

IDH Limited

Mydentist - New Queen Street - Scarborough

Inspection Report

1 New Queen Street
Scarborough
North Yorkshire
YO12 7HL
Tel: 01723 378078
Website: www.mydentist.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 16 March 2016
Date of publication: 19/04/2016

Overall summary

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection on 16 March 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

Mydentist, Scarborough is situated in the centre of Scarborough, North Yorkshire close to public transport links. The practice has two treatment rooms, one on the ground floor and one on the first floor, a waiting area, a reception area, a decontamination room. Staff facilities were located on the fourth floor with offices located on the third floor.

There is step free access to the practice to help anyone with mobility requirements. There are two Dentists, a practice manager, a lead Dental Nurse, three Dental Nurses (two of which are trainees) and a full team of support through the company structure.

The practice is open:

Monday – Friday 08:30 – 17:30.

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.

Summary of findings

On the day of inspection we received 23 CQC comment cards providing feedback. The patients who provided feedback were very positive about the care and attention to treatment they received at the practice. They told us they were involved in all aspects of their care and found the staff to be friendly, helpful, caring and considerate especially with children and they were treated with dignity and respect in a clean and tidy environment.

Our key findings were:

- Staff had received safeguarding training, knew how to recognise signs of abuse and how to report it. They had very good systems in place to work closely and share information with the local safeguarding team.
- There were sufficient numbers of suitably qualified staff to meet the needs of patients.
- Staff had been trained to manage medical emergencies.
- Patient care and treatment was planned and delivered in line with evidence based guidelines, best practice and current regulations.
- Patients received clear explanations about their proposed treatment, costs, benefits and risks and were involved in making decisions about it.
- Patients were treated with dignity and respect and confidentiality was maintained.
- There was a complaints system in place. Staff recorded complaints and cascaded learning to staff.
- The governance systems were effective.
- The practice sought feedback from staff and patients about the services.

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

- Provide a lock for the clinical waste storage area, ensure sufficient collections or larger storage facilities are available to prevent overflow to ensure it is all stored securely.
- Review the practice protocol for audits, including X-ray and patient dental care records to ensure the audits have documented learning points and action plans so the resulting improvements can be demonstrated and reviewed.
- Review awareness around guidelines including: Faculty of General Dental Practice (FGDP), National Radiological Protection Board (NRPB), National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) and Delivering Better Oral Health' toolkit (DBOH).

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 systems and processes in place to ensure all care and treatment was carried out safely. For example, there were systems in place for infection prevention and control, clinical waste control, dental radiography and management of medical emergencies. All emergency equipment and medicines were in date and in accordance with the British National Formulary (BNF) and Resuscitation Council UK guidelines.

We saw all staff had received a variety of training in infection prevention and control. There was a decontamination room with guidance for staff on effective decontamination of dental instruments.

Staff had received training in safeguarding patients and knew how to recognise the signs of abuse and who to report them to including external agencies such as the local authority safeguarding team.

Staff were appropriately recruited and suitably trained and skilled to meet patients' needs and there were sufficient numbers of staff available at all times. Staff induction processes were in place and had been completed by all staff. We reviewed the newest member of staff's induction file and evidence was available to support the policy and process.

We reviewed the legionella risk assessment dated February 2015, evidence of regular water testing was in place and quarterly dip slides was also completed.

Are services effective?

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

Dentists were not fully aware of the guidance from the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). However, patients were recalled after an agreed interval for an oral health review, during which their medical histories and examinations were updated.

The practice was not fully aware of the best practice guidelines when delivering dental care. This guidance would be sourced from the Faculty of General Dental Practice (FGDP) and NICE. The practice focused on prevention however the dentists were aware of the 'Delivering Better Oral Health' toolkit (DBOH) with regards to fluoride application and oral hygiene advice.

Patients dental care records provided information about their current dental needs and past treatment. The dental care records we looked at did not always include discussions about treatment options, relevant X-rays including grading and justification, medical history updates or gum risk assessments.

The practice monitored any changes to the patients oral health and made referrals for specialist treatment or investigations where indicated in a timely manner.

Staff were registered with the General Dental Council (GDC) and maintained their registration by completing the required number of hours of continuing professional development (CPD). Staff were supported to meet the requirements of their professional registration.

Are services caring?

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

Staff explained that enough time was allocated in order to ensure the treatment and care was fully explained to patients in a way which patients understood.

