

Mr Philip James

Wymans Brook Dental Practice

Inspection Report

1 Wyman's Court,
Windyridge Road,
Cheltenham,
Gloucestershire,
GL50 4TE
Tel: 01242 515511
Website:

Date of inspection visit: 03 February 2017
Date of publication: 15/03/2017

Overall summary

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection on 3 February 2017 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 this practice was providing safe care in accordance with the relevant regulations.

Are services effective?

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

Are services caring?

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

Are services responsive?

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

Are services well-led?

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

Background

Wymans Brook Dental Practice is a dental practice providing private treatment mainly for adults but does treat some children.

The practice is based in a former domestic property situated above a row of shops, in a suburb of Cheltenham. The practice has one waiting room, an office, small reception room, one treatment room and a separate room for the cleaning, sterilising and packing of dental instruments. Although the practice was on the first floor and not accessible to patients with limited mobility, the practice made alternative arrangements for these patients to be seen in other services.

The practice employs one principal dentist and two dental nurses who also act as receptionists or manage the decontamination processing, when not supporting the dentist at the chairside. The practice opens 9am to 1pm and 2pm to 5.30pm Monday to Thursday and 9am to 1pm and 2pm to 5pm on a Friday.

Summary of findings

There are arrangements in place to ensure patients receive urgent dental assistance when the practice is closed. This is provided by an out-of-hours service. If patients called the practice when it was closed, an answerphone message gave the telephone number patients should ring depending on their symptoms.

The principal dentist is registered with the Care Quality Commission (CQC) as an individual. 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.

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 36 patients. In addition we spoke with two patients on the day of our inspection. Feedback from patients was positive about the quality of care, the caring nature of all staff and the overall high quality of customer care. They commented that staff put them at ease and listened to their concerns. They also reported they felt proposed treatments were fully explained to them so they could make an informed decision which gave them confidence in the care provided.

Our key findings were:

- We found that the practice ethos was to provide patient centred dental care in a relaxed and friendly environment.
- Effective leadership was provided by the principal dentist.
- Staff had been trained to handle emergencies and appropriate medicines and life-saving equipment was readily available in accordance with current guidelines.
- Premises appeared well maintained and visibly clean.
- Infection control procedures were effective and the practice followed published guidance.
- There were systems in place to check all equipment had been serviced regularly, including the autoclave and the X-ray equipment.
- The practice had a safeguarding lead professional and effective processes in place for safeguarding adults and children.
- There was a policy and procedure in place for recording adverse incidents and accidents.
- The dentist provided dental care in accordance with current professional and National Institute for Care Excellence (NICE) guidelines.
- The dentist used Loupes – these enable the clinician to have a magnified view of the operation site thus enabling accuracy of treatment.
- The practice had a system to monitor and continually improve the quality of the service; including through a programme of clinical and non-clinical audits.
- Patients could access treatment and urgent and emergency care when required.
- Staff had received training appropriate to their roles and were supported in their continuing professional development by the principal dentist.
- Information from 36 completed Care Quality Commission (CQC) comment cards and speaking to patients gave us a positive picture of a friendly, caring, professional and high quality service.
- The practice reviewed and dealt with complaints according to their practice policy.

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

The practice had effective arrangements in place to help ensure the safety of staff and patients. This included for essential areas such as infection control, the disposal of clinical waste and the management of medical emergencies and dental radiography (X-rays).

We found 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 and investigating patient safety incidents.

Staff had received safeguarding training and were aware of their responsibilities regarding safeguarding children and vulnerable adults.

The practice carried out and reviewed risk assessments to identify and manage risks.

There were clear procedures regarding the maintenance of equipment and the storage of medicines in order to deliver care safely and in an emergency.

No action



Are services effective?

We found 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 evidenced good communication with other dental professionals. The staff received professional training and development appropriate to their roles and learning needs. Staff we spoke with told us they had accessed specific training in the last 12 months in line with their professional development plan and in line with General Dental Council (GDC) requirements for registrants.

