control audits twice a year. The latest audit showed the practice was meeting the required standards. However, we noted a number of areas which had not been identified and required action. This included a surgery floor which required urgent action. The registered manager confirmed this has now been addressed.

Information to deliver safe care and treatment

Staff had the information they needed to deliver safe care and treatment to patients.

We discussed with the dentist how information to deliver safe care and treatment was handled and recorded. We looked at a sample of dental care records to confirm our findings and noted that individual records were written 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.

Patient referrals to other service providers contained specific information which allowed appropriate and timely referrals in line with practice protocols and current guidance.

Safe and appropriate use of medicines

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

There was a suitable stock control system of medicines which were held on site. This ensured that medicines did not pass their expiry date and enough medicines were available if required.

The practice stored and kept records of NHS prescriptions as described in current guidance.

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

Antimicrobial prescribing data collection was being undertaken but no audits carried out annually.

Track record on safety and lessons learned and improvements



Are services safe?

There were risk assessments in relation to safety issues. The practice monitored and reviewed incidents.

In the previous 12 months there had been no safety incidents. OR The incident (s) were investigated, documented and discussed with the rest of the dental practice team to prevent such occurrences happening again in the future.

There were adequate systems for reviewing and investigating when things went wrong. The practice learned and shared lessons identified themes and acted to improve safety in the practice.

There was a system for receiving and acting on safety alerts. The practice 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

Effective needs assessment, care and treatment

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

Dental implants

The practice offered dental implants. These were placed by the associate dentist who had undergone appropriate post-graduate training in this speciality. The provision of dental implants was in accordance with national guidance.

Helping patients to live healthier lives

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

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

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

The practice was aware of national oral health campaigns and local schemes in supporting patients to live healthier lives. For example, local stop smoking services. They directed patients to these schemes when necessary.

The dentist and dental hygienist described to us the procedures they used to improve the outcomes for patients with gum disease. This involved providing patients preventative advice, taking plaque and gum bleeding scores and recording detailed charts of the patient's gum condition

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

The practice carried out detailed oral health assessments which identified patient's individual risks. Patients were provided with detailed self-care treatment plans with dates for ongoing oral health reviews based upon their individual need and in line with recognised guidance.

Consent to care and treatment

The practice 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 dentists gave patients information about treatment options and the risks and benefits of these so they could make informed decisions. Patients confirmed their dentist listened to them and gave them clear information about their treatment.

The practice's consent policy included information about the Mental Capacity Act 2005. The team understood their responsibilities under the act when treating adults who may 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. However not all staff were aware of the need to consider this when treating young people under 16 years of age. The registered manager confirmed that staff have had training on this subject.

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.

We saw the practice had data collected patients' dental care records to check that the dentists/clinicians recorded the necessary information. However, there was no action plan noted to improve their practice.

The practice carried out conscious sedation for patients who were nervous. This included people who were very nervous of dental treatment and those who needed complex or lengthy treatment. The practice had some systems to help them do this safely. These were mostly in accordance with guidelines published by the Royal College of Surgeons and Royal College of Anaesthetists in 2015.



Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

The practice's systems included checks before and after treatment, emergency equipment requirements, medicines management, sedation equipment checks, and staff availability and training. They also included patient checks and information such as consent, monitoring during treatment, discharge and post-operative instructions.

The staff assessed patients appropriately for sedation. The dental care records showed that patients having sedation had important checks carried out first. These included a detailed medical history, blood pressure checks and an assessment of health using the American Society of Anaesthesiologists classification system in accordance with current guidelines.

The records showed that staff recorded important checks at regular intervals. These included pulse, blood pressure, breathing rates and the oxygen saturation of the blood

We were unable to evidence that the operator-sedationist was supported by a trained second individual or that the name of this individual was recorded in the patients' dental care record. The registered manager confirmed that these records have now been obtained.

Effective staffing

Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to carry out their roles.

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

Staff discussed their training needs at annual appraisals. We saw evidence of completed appraisals and how the practice addressed the training requirements of staff.

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 if they needed treatment the practice did not provide.

The practice had systems to identify, manage, follow up and where required refer patients for specialist care when presenting with dental infections.

The practice also had systems for referring patients with suspected oral cancer under the national two week wait arrangements. This was initiated by NICE in 2005 to help make sure patients were seen quickly by a specialist.

The practice monitored all referrals to make sure they were dealt with promptly.



Are services caring?

Our findings

Kindness, respect and compassion

Staff treated patients with kindness, respect and compassion.

Staff were aware of their responsibility to respect people's diversity and human rights.

We saw that staff treated patients respectfully, appropriately and kindly and were friendly towards patients at the reception desk and over the telephone.

Information folders, patient survey results and thank you cards were available for patients to read.

Privacy and dignity

The practice respected and promoted patients' privacy and dignity.

Staff were aware of the importance of privacy and confidentiality. The layout of reception and waiting areas provided privacy when reception staff were dealing with patients. If a patient asked for more privacy, staff would take them into another room. The reception computer screens were not visible to patients and staff did not leave patients' personal information where other patients might see it.

Staff password protected patients' electronic care records and backed these up to secure storage. They stored paper records securely.

Involving people in decisions about care and treatment

Staff helped patients to be involved in decisions about their care and were aware of the

Accessible Information Standards (NHS Only) the Accessible Information Standard (a requirement to make sure that patients and their carers can access and understand the information they are given):

- Interpretation services were available for patients who did not use English as a first language. We saw notices in the reception areas, written in languages other than English, informing patient's translation service were available. Patients were also told about multi-lingual staff that might be able to support them.
- Staff communicated with patients in a way that they could understand and communication aids and easy read materials were available.
- Staff helped patients and their carers find further information and access community and advocacy services. They helped them ask questions about their care and treatment.