Summary of findings

Comments on the completed 23 CQC comment cards we received included positive statements about the high levels of care and the friendliness of the staff.

We observed patients being treated with respect and dignity during interactions at the reception desk and over the telephone. Privacy and confidentiality were maintained for patients using the service on the day of the inspection. We also observed the staff to be welcoming and caring towards the patients.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

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

Patients could access routine treatment and urgent care when required. The practice offered daily access for patients experiencing dental pain which enabled them to receive treatment quickly.

The practice had good disability access in the practice to help patients with mobility requirements to access care and within one of the surgeries there was room to accommodate a wheelchair. There were no disabled toilet facilities within the practice.

The practice had a complaints process which was easily accessible to patients who wished to make a complaint. The registered manager recorded complaints and cascaded learning to staff.

They also had patients' advice leaflets available on reception.

Are services well-led?

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

There was a clearly defined management structure in place and although staff said they did not always have support from central management team, they did feel supported and appreciated in their own particular roles within the practice. The registered manager was responsible for the day to day running of the practice.

The practice held monthly staff meetings for staff at the practice and also across the wider organisation which were minuted and gave everybody an opportunity to openly share information and discuss any concerns or issues which had not already been addressed during their daily interactions.

The practice undertook various audits to monitor their performance and help improve the services offered. The audits included infection prevention and control and X-rays. The X-ray audit findings were not within the guidelines of the National Radiological Protection Board (NRPB).

The practice was currently undertaking the NHS Friends and Family Test (FFT) however it did not have a patient satisfaction survey in place.

Mydentist - New Queen Street - Scarborough

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 registered provider was meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008.

The inspection was carried out on 16 March 2016 and was led by a CQC Inspector and a specialist advisor.

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

The methods that were used to collect information at the inspection included interviewing staff, observations and reviewing documents.

During the inspection we spoke with the two dentists, three dental nurses and the registered manager. We saw policies, procedures and other records relating to the management of the service. We reviewed 23 CQC comment cards that had been completed.

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 had policies and procedures in place to investigate, respond to and learn from significant events and complaints. This learning was also shared centrally within the organisation to help prevent any similar significant event occurring where possible. Staff were aware of the reporting procedures in place and were encouraged to raise safety issues to the attention of colleagues and the central team.

Staff understood the process for accident and incident reporting including their responsibilities under the Reporting of Injuries, Disease and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations 2013 (RIDDOR). The registered manager told us any accident or incidents would be discussed at practice meetings or whenever they arose and shared centrally. We saw the practice had five accidents and no significant events reported in the last 12 months. The accidents had been recorded and acted upon in line with the practice policy.

The registered manager told us they received alerts by email from the Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA), the UK's regulator of medicines, medical devices and blood components for transfusion, responsible for ensuring their safety, quality and effectiveness. Relevant alerts were shared with the practice and discussed with staff, actioned and stored for future reference.

Reliable safety systems and processes (including safeguarding)

The practice had child and adult safeguarding policies and procedures in place. These provided staff with information about identifying, reporting and dealing with suspected abuse. They included the contact details for the local authority safeguarding team, social services and other relevant agencies. The registered manager was the lead for safeguarding. This role included providing support and advice to staff and overseeing the safeguarding procedures within the practice.

We saw all staff had received safeguarding training in adults and children. Staff could easily access the

safeguarding policy. Staff demonstrated their awareness of the signs and symptoms of abuse and neglect. They were also aware of the procedures they needed to follow to address safeguarding concerns.

The dentists told us they routinely used a rubber dam when providing root canal treatment to patients. A rubber dam is a small square sheet of latex (or other similar material if a patient is latex sensitive) used to isolate the tooth operating field to increase the efficacy of the treatment and protect the patient. If they could not place a rubber dam, other safety aspects would be put in place.

The practice had a whistleblowing policy which staff were aware of. Staff told us they felt confident they could raise concerns about colleagues without fear of recriminations. Staff told us they felt they all had an open and transparent relationship and they felt all staff would have someone to go to if they had any concerns at all.

Medical emergencies

The practice had procedures in place for staff to follow in the event of a medical emergency and all staff had received training in basic life support and the use of an Automated External Defibrillator (AED). (An AED is a portable electronic device that analyses life threatening irregularities of the heart including ventricular fibrillation and is able to deliver an electrical shock to attempt to restore a normal heart rhythm).

The practice kept medicines and equipment for use in a medical emergency. These were all in line with the Resuscitation Council UK and British National Formulary guidelines. All staff knew where these items were kept.