Staff were registered with the GDC and were meeting the requirements of their professional registration.

The practice held electronic and paper records of the care given to patients including comprehensive information about patients' oral health assessments, treatment and advice given. Records showed that patients were recalled in line with national guidance and screened appropriately for gum disease and oral cancer.

They monitored any changes in the patient's oral health and made referrals as appropriate to other primary and secondary care providers such as for specialist orthodontic treatment or hospital services for further investigations or treatment as required.

The practice was proactive in providing patients with advice about preventative care and supported patients to ensure better oral health in line with Public Health England publication 'Delivering better Oral Health 3rd edition. (DBOH).

No action



Summary of findings

Are services caring?

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

We reviewed 36 completed CQC comments and received feedback on the day of the inspection from two patients about the care and treatment they received at the practice.

Patients commented the quality of care was very good. Patients commented on the friendliness and helpfulness of the staff and told us dentists were good at explaining the treatment that was proposed.

We observed privacy and confidentiality were maintained for patients using the service on the day of the inspection. Policies and procedures in relation to data protection and security and confidentiality were in place and staff were aware of these.

No action



Are services responsive to people's needs?

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

Patients could access treatment and urgent and emergency care when required.

The practice provided patients with written information.

The practice had experienced very few requests for treatment by patients whose first language was not English but provided patients with written information in a language they could understand and had access to telephone interpreter services if required.

The practice had carried out an equality assessment and although the practice was not wheelchair accessible, the provider had made reasonable adjustments for patients with physical impairments.

The practice had a portable hearing loop available, information and forms were available and could be printed in large print when required.

There was a procedure in place for acknowledging, recording, investigating and responding to complaints and concerns made by patients or their carers.

No action



Are services well-led?

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

We found effective leadership was provided by the principal dentist. Staff had an open approach to their work and shared a commitment to continually improving the service they provided. There was a no blame culture in the practice.

The practice maintained a comprehensive system of policies and procedures which were reviewed on a regular basis.

Staff told us they felt well supported and could raise any concerns with the principal dentist. All the staff we met said they were happy in their work and had clearly defined roles within the practice.

The practice assessed risks to patients and staff and carried out a programme of audits as part of a system of continuous improvement and learning.

No action



Summary of findings

<p>The practice had systems in place to seek and act upon feedback from patients using the service.</p>	
---	--

Wymans Brook Dental Practice

Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

This inspection took place on 3 February 2017. The inspection team consisted of a Care Quality Commission (CQC) inspector, and a dental specialist advisor.

Prior to the inspection we reviewed information we held about the provider. We also reviewed information we asked the provider to send us in advance of the inspection. This included their latest statement of purpose describing their values and objectives, a record of any complaints received in the last 12 months and details of their staff members together with their qualifications and proof of registration with the appropriate professional body.

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

During the inspection, we spoke with the principal dentist and both dental nurses. We conducted a tour of the practice and looked at the storage arrangements for emergency medicines and equipment.

We were shown the decontamination procedures for dental instruments and the computer system that supported the patient dental care records.

We also reviewed policies, procedures and other documents. We reviewed 36 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 was aware of their responsibilities in relation to the Reporting of Injuries Disease and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations 2013 (RIDDOR). RIDDOR is managed by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE).

The practice had an incident reporting system in place when something went wrong; this system also included the reporting of minor injuries to patients and staff.

Records showed that two accidents occurred during 2015 and were managed in accordance with the practice's accident reporting policy

We discussed with staff the action they would take if a significant incident occurred, they detailed a process that involved a discussion and feedback with any patient that might be involved. This indicated an understanding of their Duty of Candour. Duty of Candour is a legislative requirement for providers of health and social care services to set out some specific requirements that must be followed when things go wrong with care and treatment, including informing people about the incident, providing reasonable support, providing truthful information and an apology when things go wrong.

Procedures were in place for reporting adverse drug reactions and medicines related adverse events and errors.

