

Tamworth Dental Practice Partnership

Tamworth Dental Practice Partnership

Inspection Report

25 Albert Road
Tamworth
Staffordshire
B79 7JS
Tel: 01827 62152
Website: www.tamworthdentalpractice.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 15 February 2016
Date of publication: 18/03/2016

Overall summary

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection on 15 February 2016 to ask the practice the following key questions; Are services safe, effective, caring, responsive and well-led?

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 providing well-led care in accordance with the relevant regulations

Background

Tamworth Dental Practice Partnership is a mixed dental practice providing NHS and private treatment for both adults and children. The practice is situated in a converted residential property. The practice had five dental treatment rooms and a separate decontamination room for cleaning, sterilising and packing dental instruments. Dental care was provided on two floors and had a reception and waiting area on the ground floor.

The practice was open 8.00am – 8.00pm Monday to Friday and Saturday 8.00am to 3.00pm. The practice has five dentists who are supported by six dental nurses, two receptionists and a practice manager and two area managers.

The practice manager is the registered manager. A registered manager is a person who is registered with the Care Quality Commission to manage the service. Like registered providers, they are 'registered persons'. Registered persons 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 was supported in their role by two area managers.

Summary of findings

Before the inspection we sent Care Quality Commission comment cards to the practice for patients to complete to tell us about their experience of the practice. We received feedback from 14 patients. These provided a positive view of the services the practice provides. Patients commented on the high quality of care provided by the dentists, the friendly nature of all staff and the cleanliness of the practice.

Our key findings were:

- Staff had been trained to handle emergencies, appropriate medicines and life-saving equipment was readily available in accordance with current guidelines.
- The practice appeared clean and well maintained.
- Infection control procedures were robust and the practice followed published guidance.
- The practice had a safeguarding lead with effective processes in place for safeguarding adults and children living in vulnerable circumstances.
- Staff reported incidents and kept records of these which the practice used for shared learning.
- Dentists provided dental care in accordance with current professional and National Institute for Care Excellence (NICE) guidelines
- The service was aware of the needs of the local population and took these into account in how the practice was run.
- Patients could access treatment as well as urgent and emergency care when required.
- Staff recruitment files contained essential information in relation to Regulation 18, Schedule 3 of Health & Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2015.
- Staff had received training appropriate to their roles and were supported in their continued professional development (CPD) by the practice manager.
- Staff we spoke to felt supported by the practice manager and were committed to providing a quality service to their patients.
- Information from 14 completed Care Quality Commission (CQC) comment cards gave us a positive picture of a friendly and professional service.
- The practice manager provided effective leadership for staff working at the practice
- The practice reviewed and dealt with complaints according to their practice policy

There were areas where the provider could make improvements and should:

- Review the recommendations made by Radiation Protection Adviser with respect to the use of a rectangular collimator for each of the five intra-oral X-ray machines.
- Make sure that risks in relation to fire safety are fully identified and mitigated.

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 effective arrangements in place for infection control, clinical waste control, management of medical emergencies at the practice and dental radiography (X-rays). We found that all the equipment used in the dental practice was well maintained. The practice took their responsibilities for patient safety seriously and staff were aware of the importance of identifying, investigating and learning from patient safety incidents. Staff had received safeguarding training and were aware of their responsibilities regarding safeguarding children and vulnerable adults.

Are services effective?

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

The dental care provided was evidence based and focussed on the needs of the patients. The practice used current national professional guidance including that from the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) to guide their practice. We saw examples of positive teamwork within the practice and evidence of good communication with other dental professionals. The staff received professional training and development appropriate to their roles and learning needs. Staff where appropriate were registered with the General Dental Council (GDC) and were meeting the requirements of their professional registration.

Are services caring?

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

We collected 14 completed Care Quality Commission patient comment cards and obtained the views of a further two patients on the day of our visit. These provided a positive view of the service the practice provided. All of the patients commented that the quality of care was very good. Patients commented on friendliness and helpfulness of the staff and dentists were good at explaining the treatment that was proposed.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

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

The service was aware of the needs of the local population and took those into account in how the practice was run. Patients could access treatment and urgent and emergency care when required. The practice provided patients with written information in language they could understand and had access to telephone interpreter services when required. The practice had two ground floor treatment rooms and level access into the building for patients with mobility difficulties and families with prams and pushchairs.

