

Whitecross Dental Care Limited

Kingsbridge Dental Centre

Inspection Report

Ilbert Road
Kingsbridge
Devon
TQ7 1HQ
Tel: 01548 854216
Website: www.mydentist.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 8 August 2016
Date of publication: 04/10/2016

Overall summary

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection on 8 August 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

Kingsbridge Dental Centre is located in the market town of Kingsbridge, Devon. The practice provides primary dental care services for people who require dental procedures. The practice provides NHS dental treatment. There are four dental surgeries (one is situated on the ground floor and three are on the first floor). There are steps to the practice from the street and ramp access for people with mobility restrictions. Approximately 6,300 patients are registered at the practice; with patients travelling from nearby towns and villages to register and be seen at the practice. The majority of patients are adults.

The staff structure of the practice consists of a practice manager, four dentists, four reception staff, two dental nurses and two dental nurse trainees.

The practice is open from Monday to Friday from 9 am to 5.30pm. There are surgeries on Saturday mornings approximately once per month. There is an answer phone message directing patients to emergency contact numbers when the practice is closed.

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

The inspection took place over one day and was carried out by a CQC inspector and a dentist Specialist Advisor.

Thirty five patients provided feedback directly to CQC about the service. All thirty five patients were positive about the care they received from the practice. They were complimentary about the friendly, professional and caring attitude of the dental staff and the dental treatment they had received.

Our key findings were:

- There were effective systems in place for the decontamination and sterilisation of dental instruments to reduce and minimise the risk and spread of infection.
- There was a lead staff member for safeguarding patients. All staff understood their responsibilities for safeguarding adults and children living in vulnerable circumstances.
- Equipment, such as the air compressor, autoclave (steriliser), fire extinguishers, and X-ray equipment had all been checked for effectiveness and had been regularly serviced.
- Patients indicated that they felt they were listened to and that they received good care from the practice team.
- The practice had implemented clear procedures for managing comments, concerns or complaints.
- Patients could access treatment and urgent and emergency care when required.
- Patients could book appointments up to 12 months in advance.
- Appointment text/phone reminders were available on request 48 hours prior to appointments.

- Oral health initiatives took place; there was a dedicated 'kids club' held three monthly at the practice for children and their parents on oral health and decay prevention in teeth.
- The provider had a clear vision for the practice and staff told us they were well supported by the management team.
- Staff had been trained to handle emergencies and appropriate medicines and life-saving equipment was readily available in accordance with current guidelines.
- The practice appeared clean and well maintained.
- The service was aware of the needs of the local population and took these into account in how the practice was run.
- Staff received training appropriate to their roles and were supported in their continued professional development by the management team.
- Staff we spoke to felt supported by the management team and were committed to providing a quality service to their patients.

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

- Review the practice's recruitment policy and procedures with regard to the implementation of risk assessments when requests for references are not forthcoming.
- Review the storage of general cleaning materials to ensure the risk of cross infection is minimised at the practice.
- Develop systems to publicise the action taken by the practice as a result of patient feedback.

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

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

The practice had systems in place to minimise the risks associated with providing dental services. The practice had policies and protocols, which staff followed, for the management of medical emergencies. There were systems in place for identifying, investigating and learning from incidents relating to the safety of patients and staff members.

Staff had good awareness of safeguarding issues, which were informed by and supported by practice policies. There was an annual training plan to ensure staff training in safeguarding was appropriately maintained. Infection control processes in clinical areas were safely managed. General cleaning materials storage was disorganised. Equipment used in the practice was checked for effectiveness. Staff recruitment was not consistently robust.

No action



Are services effective?

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

The practice provided evidence-based care in accordance with relevant, published guidance, for example, from the General Dental Council (GDC). The practice monitored patients' oral health and gave appropriate health promotion advice.

Staff explained treatment options to ensure that patients could make informed decisions about any treatment. The practice worked well with other providers and followed up on the outcomes of referrals made to other providers.

Staff engaged in continuous professional development (CPD) and were meeting the training requirements of the General Dental Council (GDC). New staff received an induction and engaged in a probationary process to review their performance and understand their training needs.

No action



Are services caring?

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

We received positive feedback from 35 patients. The practice also received patient feedback via internal surveys and comments made directly to the practice. Feedback was consistently positive. Patient survey results were complimentary about the practice staff and treatment received. Patient survey results said that the staff were kind and caring and that patients were treated with dignity and respect at all times.

We found that dental care records were stored securely. Privacy within conversations when speaking with reception staff was difficult to maintain in the small reception/waiting area.