There was a procedure for when and how to notify CQC of incidents which cause harm. Staff reported there was an open and transparent culture at the practice which encouraged candour and honesty.

The practice received national patient safety alerts, recalls and rapid response reports issued from the Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA) and through the Central Alerting System (CAS), as well as from other relevant bodies such as, Public Health England. Where relevant these alerts were shared with all staff.

Reliable safety systems and processes (including safeguarding)

The practice had safety systems in place to help ensure the safety of staff and patients. These included clear guidelines about responding to a sharps injury (needles and sharp instruments).

We spoke with a dental nurse about the prevention of needle stick injuries. They explained that the treatment of sharps and sharps waste was in accordance with the current management of sharps regulations 2013 and the EU directive with respect to safe sharp guidelines, thus protecting patients and staff against blood borne viruses.

The practice used a system whereby needles were not manually resheathed using the hands following administration of a local anaesthetic to a patient. The practice used a rubber needle guard following the administration of dental local anaesthetics to prevent needle stick injuries from occurring during recapping. The dentist was responsible for the disposal of used sharps and needles. A practice protocol was in place should a needle stick injury occur. The systems and processes we observed were in line with the current EU directive about the use of safer sharps.

We asked how the practice treated the use of instruments that were used during root canal treatment. They explained 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 the practice followed appropriate guidance issued by the British Endodontic Society in relation to the use of the rubber dam.

The practice had policies and procedures in place for child protection and safeguarding adults. This included contact details for the local authority safeguarding team, social services and other agencies including the Care Quality Commission.

The principal dentist was the point of referral should members of staff encounter a child or adult safeguarding issue. Training records showed staff had received appropriate safeguarding training for both vulnerable adults and children. All staff had been trained to Level two in child safeguarding. The practice reported there had been no safeguarding incidents that required further investigation by appropriate authorities.

Staff demonstrated knowledge of the whistleblowing policy and were confident they would raise a concern about another staff member's performance if it was necessary.

Are services safe?

Staff files contained evidence of immunisation as recommended by Public Health England (PHE). For example, against Hepatitis B (a virus contracted through bodily fluids such as; blood and saliva). Staff 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 blood borne infections. One member of staff was awaiting a booked occupational health appointment for checking immunity. There were adequate supplies of personal protective equipment (PPE) such as face visors, gloves and aprons to ensure the safety of patients and staff.

Medical emergencies

The practice had arrangements in place to deal with medical emergencies at the practice. The practice had 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. Staff had received training in how to use this equipment.

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. The practice had access to medical oxygen along with other related items such as manual breathing aids in line with the Resuscitation Council UK guidelines. The emergency medicines and oxygen we saw were all in date and stored in a central location known to all staff.

The practice held training sessions each year for the whole team so they could maintain their competence in dealing with medical emergencies. We saw documentary evidence which demonstrated regular checks were carried out to ensure the equipment and emergency medicines were in date and safe to use. Records showed all staff had completed training in emergency resuscitation and basic life support. Staff we spoke with demonstrated they knew how to respond if a person suddenly became unwell. For example, staff explained how they dealt with a visitor who suffered from an episode of hypoglycaemia.

Staff recruitment

The practice had systems in place for the safe recruitment of staff which included seeking references, proof of identity and checking qualifications, immunisation status and professional registration. The practice had evidence of Disclosure and Barring service (DBS) checks for clinical

staff. These 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 practice had a system in place for monitoring staff had up to date medical indemnity insurance and professional registration with the General Dental Council (GDC) The GDC registers all dental care professionals to make sure they are appropriately qualified and competent to work in the United Kingdom. Records we looked at confirmed these were up to date and ongoing.

Monitoring health & safety and responding to risks

The practice had systems to monitor health and safety and deal with foreseeable emergencies. There were comprehensive health and safety policies and procedures in place to support staff, including for the risk of fire and patient safety. Records showed that fire detection and firefighting equipment such as smoke detectors and fire extinguishers were regularly checked.