Are services well-led?

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

The practice manager and the staff team had an open approach to their work and shared a commitment to continually improving the service they provided. The practice had essential clinical governance and risk management structures in place. Staff told us that they felt supported and could raise any concerns with the practice manager. All the staff we met said that they were happy in their work and the practice was a good place to work.

Tamworth Dental Practice Partnership

Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

We carried out this inspection under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as part of our regulatory functions. This inspection was planned to check whether the practice was meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008.

The inspection took place on 15 February 2016 was led by a CQC inspector and supported by a dental specialist advisor. Prior to the inspection, we asked the practice to send us some information that we reviewed. This included the complaints they had received in the last 12 months, their latest statement of purpose, and the details of their staff members including proof of registration with their professional bodies.

We informed NHS England area team that we were inspecting the practice; however, we did not receive any information of concern from them.

During the inspection, we spoke with the practice manager, area manager, dentists, dental nurses, reception staff and reviewed policies, procedures and other documents. We also obtained the views of two patients on the day of our visit. We reviewed 14 comment cards that we had left prior to the inspection, for patients to complete, about the services provided at the practice.

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 therefore formed the framework for the areas we looked at during the inspection.

Are services safe?

Our findings

Reporting, learning and improvement from incidents

The practice manager described a good awareness of RIDDOR (The reporting of injuries diseases and dangerous occurrences regulations). The practice had an incident reporting system in place along with forms for staff to complete when something went wrong, this system also included the reporting of minor injuries to patients and staff. Staff told us about an incident at another of the group's practices that had prompted them to review their own incident reporting system. This demonstrated to us that learning was discussed and shared across the group's practices. The practice received national patient safety alerts such as those issued by the Medicines and Healthcare Regulatory Authority (MHRA) via email. Relevant alerts were discussed during staff meetings to facilitate shared learning these meetings occurred each month.

Reliable safety systems and processes (including safeguarding)

We spoke to staff about the prevention of needle stick injuries. They explained that the treatment of sharps and sharps waste was in accordance with the current EU Directive with respect to safe sharp guidelines, thus helping to protect staff from blood borne diseases. The practice used a system whereby needles were not manually resheathed using the hands following administration of a local anaesthetic to a patient. The dentists were responsible for ensuring safe recapping using a 'scoop' method. Staff were also able to explain the practice protocol should a needle stick injury occur. The systems and processes we observed were in line with the current EU Directive on the use of safer sharps.

We asked three dentists how the practice treated the use of instruments used during root canal treatment. They explained that these instruments were single use only. They also explained that root canal treatment was carried out where practically possible using a rubber dam. (A rubber dam is a thin sheet of rubber used by dentists to isolate the tooth being treated and to protect patients from inhaling or swallowing debris or small instruments used during root canal work). Patients can be assured that the practice followed appropriate guidance issued by the British Endodontic Society in relation to the use of the rubber dam.

The practice manager acted as the safeguarding lead. They acted as a point of referral should members of staff encounter a child or adult safeguarding issue. A policy was in place for staff to refer to in relation to children and adults who may be the victim of abuse or neglect. Training records showed that all staff had received appropriate safeguarding training for both vulnerable adults and children. Information was displayed in the practice that contained telephone numbers of whom to contact outside of the practice if there was a need, such as the local authority responsible for investigations. The practice reported that there had been no safeguarding incidents that required further investigation by appropriate authorities in recent times.

Medical emergencies

The practice had arrangements in place to deal with medical emergencies at the practice. There was an automated external defibrillator (AED), a portable electronic device that analyses life threatening irregularities of the heart and is able to deliver an electrical shock to attempt to restore a normal heart rhythm. The practice had in place emergency medicines as set out in the British National Formulary guidance for dealing with common medical emergencies in a dental practice. This included oxygen along with other related items such as manual breathing aids and portable suction in line with the Resuscitation Council UK guidelines. The emergency medicines and oxygen were all in date and stored in a central location known to all staff. The expiry dates of medicines and equipment were monitored using a monthly check sheet that enabled staff to replace out of date medicines and equipment promptly. All of the staff had received update training in 2015 and 2016 and demonstrated to us they knew how to respond if a person suddenly became unwell.