No action



Are services responsive to people's needs?

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

No action



Summary of findings

Patients had good access to appointments, including emergency appointments, which were available on the same day.

There was a complaints policy in place. Complaints were addressed in a timely way and resolutions aimed to the satisfaction of the complainant. Systems were in place for receiving more general feedback from patients, with a view to improving the quality of the service. This included patient testimonials directly provided to the practice, practice surveys and the use of the NHS choices website. Systems had not been developed to publicise responses from the practice about what had been done as a result of patient feedback.

The culture of the practice promoted equality of access for all. The practice staff told us that if patients visited with support dogs, for assistance with a visual or a hearing impairment, the dogs would be welcomed. The facilities for people with limited mobility had been considered and there was a ground floor consulting room. However, there were no toilet facilities suitable for wheelchair users at the practice.

Are services well-led?

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

The practice had clinical governance and risk-management structures in place. Staff described an open and transparent culture where they were comfortable raising and discussing concerns with the management team. They were confident in the abilities of the managers to address any issues as they arose.

No action



Kingsbridge Dental Centre

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.

We carried out an announced, comprehensive inspection on 8 August 2016. The inspection was led by a CQC inspector who was accompanied by a dentist Specialist Advisor.

We reviewed information received from the provider prior to the inspection. During our inspection we reviewed policy documents and spoke with 11 members of staff (the provider's regulatory office, the practice manager, three dentists, two dental nurses, one trainee dental nurse and two receptionists). We conducted a tour of the practice and looked at the storage arrangements for emergency medicines and equipment. A dental nurse demonstrated how they carried out decontamination procedures of dental instruments.

Thirty five patients provided feedback about the service (27 CQC patients comment cards and interviews with eight patients). We also looked at written comments about the practice in the practice comments book and comments left about patient experiences on-line via NHS choices and the practice website. Patients were positive about the care they received from the practice. They were complimentary about the friendly, professional and caring attitude of the dental staff. Patients commented that they were likely to recommend 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

There was a system in place for reporting and learning from incidents. There had been no significant events related to patients in the past year.

We discussed the investigation of incidents with the management team. They confirmed that if patients were affected by something that went wrong, they were given an apology and informed of any actions taken as a result. Practice staff were aware of their responsibilities under the Duty of Candour. There was a poster publicising staff responsibilities under the Duty of Candour in the staff room.

Staff understood the process for accident and incident reporting including the Reporting of Injuries, Diseases and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations 2013 (RIDDOR). There had not been any such incidents in the past 12 months.

Whole staff team meetings were held at least monthly and there were daily team briefs before the practice opened. Team meetings were recorded and we looked at a sample of team meeting minutes. We saw that it was not always clear in records when actions resulting from team meetings had been addressed and signed off as closed. The practice manager took immediate action to address this by amending the record template for future staff meetings to show when actions were closed.

Reliable safety systems and processes (including safeguarding)

The practice manager was the named practice lead for child and adult safeguarding. They were able to describe the types of behaviour a child might display that would alert them to possible signs of abuse or neglect. They also had a good awareness of the issues around vulnerable elderly patients who presented with dementia.

The practice had a safeguarding policy reviewed in the last 12 months. The policy referred to national and local guidance. Information about the local authority contacts for safeguarding concerns was displayed in the staff room. The staff we spoke with were aware of the location of this information. There was evidence in staff files showing that all staff had been trained in safeguarding adults and

children to level two. The management team were aware of the recommendation that safeguarding leads be trained to level three and told us this had been discussed within the organisation with a view to arranging future training.

The practice had carried out a range of risk assessments and implemented policies and protocols with a view to keeping staff and patients safe. For example, we asked staff about the prevention of needle stick injuries. The practice had a current policy on the re-sheathing of needles, giving due regard to the Health and Safety (Sharp Instruments in Healthcare) Regulations 2013. Staff were aware of the contents of this policy. The staff we spoke with demonstrated a clear understanding of the practice policy and protocol with respect to handling sharps and needle stick injuries.

The practice followed other national guidelines on patient safety. For example, one of the dentists told us about how they used a rubber dam for root canal treatments in line with guidance from the British Endodontic Society. (A rubber dam is a thin, rectangular sheet, usually latex rubber, used in dentistry to isolate the operative site from the rest of the mouth). The other two dentists were aware of the availability of rubber dams in the practice, but said they used it very irregularly in their practice due to the type of work they carried out.