The practice had a risk management process, including a detailed log of all risks identified, to ensure the safety of patients and staff members. For example, the practice had a comprehensive file relating to the Control of Substances Hazardous to Health 2002 (COSHH) regulations, including substances such as legionella, blood, saliva, acid etch gel, x-ray processing chemicals, ionising radiation and amalgam. This file contained details of the way substances and materials used in dentistry should be handled and the precautions taken to prevent harm to staff and patients.

The practice had a business continuity plan to support staff to deal with any emergencies that may occur which could disrupt the safe and smooth running of the service.

Infection control

There were effective systems in place to reduce the risk and spread of infection. There was a documented infection control policy which was reviewed and included minimising the risk of blood-borne virus transmission and the possibility of sharps injuries, decontamination of dental instruments, hand hygiene, segregation and disposal of clinical waste.

It was demonstrated through direct observation of the cleaning process and a review of practice protocols that the practice had followed the guidance about decontamination and infection control issued by the

Are services safe?

Department of Health, the 'Health Technical Memorandum 01-05 decontamination in primary care dental practices (HTM01-05).' We observed the essential quality requirements for infection control set out in HTM 01-05 were being met. We were shown the recent audit of infection control processes carried out in January 2017 which confirmed compliance with HTM 01-05 guidelines.

We saw the dental treatment room currently in use, waiting areas, reception and toilets were visibly 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 towel dispensers in each of the treatment rooms and bare below the elbow working was observed.

Each treatment room had the appropriate routine personal protective equipment available for staff use, this included protective gloves and visors.

The dental nurse we spoke with 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. They demonstrated how the working surfaces, dental unit and dental chair were decontaminated. This included the treatment of the dental water lines.

The dental water lines were maintained to prevent the growth and spread of Legionella bacteria in line with current HTM 01 05 guidelines. (Legionella is a term for particular bacteria which can contaminate water systems in buildings). We saw a Legionella risk assessment had been carried out at the practice by a competent person in July 2016. The recommended procedures contained in the report were carried out and logged appropriately. These included the monitoring of water temperatures and microbiological testing of samples of the water supply. These measures ensured patients and staff were protected from the risk of infection due to Legionella.

The practice had a separate decontamination area for instrument processing and a designated clean room for the packaging and storage of processed instruments. The dental nurse we spoke with 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 an automated washer disinfectant for the initial cleaning process, following inspection with an illuminated magnifier the instruments were placed in an autoclave (a device for sterilising dental and medical instruments). Instruments were sterilised in pouches and stored until required. All pouches were dated with an expiry date in accordance with current guidelines. We were shown the systems in place to ensure that the autoclave and washer disinfectant used in the decontamination process were working effectively. We saw that the data sheets used to record the essential daily, weekly and quarterly validation of this equipment were complete and up to date. These checks included details of the sterilisation cycles and steam penetration tests for the autoclave and the residual protein test and soil tests of the washer disinfectant.

The segregation and storage of clinical waste was in line with current guidelines laid down by the Department of Health. We observed 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. Clinical waste was stored in a locked room within the practice prior to collection by the waste contractor. Waste consignment notices were available for inspection. Patients' could be assured they were protected from the risk of infection from contaminated dental waste.

We also saw general environmental cleaning was carried out according to a cleaning plan developed by the practice. Cleaning materials and equipment were stored in accordance with current national guidelines.

Equipment and medicines

There were systems in place to check all equipment had been serviced. Records seen showed contracts were in place to ensure annual servicing and routine maintenance. Equipment checks were carried out in line with the manufacturer's recommendations. For example, the autoclave and washer disinfectant had been serviced and calibrated in January 2017. The practice X-ray machines had been serviced and calibrated as specified under current national regulations in June 2015 and were due to be serviced and calibrated again in June 2018. Portable appliance testing (PAT) had been carried out in August 2015.