Staff recruitment

All of the dentists and dental nurses, except the four trainee dental nurses had current registration with the General Dental Council, the dental professionals' regulatory body. The practice had in place systems and processes for the recruitment of staff. This included important pre employment checks including proof of identity, immunisation status and references. We saw that all staff had received appropriate checks from the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS). These are checks to identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of

Are services safe?

people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable. The systems and processes we saw were in line with the information required by Regulation 18, Schedule 3 of Health & Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2015. Staff recruitment records were stored securely to protect the confidentiality of staff personal information.

Monitoring health & safety and responding to risks

The practice had a health and safety risk management process in place which enabled them to assess, mitigate and monitor risks to patients, staff and visitors to the practice. There was a business continuity plan in place.

There were arrangements in place to deal with foreseeable emergencies. We found the practice had self-assessed their risk of fire. Fire safety signs were clearly displayed, fire extinguishers had been recently serviced and staff demonstrated to us how to respond in the event of a fire. However, we found the practice fire risk assessment was not detailed in that it did not clearly define exit routes. We had concerns that risks may not have been fully identified and mitigated and discussed this with the practice management team who agreed and resolved to contact an external fire safety expert to undertake a fire risk assessment.

There were effective arrangements in place to meet the Control of Substances Hazardous to Health 2002 (COSHH) regulations. We looked at the COSHH file and found this to be comprehensive where risks (to patients, staff and visitors) associated with substances hazardous to health had been identified and actions taken to minimise them. The file was regularly updated when new materials or chemicals were introduced to the practice.

Infection control

There were effective systems in place to reduce the risk and spread of infection within the practice. The practice had in place an infection control policy that was regularly reviewed and the practice. This was demonstrated through direct observation of the cleaning process and a review of practice protocols that showed HTM 01 05 (national guidance for infection prevention control in dental practices') Essential Quality Requirements for infection control were being met. We observed that audits of infection control processes carried out in 2015 confirmed compliance with HTM 01 05 guidelines.

We saw that the five dental treatment rooms, waiting area, reception and toilet were clean, tidy and clutter free. Clear zoning demarking clean from dirty areas was apparent in all treatment rooms. Hand washing facilities were available including liquid soap and paper towels in each of the treatment rooms and toilet. Hand washing protocols were also displayed appropriately in various areas of the practice and bare below the elbow working was observed.

The drawers of treatment rooms were inspected and these were clean, ordered and free from clutter. Each treatment room had the appropriate routine personal protective equipment available for staff use, this included protective gloves and visors.

A trainee dental nurse described to us the end-to-end process of infection control procedures at the practice. They explained the decontamination of the general treatment room environment following the treatment of a patient. This included the working surfaces, dental unit and dental chair were decontaminated. They also explained how the dental water lines were maintained. The dental water lines were maintained to prevent the growth and spread of Legionella bacteria (legionella is a term for particular bacteria which can contaminate water systems in buildings) they described the method they used which was in line with current HTM 01 05 guidelines. We saw that a Legionella risk assessment had been carried out at the practice by a competent person. The recommended procedures contained in the report were carried out and logged appropriately. These measures ensured that patients' and staff were protected from the risk of infection due to Legionella.

The practice had a separate decontamination room for instrument processing. The trainee dental nurse demonstrated the process from taking the dirty instruments through to clean and ready for use again. The process of cleaning, inspection, sterilisation, packaging and storage of instruments followed a well-defined system of zoning from dirty through to clean.

The practice used a system of manual scrubbing and an ultra-sonic cleaning bath for the initial cleaning process. Following inspection with an illuminated magnifier instruments were placed in an autoclave (a device for sterilising dental and medical instruments). When instruments had been sterilized, they were pouched and stored until required. Pouches were dated with an expiry date in accordance with current guidelines. We were shown

Are services safe?

the systems in place to ensure that the autoclaves used in the decontamination process were working effectively. We observed that the data sheets used to record the essential daily and weekly validation checks of the sterilisation cycles were always complete and up to date. The weekly foil tests which formed part of the validation of the ultra-sonic cleaning baths were carried out and the results were recorded on appropriate log sheets.