We saw the practice kept logs which indicated when the emergency equipment, emergency medical oxygen cylinder, emergency drugs and AED were checked daily by staff and monthly by the registered manager. This ensured the equipment was fit for use and the medication was within the manufacturer's expiry dates. We checked the emergency medicines and found they were of the recommended type and were all in date.

Staff recruitment

The practice had a recruitment policy which included a process to be followed when employing new staff. This included obtaining proof of their identity, checking their

Are services safe?

skills and qualifications, registration with relevant professional bodies and taking up references. We reviewed the newest members of staff's recruitment file which confirmed the processes had been followed.

We saw all staff had been checked by the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS). The DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable. The organisation was about to review when they needed to renew DBS checks or implement a risk assessment as part of the appraisal system as required.

We recorded all relevant staff had personal indemnity insurance (insurance professionals are required to have in place to cover their working practice). In addition, there was employer's liability insurance which covered employees working at the practice.

Monitoring health & safety and responding to risks

The practice had undertaken a number of risk assessments to cover the health and safety concerns that may arise in providing dental services generally and those that were particular to the practice. The practice had a Health and Safety policy which included guidance on fire safety, manual handling and dealing with clinical waste. We saw this policy was reviewed in February 2016.

The practice had maintained a Control of Substances Hazardous to Health (COSHH) folder. COSHH was implemented to protect workers against ill health and injury caused by exposure to hazardous substances - from mild eye irritation through to chronic lung disease. COSHH requires employers to eliminate or reduce exposure to known hazardous substances in a practical way. If any new materials were implemented into the practice a new risk assessment was put in place.

We noted there had been a specific fire risk assessment completed for the premises. We saw as part of the checks by the smoke alarms were tested and the fire extinguishers were serviced annually. There was evidence that a fire drill had been undertaken with staff and discussion about the process reviewed at practice meetings. Two members of staff had completed fire marshal training. These and other measures were taken to reduce the likelihood of risks of harm to staff and patients.

Infection control

The practice had a decontamination room that was set out according to the Department of Health's guidance, Health Technical Memorandum 01-05 (HTM 01-05), decontamination in primary care dental practices.

There were two separate sinks for decontamination work and all clinical staff were aware of the work flow in the decontamination room from the 'dirty' to the 'clean' zones. The procedure for cleaning, disinfecting and sterilising the instruments was clearly displayed on the wall to guide staff. We observed staff wearing appropriate personal protective equipment when working in the decontamination area this included disposable gloves, aprons and protective eye wear.

We found instruments were being cleaned and sterilised in line with published guidance (HTM01-05). The dental nurses were knowledgeable about the decontamination process and demonstrated they followed the correct procedures. For example, instruments were placed in an ultrasonic bath, examined under illuminated magnification and sterilised in an autoclave. Sterilised instruments were correctly packaged, sealed, stored and dated with an expiry date. For safety, instruments were transported between the surgeries and the decontamination area in lockable boxes.

We saw records which showed the equipment used for cleaning and sterilising had been maintained and serviced in line with the manufacturer's instructions. Appropriate records were kept of the decontamination cycles of the autoclaves to ensure they were functioning properly. The ultrasonic cleaner had validation testing in place, including a foil ablation test as recommended in HTM01-05 guidelines.

We saw from staff records all staff had received various infection prevention and control training at different intervals over the last year covering a range of topics including hand washing techniques.

There were adequate supplies of liquid soap and paper hand towels in the decontamination area and surgeries and a poster describing proper hand washing techniques was displayed above all the hand washing sinks. Paper hand towels and liquid soap were also available in the toilet.

We saw all sharps bins were used correctly and located appropriately in all surgeries. Clinical waste was not stored securely for collection in a container outside of the practice as we saw this was overflowing and excess waste was being

Are services safe?

stored in the decontamination room that was also not secure. The organisation had a contract with an authorised contractor for the collection and safe disposal of clinical waste. On the day of the inspection arrangements were made for collection as soon as possible.

The staff files we reviewed showed all clinical staff had received inoculations against Hepatitis B, although the evidence for some members of staff did not fully show the required details and no risk assessment had been completed to support staff. It is recommended that people who are likely to come into contact with blood products or are at increased risk of needle-stick injuries should receive these vaccinations to minimise risks of acquiring blood borne infections. New members of staff new to healthcare had received the required checks as stated in the Green book, chapter 12, Immunisation for healthcare and laboratory staff.