The practice also dispensed their own medicines as part of a patients' dental treatment. These medicines were a range

Are services safe?

of antibiotics, the dispensing procedures were in accordance with current dispensing guidelines and medicines were stored according to manufacturer's instructions.

We observed the practice had equipment to deal with minor first aid problems such as minor eye problems and body fluid and spillage.

Radiography (X-rays)

We were shown documentation 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 three yearly maintenance logs and a copy of the local rules. The local

rules must contain the name of the appointed Radiation Protection Advisor, the identification and description of each controlled area and a summary of the arrangements for restriction access. Additionally, they must summarise the working instructions, any contingency arrangements and the dose investigation level.

We saw the quality of dental x-rays was monitored on a regular basis. Dental care records seen where X-rays had been taken showed that dental X-rays were justified, reported upon and quality assured. These findings showed the practice was acting in accordance with national radiological guidelines and patients and staff were protected from unnecessary exposure to radiation. We saw training records which showed staff, where appropriate, had received training for core radiological knowledge under IRMER 2000 Regulations

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Monitoring and improving outcomes for patients

The dentists carried out consultations, assessments and treatment in line with recognised general professional guidelines. The dentist we spoke with 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 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 then 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 discussed with the patient and treatment options explained.

Where relevant, preventative dental information was given in order to improve the outcome for the patient. This included dietary advice and general oral hygiene instruction such as tooth brushing techniques or recommended tooth care products. The patient's dental care record was updated with the proposed treatment after discussing options with the patient. A treatment plan was then 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 seen demonstrated 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. The records we saw were detailed, accurate and fit for purpose.

During the inspection we noted that the dentist used dental loupes during examinations and whilst providing treatment. Dental loupes provide a dentist with a degree of magnification which aids visual acuity and aids correct diagnosis and treatment of dental conditions.

Health promotion & prevention

The practice was very focussed on the prevention of dental disease and the maintenance of good oral health.

The dentist explained that children at high risk of tooth decay were identified and were offered fluoride varnish applications or the prescription of high concentrated fluoride tooth paste to keep their teeth in a healthy condition. Other preventative advice included tooth brushing techniques 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 about prevention of dental decay, known as 'Delivering Better Oral Health'. (Delivering Better Oral Health' is an evidence based toolkit to support dental teams in improving their patient's oral and general health published by Public Health England).

Dental care records we observed demonstrated the dentist had given oral health advice to patients. The practice also sold a range of dental hygiene products to maintain healthy teeth and gums; these were available in the reception area.

The waiting room and reception area at the practice contained leaflets that explained the services offered at the practice. This included information about how to carry out effective dental hygiene and how to reduce the risk of poor dental health. There was information about making patients aware of the early detection of oral cancer.

Patients reported they felt well informed about their dental care and treatment pertaining to the health of their teeth and dental needs.

Staffing

We observed a friendly atmosphere at the practice. All clinical staff had current registration with their professional body, the General Dental Council (GDC).

The practice had one principal dentist who was supported by two dental nurses who covered reception and decontamination duties.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

We were shown evidence of completed training carried out. A record of all training completed by staff was available in staff files. Training was individual to their identified development needs to ensure they had the right skills to carry out their work. Mandatory training included basic life support and infection prevention and control.

Staff had access to policies which contained information that further supported them in the workplace. All clinical staff were required to maintain an on-going programme of continuing professional development as part of their registration with the GDC. Records showed professional registration and professional indemnity was up to date for all staff.

Staff we spoke with told us they had accessed specific training in the last six months in line with their professional needs and we saw evidence to support this.

Working with other services

The dentist could refer patients to a range of specialists in primary and secondary services if the treatment required was not provided by them. The dentist used referral criteria and referral forms developed by other primary and secondary care providers such as oral surgery, special care dentistry and orthodontic providers.