The segregation and storage of clinical waste was in line with current guidelines laid down by the Department of Health. We observed that sharps containers, clinical waste bags and municipal waste were properly maintained and was in accordance with current guidelines. The practice used an appropriate contractor to remove clinical waste from the practice. This was stored in a separate locked location adjacent to the practice prior to collection by the waste contractor. Waste consignment notices were available for inspection. Patients' could be assured that they were protected from the risk of infection from contaminated dental waste. We also saw that general environmental cleaning was carried out by an external cleaner and they carried out cleaning according to a cleaning plan developed by the practice. Cleaning materials were stored in a well-maintained storage facility.

Equipment and medicines

Equipment checks were regularly carried out in line with the manufacturer's recommendations. For example, the autoclaves had been serviced and calibrated in June 2015. The practices' X-ray machines had been serviced and calibrated as specified under current national regulations. We did note that one of the recommendations had not

been addressed by the practice. The practice manager assured us that this would be addressed as soon as possible. Portable appliance testing (PAT) had been carried out in March 2015. The batch numbers and expiry dates for local anaesthetics were recorded in patient dental care records. We found that the practice stored prescription pads in a secure cabinet to prevent loss due to theft and maintained a prescription log to account for the medicines prescribed by each dentist.

Radiography (X-rays)

We were shown a well-maintained radiation protection file in line with the Ionising Radiation Regulations 1999 and Ionising Radiation Medical Exposure Regulations 2000 (IRMER). This file contained the names of the Radiation Protection Advisor and the Radiation Protection Supervisor and the necessary documentation pertaining to the maintenance of the X-ray equipment. Included in the file were the critical examination packs for each X-ray set along with the three yearly maintenance logs and a copy of the local rules. The maintenance logs were within the current recommended interval of three years.

A copy of the radiological audits for each dentist carried out in 2015 was available for inspection. Dental care records we saw where X-rays had been taken showed that dental X-rays were justified, reported on and quality assured. These findings showed that practice was acting in accordance with national radiological guidelines and patients and staff were protected from unnecessary exposure to radiation. We saw training records that showed all staff where appropriate had received training for core radiological knowledge under IRMER 2000.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Monitoring and improving outcomes for patients

The four dentists we spoke with carried out consultations, assessments and treatment in line with recognised general professional guidelines. Each dentist described to us how they carried out their assessment of patients for routine care. The assessment began with the patient completing a medical history questionnaire disclosing any health conditions, medicines being taken and any allergies suffered. We saw evidence that the medical history was updated at subsequent visits. This was followed by an examination covering the condition of a patient's teeth, gums and soft tissues and the signs of mouth cancer. Patients were made aware of the condition of their oral health and whether it had changed since the last appointment. Following the clinical assessment the diagnosis was then discussed with the patient and treatment options explained in detail.

Where relevant, preventative dental information was given in order to improve the outcome for the patient. This included dietary advice and general dental hygiene procedures such as tooth brushing techniques or recommended tooth care products. The patient dental care record was updated with the proposed treatment after discussing options with the patient. A treatment plan was given to each patient and this included the cost involved. Patients were monitored through follow-up appointments and these were scheduled in line with their individual requirements.

Dental care records we saw showed that the findings of the assessment and details of the treatment carried out were recorded appropriately. We saw details of the condition of the gums using the basic periodontal examination (BPE) scores and soft tissues lining the mouth. (The BPE tool is a simple and rapid screening tool used by dentists to indicate the level of treatment need in relation to a patient's gums). These were carried out where appropriate during a dental health assessment.

Health promotion & prevention

Adults and children attending the practice were advised during their consultation of steps to take to maintain healthy teeth. Television monitors in the waiting areas of the practice were used to assist in this process. Three dentists we spoke with explained that children at high risk

of tooth decay were identified and were offered fluoride varnish applications to keep their teeth in a healthy condition. Tooth brushing techniques were explained to patients in a way they understood and dietary, smoking and alcohol advice was given to them where appropriate. This was in line with the Department of Health guidelines on prevention known as 'Delivering Better Oral Health'. Dental care records we observed demonstrated that dentists had given oral health advice to patients. The waiting room and reception area contained leaflets that explained the services offered at the practice. The practice also sold a range of dental hygiene products to maintain healthy teeth and gums; these were available in the reception area.