We reviewed the last legionella risk assessment report dated February 2015. All recommended testing including hot and cold water temperature checks were being carried out by a staff member in accordance to the risk assessment and they were responsible for the testing and reporting of any concerns. There had been no training for a nominated individual and this was brought to the attention of the registered manager on the day of the inspection. Legionella is a term for particular bacteria which can contaminate water systems in buildings.

Equipment and medicines

We saw the Portable Appliance Testing (PAT) (PAT is the term used to describe the examination of electrical appliances and equipment to ensure they are safe to use) was undertaken annually and had been completed in July 2015.

We saw the fire extinguishers had been checked in February 2016 to ensure they were suitable for use if required.

We saw maintenance records for equipment such as autoclaves, compressors and X-ray equipment which showed they were serviced in accordance with the manufacturers' guidance. The regular maintenance ensured the equipment remained fit for purpose.

Local anaesthetics were stored appropriately and a log of batch numbers and expiry dates was in place. Other than emergency medicines no other medicine was stored on the premises.

Radiography (X-rays)

The X-ray equipment was located in each of the surgeries and all X-rays were carried out safely and in line with the rules relevant to the practice and type and model of equipment being used.

We reviewed the practice's radiation protection file. This contained a copy of the local rules which stated how the X-ray machine needed to be operated safely. The local rules were also displayed in each of the surgeries. The file also contained the name and contact details of the Radiation Protection Advisor.

We saw all the staff were up to date with their continuing professional development training in respect of dental radiography. The practice also had a maintenance log which showed that the X-ray machines had been serviced regularly. The registered manager told us that they undertook annually quality audits of the X-rays taken. We saw the results of the December 2015 audit and the results were not in accordance with the National Radiological Protection Board (NRPB). There was no learning outcomes or actions plans in place. No specific information was available as to why an X-ray had been graded less than excellent or how this could be prevented in the future. When reviewing patient dental care records we saw X-rays were not always justified or reported on. This was brought to the attention of the registered manager.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Monitoring and improving outcomes for patients

The practice kept up to date detailed electronic dental care records. They contained information about the patient's current dental needs and past treatment. The dentists carried out an assessment although they were not fully aware of the recognised guidance from the Faculty of General Dental Practice (FGDP). An assessment was repeated at each appointment in order to monitor any changes in the patient's oral health. The practice did not always record the medical history information within the patients' dental care records for future reference. The staff told us they discussed patients' lifestyle and behaviour such a social history including diet advice and daily oral hygiene routines and where appropriate offered them health promotion, however this was not always recorded in the patients' dental care records.

During the course of our inspection we discussed patient dental care records with the staff and reviewed dental care records to confirm the findings. We found they were not in accordance with the guidance provided by the Faculty of General Dental Practice. For example, evidence of a discussion of treatment needs with the patient was not always recorded. The practice did not always record medical histories had been up dated prior to treatment. Soft tissue examinations, diagnosis and a full assessment of each patients needs were also not routinely recorded.

At all subsequent appointments patients were asked to review and update a medical history format reception. This ensured the dentists were aware of the patients' present medical condition before offering or undertaking any treatment.

The dentists told us they always discussed the diagnosis with their patients and parents or guardian and, where appropriate, offered them any options available for treatment and explained the costs if required. By reviewing the dental care records we found these discussions were not always recorded however signed treatment plans were placed into the patients' dental care record card.

Patients' oral health was monitored throughout the practice This was followed up accordingly; these were scheduled in line with the National Institute for Health and

Care Excellence (NICE) recommendations. We saw from the dental care records the dentists were not aware of the NICE guidelines for recalling patients for check-ups, however various recalls were in place.

Dentists were not fully aware of the guidance from the FGDP before taking X-rays. This would ensure they were required and necessary. Justification for the taking of an X-ray, a grade of each X-ray and a detailed report was not always recorded in the patient's dental care record.

Patients requiring specialist treatments that were not available at the practice, such as conscious sedation or orthodontics, were referred to other dental specialists. Their oral health was then monitored after the patient had been referred back to the practice. This helped ensure patients had the necessary post-procedure care and satisfactory outcomes.

Health promotion & prevention

The patient reception and waiting area contained a range of information that explained the services offered at the practice and the NHS fees for treatment. Staff told us they offered patients information about effective dental hygiene and oral care in the surgeries.