Consent to care and treatment

We spoke with the principal dentist about how they implemented the principles of informed consent; they 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 a written treatment plan. They stressed the

importance of communication skills when explaining care and treatment to patients to help ensure they understood their treatment options. The dentist told us patients should be given time to think about the treatment options presented to them and explained that in certain situations patients would be brought back to the practice to discuss complex treatment options. This process made it clear that a patient could withdraw consent at any time.

The dentist explained how they would obtain consent from a patient who suffered with any cognitive impairment that may mean they might be unable to fully understand the implications of their treatment. If there was any doubt about their ability to understand or consent to the treatment, then treatment would be postponed. They went on to say they would involve relatives and carers if appropriate to ensure the best interests of the patient were served as part of the process. This followed the guidelines of the Mental Capacity Act 2005. Staff were familiar with the concept of Gillick competence in respect of the care and treatment of children under 16 years. 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.

The practice consent policy provided staff with guidance and information about when consent was required and how it should be recorded.

We reviewed dental care records to corroborate our information. Feedback in CQC comment cards confirmed patients were provided with sufficient information to make decisions about the treatment they received.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Respect, dignity, compassion & empathy

We obtained the views of two patients on the day of our visit. These provided a positive view of the service the practice provided. During the inspection, we observed staff in the reception area, they were polite and helpful towards patients and the general atmosphere was welcoming and friendly. Patients commented they were treated with respect and dignity and that staff were friendly and reassuring. We observed positive interactions between staff and patients during the inspection.

Treatment rooms were situated away from the main waiting areas and we saw doors were always closed when patients were receiving or discussing treatment during consultations. Conversations between patients and dentists could not be heard from outside the treatment rooms which protected patients' privacy. 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 a secure room not accessible by the public. 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.

During the inspection, we observed staff in the reception area were polite and helpful towards patients and that the general atmosphere was welcoming and friendly.

The provider told us they would act upon any concerns raised by patients regarding their experience of attending the practice.

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 costs was displayed in the waiting area.

The dentist we spoke with paid attention to patient involvement when drawing up individual care plans. We saw evidence in the records we looked at that the dentist recorded the information they had provided to patients about their treatment and the options open to them.

Patients were given time to consider options before returning to have their treatment. Patients signed their treatment plan before treatment began.

The practice provided patients with information to enable them to make informed choices. Patients commented they felt fully involved in making decisions about their treatment, were at ease speaking with the dentist and felt listened to and respected.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting patients' needs

The practice provided patients with information about the services they offered in the practice leaflet.

Patients' feedback demonstrated they had flexibility and choice to arrange appointments in line with other commitments. Patients booked in with the receptionist on arrival and they kept patients informed if there were any delays to appointment times.

During our inspection, we looked at examples of information available to patients. We saw the practice waiting area displayed a variety of information. These explained opening hours, emergency 'out of hours' contact details, arrangements about how to make a complaint, provide feedback about services and information about maintaining good oral health. We observed the appointment diaries were not overbooked and that this provided capacity each day for patients with dental pain to be fitted into urgent slots for the dentist.

The dentist decided how long a patient's appointment needed to be and considered any special circumstances such as whether a patient was very nervous, had an impairment and the level of complexity of treatment.

Tackling inequity and promoting equality

The practice had made reasonable adjustments as far as possible, to help prevent inequity for patients that experienced limited mobility or other barriers which may hamper them from accessing services. However, the practice is situated above shops, accessed via external steps only and is not accessible to persons using a wheelchair or with significant mobility difficulties. It is not possible to install a stair or shaft lift to the premises. The practice had made alternative arrangements for these patients to be seen in other services.

The practice had only treated a few patients whose first language was not English but if it became clear that a patient had difficulty in understanding information about their treatment, they could access internet based interpreter services.

The practice had a portable 'hearing loop' which would assist patients with hearing issues.

Access to the service

The practice displayed its opening hours in the practice leaflet.

The practice opens 9am to 1pm and 2pm to 5.30pm Monday to Thursday and 9am to 1pm and 2pm to 5pm on a Friday.