Staffing

The practice has five dentists who are supported by six dental nurses some of whom were trainees, two receptionists a practice manager and two area managers. The patients we spoke with on the day of our visit said they had confidence and trust in the dentists. This was also reflected in the Care Quality Commission comment cards we observed. We observed a friendly atmosphere at the practice. The staff appeared to be a very effective team and worked well together, they told us they felt supported by the practice manager. Staff told us they felt they had acquired the necessary skills to carry out their role.

Working with other services

Dentists were able to refer patients to a range of specialists in primary and secondary services if the treatment required was not provided by the practice. The practice used referral criteria and referral forms developed by other primary and secondary care providers such as oral surgery or special care dentistry. This ensured that patients were seen by the right person at the right time. We noted that the practice manager maintained a comprehensive referral tracking system to ensure that referrals were managed by the practice in a timely manner.

Consent to care and treatment

We spoke with four dentists about how they implemented the principles of informed consent; all of the dentists had a very clear understanding of consent issues. They explained how individual treatment options, risks, benefits and costs were discussed with each patient and then documented in

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

a written treatment plan. They stressed the importance of communication skills when explaining care and treatment to patients to help ensure they had an understanding of their treatment options.

We spoke to the dentists about how they would obtain consent from a patient who suffered with any mental impairment that may mean that they might be unable to fully understand the implications of their treatment. They went on to say they would involve relatives and carers if

appropriate to ensure that the best interests of the patient were served as part of the process. This followed the guidelines of the Mental Capacity Act 2005. They were familiar with the concept of Gillick competence in respect of the care and treatment of children under 16. Gillick competence is used to help assess whether a child has the maturity to make their own decisions and to understand the implications of those decisions.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Respect, dignity, compassion & empathy

Treatment rooms were situated away from the main waiting areas and we saw that doors were closed at all times when patients were with dentists. Conversations between patients and dentists could not be heard from outside the treatment rooms which protected patients privacy. The practice maintained a separate 'privacy room' where patients could discuss with staff issues of a personal or sensitive nature. Patients' clinical records were stored electronically and in paper form. Computers were password protected and regularly backed up to secure storage with paper records stored in lockable records storage cabinets. Practice computer screens were not overlooked which ensured patients' confidential information could not be viewed at reception. Staff we spoke with were aware of the importance of providing patients with privacy and maintaining confidentiality.

Before the inspection, we sent Care Quality Commission (CQC) comment cards to the practice for patients to use to tell us about their experience of the practice. We collected 14 completed CQC patient comment cards and obtained

the views of five patients on the day of our visit. These provided a positive view of the service the practice provided. Patients commented that the quality of care was very good, treatment was explained clearly and the staff were caring and put them at ease. They also said that the reception staff were always helpful and efficient. During the inspection, we observed staff in the busy reception area and found that they were polite and helpful towards patients. The general atmosphere of the practice was welcoming and friendly.

Involvement in decisions about care and treatment

The practice provided clear treatment plans to their patients that detailed possible treatment options and indicative costs. A poster detailing NHS and private treatment costs was displayed in the waiting area. The dentists we spoke with paid particular attention to patient involvement when drawing up individual care plans. We saw evidence in the records we looked at that the dentists recorded the information they had provided to patients about their treatment and the options open to them. This included information recorded on the standard NHS treatment planning forms for dentistry where applicable.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting patients' needs

During our inspection we looked at examples of information available to people. We saw that the practice waiting area displayed a variety of information including the practice patient information leaflet. This explained opening hours, emergency 'out of hours' contact details and arrangements and how to make a complaint. The practice web site also contained useful information to patients such as how to book appointments on-line and how to provide feedback on the services provided.