The practice gave patients clear information to help them make informed choices about their treatment. Patients confirmed that staff listened to them, did not rush them and discussed options for treatment with them. A dentist described the conversations they had with patients to satisfy themselves they understood their treatment options.

The practice's website and information leaflet provided patients with information about the range of treatments available at the practice.

The dentists described to us the methods they used to help patients understand treatment options discussed. These included for example models, X-ray images.



Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice organised and delivered services to meet patients' needs. It took account of patient needs and preferences.

Staff were clear on the importance of emotional support needed by patients when delivering care.

A disability access audit had been completed.

Timely access to services

Patients could access care and treatment from the practice within an acceptable timescale for their needs.

The practice displayed its opening hours in the premises, and included it in their information leaflet and on their website.

The practice had an appointment system to respond to patients' needs. Patients who requested an urgent appointment were seen the same day. Patients had enough time during their appointment and did not feel rushed. Appointments ran smoothly on the day of the inspection and patients were not kept waiting.

The staff took part in an emergency on-call arrangement internally and with 111 out of hour's service.

The practice's website, information leaflet and answerphone provided telephone numbers for patients

needing emergency dental treatment during the working day and when the practice was not open. Patients confirmed they could make routine and emergency appointments easily and were rarely kept waiting for their appointment.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

The practice took complaints and concerns seriously and responded to them appropriately to improve the quality of care.

The practice had a policy providing guidance to staff on how to handle a complaint. The practice information leaflet explained how to make a complaint.

The practice manager was responsible for dealing with these. Staff would tell the practice manager about any formal or informal comments or concerns straight away so patients received a quick response.

The practice manager aimed to settle complaints in-house and invited patients to speak with them in person to discuss these. Information was available about organisations patients could contact if not satisfied with the way the practice dealt with their concerns.

We looked at comments, compliments and complaints the practice received over the last 12 months.

These showed the practice responded to concerns appropriately and discussed outcomes with staff to share learning and improve the service.

Are services well-led?

Our findings

Leadership capacity and capability

We found leaders had some capacity and skills to deliver high-quality, sustainable care. Leaders demonstrated they had the experience, capacity and skills to deliver the practice strategy and address risks to it.

They were knowledgeable about issues and priorities relating to the quality and future of services. They understood the challenges and were addressing them.

Leaders at all levels were visible and approachable. They worked closely with staff and others to make sure they prioritised compassionate and inclusive leadership.

The practice had some effective processes to develop leadership capacity and skills, including planning for the future leadership of the practice.

Vision and strategy If applicable

There was a clear vision and set of values.

The strategy was in line with health and social priorities across the region. The practice planned its services to meet the needs of the practice population.

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.

The practice focused on the needs of patients.

We saw the provider took effective action to deal with poor performance.

Openness, honesty and transparency were demonstrated when responding to incidents and complaints. The provider was aware of and had systems to ensure compliance with the requirements of the Duty of Candour.

Staff could raise concerns and were encouraged to do so. They had confidence that these would be addressed.

Governance and management

There were noted responsibilities, roles and systems of accountability to support good governance and management in place.

The registered manager had overall responsibility for the management and clinical leadership of the practice. Staff knew the management arrangements and their roles and responsibilities.

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.

There were some processes for managing risks, issues and performance.

Appropriate and accurate information

The practice acted on appropriate and accurate information.

Quality and operational information was used to ensure and improve performance. Performance information was combined with the views of patients.

The practice 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 practice involved patients, the public, staff and external partners to support high-quality sustainable services.

The practice used patient surveys and comment cards to obtain staff and patients' views about the service. We saw examples of suggestions from patients/staff the practice had acted on.

Patients were encouraged to complete the NHS Friends and Family Test (FFT). This is a national programme to allow patients to provide feedback on NHS services they have used. These were all positive.

The practice 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

There were systems and processes for learning, continuous improvement and innovation.

The practice had some quality assurance processes to encourage learning and continuous improvement. These

Are services well-led?

included data collection of dental care records, audits of radiographs and infection prevention and control. However, they did not have clear records of the results of these audits and the resulting action plans and improvements we would expect to see.

The registered manager showed a commitment to learning and improvement and valued the contributions made to the team by individual members of staff.

The dental nurses had annual appraisals, however we did not see all the dentist's files. They discussed learning needs, general wellbeing and aims for future professional development. We saw some evidence of completed appraisals in the staff folders.

Staff completed 'highly recommended' training as per General Dental Council professional standards. This included undertaking medical emergencies and basic life support training annually. The provider supported and encouraged staff to complete CPD, however not all evidence could be found.

Requirement notices

Action we have told the provider to take

The table below shows the legal requirements that were not being met. The provider must send CQC a report that says what action they are going to take to meet these requirements.

Regulated activity	Regulation
Diagnostic and screening procedures Surgical procedures Treatment of disease, disorder or injury	<p>Regulation 17 HSCA (RA) Regulations 2014 Good governance</p> <p>Establish effective systems and processes to ensure good governance in accordance with the fundamental standards of care. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Risk assessments had not been, comprehensively undertaken. This included infection control and fire.• We spoke with staff and were not convinced of their knowledge about mental capacity act, safeguarding, duty of candour, the Gillick principals, and sepsis.• Not all staff records were available regarding the recruitment procedures to show they were established and operated effectively, to ensure only fit and proper persons are employed.• Not all the practice's infection control procedures and protocols were being adhered to (taking into account the guidelines issued by the Department of Health in the Health Technical Memorandum 01-05: Decontamination in primary care dental practices and having regard to The Health and Social Care Act 2008: 'Code of Practice about the prevention and control of infections and related guidance) this was in particular the pouching and storing of instruments.