Medical emergencies

The practice had arrangements in place to deal with medical emergencies. The practice had an oxygen cylinder, and other related items, such as manual breathing aids and portable suction in line with the Resuscitation Council UK guidelines. An automated external defibrillator (AED) was situated in with the emergency equipment in an area accessible only to staff. This was available for the dental staff to use; the staff were aware of its location and how to use it. (An AED is a portable electronic device that analyses life threatening irregularities of the heart and delivers an electrical shock to attempt to restore a normal heart rhythm).

The practice held emergency medicines in line with guidance issued by the British National Formulary for dealing with common medical emergencies in a dental practice. The emergency medicines were all in date and stored securely with emergency oxygen in a location known to all staff.



Are services safe?

Staff received annual training in using the emergency equipment. The staff we spoke with were all aware of the location of the emergency equipment. This equipment was checked for safe use each day the practice was open.

Staff recruitment

The staff structure of the practice consisted of two full time and two part time dentists. There was a practice manager, two dental nurses, two trainee dental nurses and four receptionists.

Many of the staff had been in post for a number of years. There was a recruitment policy in place which stated that all relevant checks would be carried out to confirm that any person being recruited was suitable for the role. This included the use of an application form, interview, review of employment history, evidence of relevant qualifications, the checking of references and a check of registration with the General Dental Council.

It was practice policy to carry out a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check for all members of staff prior to employment and periodically thereafter. We saw evidence that all members of staff had a DBS check. (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). We looked at two staff files. One file had no references, despite reference requests being sought and additional reminders sent to the referees. We spoke with the management team who told us they would arrange to implement a risk assessment in instances when references could not be obtained.

Monitoring health & safety and responding to risks

There were arrangements in place to deal with foreseeable emergencies. We saw that there was a health and safety policy in place. The practice had considered the risk of fire, had clearly marked exits and an evacuation plan. There were also fire extinguishers situated at suitable points in the premises. The practice carried out fire drills. The last was carried out during June 2016. A record had been completed of an assessment of the effectiveness of the fire drill and shared with the whole staff team.

There were arrangements in place to meet the Control of Substances Hazardous to Health 2002 (COSHH) regulations. There was a COSHH file where risks to patients, staff and visitors associated with hazardous substances were identified. COSHH products were securely stored.

The practice had a system in place for receiving and responding to 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). Relevant alerts were discussed during monthly staff meetings which facilitated shared learning. Practice staff were able to cite a recent example for action regarding discussion of a blood thinning medicine with patients when completing their medical history forms and presenting for treatment.

Infection control

There were effective systems in place to reduce the risk and spread of infection within the practice. There was an infection control policy, which included the decontamination of dental instruments, hand hygiene, use of protective equipment, and the segregation and disposal of clinical waste. The lead infection control nurse carried out bi-annual audits of infection control processes at the practice using a recognised industry assessment tool. This had last been done on 26 July 2016.

We observed that the premises appeared clean, tidy and clutter free. Clear zoning demarked clean from dirty areas in all of the treatment and decontamination rooms. Hand-washing facilities were available, including wall-mounted liquid soap, hand gels and paper towels in each of the treatment and decontamination rooms.

We asked a dental nurse to describe to us the end-to-end process of infection control procedures at the practice. The protocols described demonstrated that the practice had followed the guidance on decontamination and infection control issued by the Department of Health, namely 'Health Technical Memorandum 01-05 - Decontamination in primary care dental practices (HTM 01-05)'.

The dental nurse showed us the decontamination and sterilisation of instruments. There was a dedicated decontamination room in the practice. The dental nurse described the process they followed to ensure that the working surfaces, dental units and dental chairs were decontaminated. This included the treatment of the dental water lines.



Are services safe?

Environmental cleaning was carried out in accordance with the national colour coding scheme by the cleaning staff employed to work throughout the building. However, the equipment storage area was disorganised and there was risk of cross contamination from used to clean equipment in the storage area. The practice manager took immediate action to remove items that may have been contaminated and told us they would arrange for alternative storage facilities for general cleaning equipment. They also said they would implement a system for monitoring the storage of equipment within.

We checked the contents of the drawers in one of the treatment rooms. These were well stocked, clean, ordered and free from clutter. All of the instruments were pouched. Each treatment room had the appropriate personal protective equipment, such as gloves and aprons, available for staff and patient use.

Instruments were cleaned using a washer disinfectant then inspected under a light magnification device and then placed in an autoclave (steriliser). When instruments had been sterilised, they were pouched and stored appropriately until required. Pouches were dated with a date of sterilisation and an expiry date in accordance with HTM 01-05.