On the day of our visit we observed that the appointment diaries although busy, were not unduly overbooked. This provided capacity each day for patients with dental pain to be fitted into urgent slots for each dentist. Patients were also invited to come and sit and wait if these slots had already been allocated. Although the practice felt that one of their strengths was not to turn patients away who were suffering from pain, this did cause some patients to complain about being kept waiting from time to time. This was reflected in some of the Friends and Family Test comment cards we observed. The dentists decided how long a patient's appointments needed to be and took into account any special circumstances such as whether a patient was very nervous, had a disability and the level of complexity of treatment.

Tackling inequity and promoting equality

The practice had made reasonable adjustments to prevent inequity for disadvantaged groups in society. The practice used a translation service, which they arranged if it was

clear that a patient had difficulty in understanding information about their treatment. In recent times the practice had carried out additional building works to improve access for disabled patients making it more convenient for them to enter the building.

Access to the service

The practice was open 8.00am to 8.00pm Monday to Friday and Saturday 8.00am to 3.00pm. The practice used the NHS 111 service to give advice in case of a dental emergency when the practice was closed. This information was publicised in the reception, waiting areas, practice information leaflet and on the telephone answering machine when the practice was closed.

Concerns & complaints

There was a complaints policy which provided staff with information about handling formal complaints from patients. Staff told us the practice team viewed complaints as a learning opportunity and discussed those received in order to improve the quality of service provided.

Information for patients about how to make a complaint was available in the practice's waiting room. This included contact details of other agencies to contact if a patient was not satisfied with the outcome of the practice investigation into their complaint.

We looked at the practice procedure for acknowledging, recording, investigating and responding to complaints, concerns and suggestions made by patients and found there was an effective system in place which ensured a timely response.

Are services well-led?

Our findings

Governance arrangements

The governance arrangements for this location were overseen by the registered manager who was responsible for the day to day running of the practice. They were supported by the groups two area managers. We saw a number of policies and procedures in place to govern the practice and we saw these covered a wide range of topics. For example, control of infection and health and safety. We noted management policies and procedures were kept under review by the practice manager and practice owner. Staff were aware of where policies and procedures were held and we saw these were easily accessible.

Leadership, openness and transparency

The staff we spoke with described a transparent culture which encouraged candour, openness and honesty. Staff said they felt comfortable about raising concerns with the practice manager or owner of the practice. They felt they were listened to and responded to when they did raise a concern. Staff told us they enjoyed their work and were well supported by the owner and dentists.

We found staff to be hard working, caring and committed to the work they did. All of the staff we spoke with demonstrated a good understanding of the principles of clinical governance in dentistry, were generally happy with the practice facilities. Staff reported that the practice manager was proactive and tried to resolve problems as soon as practicably possible. As a result, staff were motivated and enjoyed working at the practice and were proud of the service they provided to patients.

Learning and improvement

We found there were a number of clinical audits taking place at the practice. These included infection control, clinical record keeping and X-ray quality. There was evidence of repeat audits at appropriate intervals and

these reflected standards and improvements were being maintained. For example infection control audits were undertaken every six months and X-ray audits were carried out in accordance with current guidelines.

The practice also carried out monthly audits of each dentist's record keeping, waiting times and patients who had failed to attend. Results were analysed and shared with individual dentists who were supported to make improvements where needed. Learning points were also shared and discussed with staff at team meetings.

Staff working at the practice were supported to maintain their continuing professional development as required by the General Dental Council. Training was completed through a variety of resources including the attendance at lectures and online courses. Staff were given time to undertake training which would increase their knowledge of their role. We found that the practice undertook 'lunch and learns' where new techniques and dental materials were discussed.

Practice seeks and acts on feedback from its patients, the public and staff

The practice gathered feedback from patients through patient surveys, compliments and complaints. Changes made as a result of this feedback included trying to improve waiting times, improving the chairs in the waiting areas for older patients, improving the physical access for disabled patients and a text messaging service for patients. Staff told us they felt included in the running of the practice and how the practice management team listened to their opinions. Staff told us they felt valued and were proud to be part of the team. Results of the NHS Family and Friends Test we saw indicated that most patients were either highly likely or likely to recommend the service to family and friends. Patients felt improvements could be made with the time they sometimes needed to wait before entering the treatment room. The practice was trying to address this issue through monthly audits and continuous improvement.