The dentists told us they offered patients oral health advice however they were not aware of the Department of Health's policy, the 'Delivering Better Oral Health' toolkit, this includes information regarding fluoride applications. Fluoride treatments are a recognised form of preventative measures to help protect patients' teeth from decay.

The practice had a selection of dental products on sale in the reception area to assist patients with their oral health.

Staffing

New staff to the practice had a period of induction to familiarise themselves with the way the practice ran. The induction process included a two day external programme including core CPD training. We saw evidence of completed induction checklists in the recruitment files.

Staff told us they had good access to on-going online training to support their skill level and they were encouraged to maintain the continuous professional development (CPD) required for registration with the General Dental Council (GDC). The practice organised in-house training including that for medical emergencies.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

This was in place to help staff keep up to date with current guidance and new requirements. Records showed professional registration with the GDC was up to date for all staff and we saw evidence of on-going CPD.

Staff told us they had annual appraisals and training requirements were discussed at these. We saw evidence of completed appraisal documents. Staff also felt they could approach the registered manager at any time to discuss continuing training and development as the need arose.

Working with other services

The practice worked with other professionals in the care of their patients where this was in the best interest of the patient. For example, referrals were made to hospitals and specialist dental services for further investigations or specialist treatment including orthodontics and sedation.

The practice completed detailed proformas or referral letters to ensure the specialist service had all the relevant information required. A copy of the referral letter was kept in the patient's dental care records. Letters received back relating to the referral were first seen by the referring dentist to see if any action was required and then stored in the patient's dental care records. The reception staff kept a log of the referrals which had been sent and when a response had been received.

The practice also had a process for urgent referrals for suspected malignancies.

Consent to care and treatment

Patients were given appropriate information to support them to make decisions about the treatment they received. Staff were knowledgeable about how to ensure patients had sufficient information and the mental capacity to give informed consent. Staff described how valid consent was obtained for all care and treatment and the role family members and carers might have in supporting the patient to understand and make decisions. Staff were clear about involving children in decision making and ensuring their wishes were respected regarding treatment.

Staff ensured patients gave their consent before treatment began and a treatment plan was signed by the patient. We saw within dental care records that individual treatment options, risks, benefits and costs were not always recorded as being discussed with each patient. Patients were given time to consider and make informed decisions about which option they preferred.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Respect, dignity, compassion & empathy

Feedback from the patients was positive and they commented they were treated with care, respect and dignity. They said staff supported them and were quick to respond to any distress or discomfort during treatment. Staff told us they always interacted with patients in a respectful, appropriate and caring manner. We observed staff to be friendly and respectful towards patients during interactions at the reception desk and over the telephone.

We observed privacy and confidentiality were maintained for patients who used the service on the day of inspection. We observed staff were helpful, discreet and respectful to patients. Staff said that if a patient wished to speak in private, an empty room would be found to speak with them.

Patients' electronic care records were password protected and regularly backed up to secure storage. Any paper documentation was stored in locked cabinets.

A radio and a selection of magazines were available in the waiting area, oral health and treatment leaflets were in place for patients to take home. The waiting room also had a large information screen to show different treatment options available within the practice.

Involvement in decisions about care and treatment

The practice provided patients with information to enable them to make informed choices. Patients commented they felt involved in their treatment. Staff described how they involved patients' relatives or carers when required and ensured there was sufficient time to explain fully the care and treatment they were providing in a way patients understood.

Staff told us how the dentists would provide treatment options including benefits and possible risks of each option.

Patients were also informed of the range of treatments available in information leaflets in the waiting room. The practice's website provided patients with information about the range of treatments which were available at the practice. This included root canal treatment, extractions, treatments for gum disease and crowns.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting patients' needs

We found the practice had an efficient appointment system in place to respond to patients' needs. Staff told us patients who requested an urgent appointment would be seen the same day. The appointment book showed there were dedicated emergency slots available each day for each dentist. If the emergency slots had already been taken for the day then the patient was offered to sit and wait for an appointment if they wished.

The dentists told us they offered patient information leaflets on oral care and treatments in the surgery to aid the patients' understanding if required or requested.

The patients commented they had sufficient time during their appointment and they were not rushed. We observed the clinics ran smoothly on the day of the inspection and patients were not kept waiting.

Tackling inequity and promoting equality

Reasonable adjustments had been made to the premises to accommodate disabled patients. The practice had step free access to the premises and a hearing loop.