The practice carried out checks of the autoclave to assure that it was working effectively. Twice daily checks when the practice was open included the automatic control test and steam penetration test. A log book was used to record the essential daily validation checks of the sterilisation cycles.

The segregation and storage of dental 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. The practice used a contractor to remove dental waste from the practice. Waste was stored in a separate, locked location at the practice premises prior to collection by the contractor. Waste consignment notices were available for inspection.

Staff files showed that staff regularly attended training courses in infection control. Clinical staff were also required to produce evidence to show that they had been effectively vaccinated against Hepatitis B to prevent the spread of infection between staff and patients. (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 blood borne infections.)

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). The practice manager described the method they used which was in line with current HTM 01-05 guidelines. A Legionella risk assessment had most recently been carried out by an external contractor in February 2016. The practice was following recommendations to reduce the risk of Legionella, for example, through the regular testing of the water temperatures. A record had been kept of the outcome of these checks on a monthly basis.

Equipment and medicines

We found that the equipment used at the practice was regularly serviced and well maintained. For example, we saw documents showing that the air compressor, fire equipment and X-ray equipment had all been inspected and serviced. Certificates for pressure equipment had been issued in accordance with the Pressure Systems Safety Regulations 2000. Portable appliance testing (PAT) had been completed in accordance with current guidance in May 2016. PAT is the name of a process during which electrical appliances are routinely checked for safety every two years as a minimum.

The expiry dates of medicines, oxygen and equipment were monitored using daily, weekly and monthly check sheets to support staff to replace out-of-date medicines and equipment promptly.

Radiography (X-rays)

There was a radiation protection file, which was in the process of being completed at the time of the inspection, in line with the Ionising Radiation Regulations (IRR) 1999 and Ionising Radiation (Medical Exposure) Regulations 2000 (IRMER). This file contained the names of the Radiation Protection Advisor and the Radiation Protection Supervisor as well as the documentation pertaining to the maintenance of the X-ray equipment. We saw that the X-ray equipment had been serviced in December 2015, within the three yearly recommended maintenance cycle.

We saw evidence that the dentists had completed radiation training in line with the IRMER regulations.



Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Monitoring and improving outcomes for patients

Dentists and hygienists carried out consultations, assessments and treatment in line with recognised general professional guidelines and General Dental Council (GDC) guidelines. We spoke with three dentists and asked them to describe to us how they carried out their assessments. The assessment began with the patient completing a medical history update covering any health conditions, medicines being taken and any allergies suffered. We saw patients being asked to complete a medical history when they booked in for their appointment to give to the dentist. 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.

We spoke with the dentists about National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidance. Patients were recalled for check up on an individual risk assessed basis from the dentists (or sooner on the patient request). One dentist also gave an example that they would consider the prescribing of prophylactic antibiotics prior to providing invasive treatment for patients with cardiac conditions if a patient insisted. However, all dentists stated that they would liaise with a patient's GP if they required further information or had any concerns about a patient's medical condition. We raised the responses from the dentists with the practice manager. They told us that they would arrange for a clinical training session for the dentists on NICE guidance on patient recall and antibiotic prescribing and wisdom tooth removal.

The patient's dental care record was updated with the proposed treatment after discussing options with the patient. Treatment plans were printed for each patient on request, which included information about the costs involved whether NHS or referral to private treatment. Patients were referred to the practice information leaflet, or website for cost information on routine treatments. Patients were monitored through follow-up appointments and these were scheduled in line with their individual requirements.

We checked a sample of dental records.. These 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 and soft tissues lining the mouth were noted using the basic periodontal examination (BPE) scores. (The BPE is a simple and rapid screening tool that is used to indicate the level of examination needed and to provide basic guidance on treatment need). These were carried out, where appropriate, during a dental health assessment. We noted that radiographs were not always correctly orientated in the storage wallets which could potentially lead to incorrect treatment.

Health promotion & prevention

The practice promoted the maintenance of good oral health through the use of health promotion and disease prevention strategies. Dentists told us they discussed oral health with their patients, for example, around effective tooth brushing. They were aware of the need to discuss a general preventive agenda with their patients. They told us they held discussion with their patients, where appropriate, around smoking cessation, sensible alcohol use and diet. The dentists also carried out examinations to check for the early signs of oral cancer.

We observed that there were health promotion materials displayed in the reception area. These could be used to support patient's understanding of how to prevent gum disease and how to maintain their teeth in good condition.