There were arrangements in place to ensure patients received urgent dental assistance when the practice was closed. This was provided by an out-of-hours service. The number was available on the practice leaflet and answerphone.

The 36 CQC comment cards seen reflected patients felt they had good access to the service and appointments were flexible to meet their needs.

Concerns & complaints

The practice had a complaint policy which provided staff with clear guidance about how to handle a complaint. The policy explained the process to follow, and included other agencies to contact if the complaint was not resolved to the patients satisfaction. This included the Dental Complaints Service. Staff told us if they raised any formal or informal comments or concerns with the practice manager they ensured these were responded to appropriately and in a timely manner.

The practice had received one written complaint in the last 12 months. We looked at the practice procedure for acknowledging, recording, investigating and responding to complaints, concerns and suggestions made by patients.

We found there was a system in place which ensured a timely response, sought to address the concerns promptly and efficiently and effect a satisfactory outcome for the patient. The principal dentist and dental nurse told us that complaints made would be investigated and the outcome discussed amongst the team and implemented for the safety and well-being of patients.

Are services well-led?

Our findings

Governance arrangements

The practice had governance arrangements in place to ensure risks were identified, understood and managed appropriately. The governance arrangements were managed by the principal dentist and dental nurse who were responsible for the day to day running of the practice. The practice maintained a comprehensive system of policies and procedures.

We saw risk assessments and the control measures in place to manage those risks, for example infection control and substances hazardous to health. Staff we spoke with were aware of their roles and responsibilities within the practice.

Health and safety and risk management policies were in place including processes to ensure the safety of patients and staff members. We saw risk assessments and the control measures in place to manage those risks for example, use of equipment and infection control. Lead roles, for example in infection control, supported the practice to identify and manage risks and helped ensure information was shared with all team members.

There were relevant policies and procedures in place to govern activity. There was a full range of policies and procedures in use at the practice and accessible to staff on the practice computers and in paper files. Staff were aware of the policies and procedures and acted in line with them.

These included guidance about confidentiality, record keeping, inoculation injuries and patient safety. There was a clear process in place to ensure all policies and procedures were reviewed as required to support the safe running of the service. The practice had begun a regular programme of meetings covering a wide range of topics areas. Time was also provided for educational activity. Notes and actions were written up as appropriate.

Leadership, openness and transparency

Effective leadership was provided by the principal dentist. The practice ethos focussed on providing patient centred dental care in a relaxed and friendly environment. The comment cards seen and the patients we spoke with reflected this approach. 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 principal dentist.

There was a no blame culture within the practice. They felt they were listened to and responded to when they did raise a concern. All the staff we spoke with demonstrated a firm understanding of the principles of clinical governance in dentistry and were happy with the practice facilities. Staff were motivated and enjoyed working at the practice and were proud of the service they provided to patients.

The practice had a statement of purpose that described their vision, aims and objectives.

We observed and staff told us the practice was a relaxed and friendly environment to work in and they enjoyed coming to work at the practice. Staff felt well supported by the principal dentist and the dental nurse / practice manager and worked as a team toward the common goal of delivering high quality care and treatment.

The service was aware of and complied with the requirements of the Duty of Candour. Patients were told when they were affected by something that went wrong, given an apology and informed of any actions taken as a result.

Learning and improvement

We found there was a rolling programme of clinical and non-clinical audits taking place at the practice. These included infection control; X-ray quality and the quality of clinical record keeping. The audits demonstrated a process where the practice had analysed the results to discuss and identify where improvement actions may be needed.

The practice had a clear understanding of the need to ensure staff had access to learning and improvement opportunities. Staff working at the practice were supported to maintain their continuing professional development as required by the General Dental Council. Records showed professional registrations were up to date for all staff and there was evidence continuing professional development had taken place.

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

The practice had systems in place to seek and act upon feedback from patients using the service.

The practice gathered feedback from patients through feedback forms located in the waiting area and results of a recent survey were all positive.