The practice had equality and diversity policy to support staff, however no training had been undertaken to provide an understanding to meet the needs of patients. The practice also had access to translation services for those whose first language was not English.

Access to the service

The practice displayed its opening hours in the premises, in the practice information leaflet and on the practice website. The opening hours are Monday – Friday 08:30 -17:30.

The patients told us they were sometimes kept waiting for their appointment. Where treatment was urgent patients would be seen the same day and if not, within 24 hours.

The patients told us when they had required an emergency appointment this had been organised the same day. The practice had a system in place for patients requiring urgent dental care when the practice was closed. Patients were signposted to the NHS 111 service on the telephone answering machine.

Concerns & complaints

The practice had a complaints policy which provided staff with clear guidance about how to handle a complaint. The registered manager was in charge of dealing with complaints when they arose. Staff told us they raised any formal or informal comments or concerns with the registered manager to ensure responses were made in a timely manner.

We looked at the practice's procedure for acknowledging, recording, investigating and responding to complaints, concerns and suggestions made by patients. This was in accordance with the Local Authority Social Services and National Health Service Complaints (England) Regulations 2009.

The practice had received two complaints in the last year, we saw evidence all complaints had been dealt with in line with the practice's procedure. This included acknowledging the complaint within three working days and providing a formal response within 20 working days. If the practice was unable to provide a response within 20 working days then the patient would be made aware of this. Any concerns raised on the NHS choices website were responded to in a timely manner and if possible were followed up directly by the registered manager.

The complaints procedure was displayed in the waiting room. The registered manager recorded complaints and cascaded learning to staff these were also on a database to be collated and shared across the organisation to learn from all situations. The practice also had patient advice leaflets available on reception.

Are services well-led?

Our findings

Governance arrangements

The registered manager was responsible for the day to day running of the service. There was a range of policies and procedures in use at the practice. We saw they had systems in place to monitor the quality of the service and to make improvements.

The practice had an approach for identifying where quality or safety was being affected and addressing any issues. Health and safety policies were in place, and risk management process to ensure the safety of patients and staff members.

The practice had governance arrangements in place such as various policies and procedures for monitoring and improving the services provided for patients. For example, there was a recruitment policy, health and safety policy and an infection control policy. Staff were aware of their roles and responsibilities within the practice.

We saw the results of the X-ray, patient dental care record and infection prevention and control audit. Although some action plans and learning outcomes were in place to continuously improve the procedures and reduce future risks nothing had been addressed regarding issues raised within three cycles of the patients' dental care record audit and the last X-ray audit that was not in the required percentages. This was brought to the attention of the registered provider to review.

There was an effective management structure within the practice to ensure responsibilities of staff were clear. Staff told us that they felt supported and were clear about their roles and responsibilities.

Leadership, openness and transparency

Staff told us there was an open culture within the practice and they were encouraged and confident to raise any issues at any time. These were discussed openly at various staff meetings where relevant and it was evident the practice worked as a team and dealt with any issues in a professional manner.

The practice held monthly staff meetings involving all staff members. These meetings were minuted and displayed on the notice board for those who were unable to attend. If there was more urgent information to discuss with staff

then an informal staff meeting would be organised to discuss the matter. The registered manager said the practice also had informal chats every morning before they started seeing patients to share any concerns. Some of the staff meetings involved peer review, audit results and also gave an opportunity for staff to share any specialist knowledge with others.

All staff were aware of whom to raise any issue with and told us the registered manager would listen to their concerns and act appropriately. We were told there was a no blame culture at the practice and the delivery of high quality care was part of the practice.

Learning and improvement

The practice had quality assurance processes in place to encourage continuous improvement. The practice audited areas of their practice as part of a system of continuous improvement and learning. This included audits such as X-rays and infection prevention and control. Although concerns had been raised through previous audits nothing had been put in place to ensure areas of concern would be prevented in future.

Staff told us they were encouraged to complete training, this included medical emergencies and basic life support, infection prevention and control and radiography. All mandatory training was provided through the organisation and this could be accessed through on line and in house training sessions.

Staff working at the practice were supported to maintain their continuous professional development as required by the General Dental Council.

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

The practice was participating in the continuous NHS Friends and Family Test (FFT). The FFT is a feedback tool that supports the fundamental principle that people who use NHS services should have the opportunity to provide feedback on their experience.

We saw the practice held monthly practice meetings which were minuted and gave everybody an opportunity to openly share information and discuss any concerns or issues which had not already been addressed during their daily interactions.