Oral health initiatives took place. For example, there was a dedicated 'kids club' held on Saturdays three monthly at the practice for children and their parents. The club focused on oral health and decay prevention in children's teeth.

Staffing

Staff told us they received appropriate professional development and training. We checked the staff recruitment files and saw that this was the case. The training covered the mandatory requirements for registration issued by the General Dental Council. This included responding to emergencies, safeguarding, infection control and X-ray training.

There was a written induction programme for new staff to follow and evidence in the staff files that this had been used at the time of their employment.

Many of the staff employed had worked at the practice for a number of years. Staff told us that the management team



Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

was supportive and invested in their staff through regular training opportunities to promote clinical excellence at the practice. Some staff felt that on occasions there was potential for work overload. We discussed this with the practice manager who was open to discussing delegated responsibilities across the whole staff team.

Working with other services

The practice had suitable arrangements in place for working with other health professionals to ensure quality of care for their patients.

Staff at the practice explained how they worked with other services, when required. The dentists were able to refer patients to a range of specialists in primary and secondary care if the treatment required was not provided by the practice. For example, the practice made referrals to other specialists for orthodontic work.

We reviewed the systems for referring patients to specialist consultants in secondary care. A referral letter was prepared and sent with full details of the dentist's findings and a copy was stored on the practices' records system. We looked at three examples of referral letters. These were comprehensively completed and referrals took place in a timely way to avoid delay to treatment. The receptionist kept an electronic record noting the dates when referrals were made, when the appointment had been completed and further actions required for follow up.

Consent to care and treatment

The practice ensured valid consent was obtained for all care and treatment. We spoke to the dentists about their understanding of consent issues. They explained that individual treatment options, risks, benefits and costs were discussed with each patient. We saw that the practice recorded consent to care and treatment in the patients records. We looked at eight patient record cards and saw that the patients had signed the relevant forms consenting to care and treatment and were provided with written treatment plans detailing relevant costs.

All of the staff were aware of the Mental Capacity Act 2005. (The Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA) provides a legal framework for health and care professionals to act and make decisions on behalf of adults who lack the capacity to make particular decisions for themselves). Clinical staff had completed formal training in relation to the MCA in 2015. The dentists could describe scenarios for how they would manage a patient who lacked the capacity to consent to dental treatment. They noted that they would involve the patient's family, check for appropriate lasting power of attorney authorisation to act on a person's behalf, along with other professionals involved in the care of the patient, to ensure that the best interests of the patient were met.



Are services caring?

Our findings

Respect, dignity, compassion & empathy

The 27 comments cards we received, all made positive remarks about the staff's caring, professional and helpful attitude. We spoke with a further eight patients who indicated that they felt comfortable and relaxed with their dentist and that they were made to feel at ease during consultations and treatments. We also observed staff were welcoming and helpful when patients arrived for their appointment or made enquiries over the phone.

Staff were aware of the importance of protecting patients' privacy and dignity. The treatment rooms were situated away from the main waiting area and we saw that doors were closed at all times when patients were having treatment. Conversations between patients and the dentists could not be heard from outside the rooms, which protected patients' privacy. The reception/waiting area was small and we observed it offered little opportunity for privacy. Conversations between patient and receptionist could be overheard. Staff told us patients could be offered the use of a private room in the practice for confidential conversations. There was no notice in the reception to this effect. We spoke with the practice manager who took immediate action to place a notice offering patients a private space for confidential conversations in the practice.

Staff understood the importance of data protection and confidentiality and had received training in information governance. Patients' dental care records were stored in a paper format securely together with the radiographs. There were also electronic records of charting. Computers were password protected and regularly backed up.

Involvement in decisions about care and treatment

The practice detailed information about services on the practice website. This gave details of the range of services available, dental charges or fees. A poster detailing NHS treatment costs was displayed in the waiting area.

We spoke with 11 staff on duty on the day of our inspection. All of these staff told us they worked towards providing clear explanations about treatment and prevention strategies. We saw evidence in the records 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.

The patient feedback we received on the day of the inspection, confirmed that patients felt appropriately involved in the planning of their treatment and were satisfied with the descriptions given by staff.



Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting patients' needs

The practice had a system in place to schedule enough time to assess and meet patients' dental needs. The dentists decided on the length of time needed for their patient's consultation and treatment according to patient need. Same day urgent appointments were scheduled for patients registered with the practice. The feedback we received from patients indicated that they felt they had enough time with the dentist and were not rushed.

Staff told us that patients could book an appointment in good time to see the dentist. The feedback we received from patients confirmed that they could get an appointment when they needed one, and that this included good access to emergency appointments on the day that they needed to be seen.

During our inspection we looked at examples of information available to people. The practice website contained a variety of information, including opening hours and costs. There was also a printed patient information leaflet at the practice.

Tackling inequity and promoting equality

The practice had recognised the needs of different groups in the planning of its service. There was an equality and diversity policy for staff to refer to. Staff told us they treated everybody equally and welcomed patients from a range of different backgrounds, cultures and religions. There was a hearing loop for patients with hearing aids. Reception staff told us they provided written information for people who were hard of hearing and translation services were available for patients speaking English as a second language. There were both female and male dentists to facilitate requests for same gender examinations or treatment.

Patients who used a wheelchair could access the practice from the ramp access and there was a ground floor

treatment room. The patient toilet facility was not wheelchair accessible however. Staff told us that there were accessible public facilities in a nearby car park, however one person told us this was a 10 minute walk away. The seating in the waiting area provided arms for people who needed these to assist them in rising from their seat. We saw one patient with restricted mobility being offered their consultation in the ground floor treatment room, which they accepted.

Access to the service

The practice opening hours were Monday to Friday from 9 am to 5.30pm. There were surgeries on Saturday mornings approximately once per month. There was an answer phone message directing patients to emergency contact numbers when the practice is closed.

The receptionists told us that patients, who needed to be seen urgently, for example, because they were experiencing dental pain, were seen on the same day that they alerted the practice of their concerns. The feedback we received via comments cards confirmed that patients had good access to the dentist in the event of needing emergency treatment.

Concerns & complaints

Information about how to make a complaint was displayed in the reception area. There was a formal complaints policy describing how the practice handled formal and informal complaints from patients. There had been one complaint recorded during 2016 regarding fees. We looked at this complaint. It was handled in a timely way following the provider's complaints procedure.

Patients were also invited to give feedback through patient surveys and the NHS choices site. Patients could choose to remain anonymous. There were not systems in place to publicise the action taken by the practice as a result of patient feedback. The practice manager said that they would arrange to display results from patient surveys in the practice waiting area.



Are services well-led?

Our findings

Governance arrangements

The practice had governance arrangements and a management structure. The governance arrangements for this location were overseen by the practice manager who was responsible for

the day to day running of the practice. They were supported by the group's regulatory officer and group senior management team. There were relevant policies and procedures in place. Staff were aware of these and acted in line with them. There were arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks through the use of risk assessment processes.

Regular staff meetings took place at the practice with records maintained of all staff meetings. Minutes from staff meetings were circulated via a staff communication board.

The practice manager told us about the governance structures and protocols at the practice. A systematic process of induction and staff training was in place which ensured that staff were aware of, and were following, the governance procedures.

Leadership, openness and transparency

The staff we spoke with described a transparent culture which encouraged candour, openness and honesty. Staff said that they felt comfortable about raising concerns with the practice manager. They felt they were listened to and responded to when they did so.

We found staff to be dedicated in their roles and caring towards the patients. We found the dentists provided effective clinical leadership to the dental team.

Staff told us they enjoyed their work and were supported by the senior managers. All staff had received a documented appraisal in the last 12 months. The practice manager told us that staff appraisals took place on a rolling six monthly schedule, with all staff receiving a mid-year and end of year appraisal.

Learning and improvement

The management had a clear vision for the practice which included plans for improving the premises and equipment. For example, there was an upgrade plan for the premises decoration and refurbishment.

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. The annual X-ray audit was in the process of being completed. There was evidence of repeat audits at appropriate intervals and these reflected standards and improvements were being maintained. For example, twice yearly infection control and record keeping audits.

Staff were being supported to meet their professional standards and complete continuing professional development (CPD) standards set by the General Dental Council (GDC). We saw evidence that the clinical staff were working towards completing the required number of CPD hours to maintain their professional development in line with requirements set by the GDC. Training was completed through a variety of resources including the attendance at face to face and online courses. Staff were given time to undertake training which would increase their knowledge of their role.

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

The practice gathered feedback from patients through the use of patient surveys. In the previous month 19 patients had taken part in a survey. Questions included how likely patients were to recommend the practice and whether they thought treatment options were communicated clearly to them. Results showed the practice was performing well and better than most other practices nationally owned by the provider.

Staff told us that the management team were open to feedback regarding the quality of the care. All staff were aware of the practice whistleblowing policy and felt they could raise concerns, which would be acted upon by the practice manager or senior management team.