

Rise Park Dental Practice Limited

Rise Park Dental Practice

Inspection Report

257 Brownlow Drive
Nottingham
Nottinghamshire
NG5 5DF
Tel: 0115 9751635
Website:

Date of inspection visit: 19 October 2016
Date of publication: 28/11/2016

Overall summary

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection on 19 October 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

The practice is located on the ground floor of premises in the rise Park area of Nottingham. The practice provides a mixture of NHS and private dental treatments (50/50). There are a number of free car parks. There are four treatment rooms all of which are located on the ground floor.

The practice provides regulated dental services to both adults and children. Services provided include general dentistry, dental hygiene, crowns and bridges, and root canal treatment.

The practice's opening hours are – Monday to Friday: 9 am to 5:30 pm.

Access for urgent treatment outside of opening hours is by telephoning the practice and following the instructions on the answerphone message or by telephoning the 111 NHS service.

The principal dentist is the registered manager. A registered manager is a person who is registered with the Care Quality Commission to manage the service. Like registered providers, they are 'registered persons'. Registered persons have legal responsibility for meeting the requirements in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 and associated Regulations about how the practice is run.

The practice has seven dentists; one dental hygienist; seven qualified dental nurses; Dental nurses also worked on the reception desk when required.

Summary of findings

Before the inspection we sent Care Quality Commission comments cards to the practice for patients to complete to tell us about their experience of the practice and during the inspection we spoke with patients. We received feedback from 29 patients who provided a positive view of the services the practice provides. All of the patients commented that the quality of care was good.

Our key findings were:

- The premises were visibly clean and there were systems and processes in place to maintain the cleanliness.
- Records showed there were sufficient numbers of suitably qualified staff to meet the needs of patients.
- Patients commented they had no problem getting an appointment that suited their needs.
- Patients were able to access emergency treatment when they were in pain.
- Patients provided positive feedback about their experiences at the practice. Patients said they were treated with dignity and respect; and the dentist involved them in discussions about treatment options and answered questions.
- Patients' confidentiality was protected.
- There were systems to record accidents, significant events and complaints, and where learning points were identified these were shared with staff.
- The records showed that apologies had been given for any concerns or upset that patients had experienced at the practice.
- Dentists were not always using rubber dams when completing root canal treatments, and did not always record this in the dental care records.
- The practice mostly followed the relevant guidance from the Department of Health's: 'Health Technical

Memorandum 01-05 (HTM 01-05) for infection control with regard to cleaning and sterilizing dental instruments. However regular six monthly infection control audits had not been completed and monitoring of the water temperature during manual cleaning of dental instruments.

- There was a whistleblowing policy accessible to all staff, who were aware of procedures to follow if they had any concerns.
- The arrangements for staff to receive an annual appraisal were not robust.
- The practice had the necessary equipment for staff to deal with medical emergencies, and staff had been trained how to use that equipment. This included an automated external defibrillator, oxygen and emergency medicines.

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

- Review the practice's protocols for the use of rubber dam for root canal treatment giving due regard to guidelines issued by the British Endodontic Society.
- Review the practice's infection control procedures and protocols giving due regard to guidelines issued by the Department of Health - Health Technical Memorandum 01-05: Decontamination in primary care dental practices and The Health and Social Care Act 2008: 'Code of Practice about the prevention and control of infections and related guidance.
- Review the training, learning and development needs of individual staff members and have an effective process established for the on-going assessment and supervision of all staff.

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 was visibly clean.

All staff had received up-to-date training in safeguarding vulnerable adults and children. There were clear guidelines for reporting concerns and the practice had a lead member of staff to offer support and guidance over safeguarding matters. Staff knew how to recognise the signs of abuse, and how to raise concerns when necessary. Information regarding safeguarding was displayed throughout the practice.

The practice had emergency medicines and oxygen available, and an automated external defibrillator (AED). Regular checks were being completed to ensure the emergency equipment was in good working order.

Recruitment checks were completed on all new members of staff. This was to ensure staff were suitable and appropriately qualified and experienced to carry out their role.

The practice had infection control procedures to ensure that patients were protected from potential risks. Regular audits of the decontamination process had not been undertaken as recommended by the current guidance.

X-ray equipment was regularly serviced and inspected to make sure it was safe for use.

No action



Are services effective?

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

All patients were clinically assessed by a dentist before any treatment began. The practice used a recognised assessment process to identify any potential areas of concern in a patient's mouth including their soft tissues (gums, cheeks and tongue).

Dentists did not always use rubber dams when completing root canal treatments.

The practice was following National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidelines for the care and treatment of dental patients. Particularly in respect of patient recalls, lower wisdom tooth removal and the prescribing of antibiotics for patients at risk of infective endocarditis (a condition that affects the heart).

Not all staff had not received an appraisal to identify their learning needs and monitor their development and progress.

The practice had systems in place for making referrals to other dental professional when it was clinically necessary.

No action



Are services caring?

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

No action



Summary of findings

Patient confidentiality was maintained and dental care records were stored securely.

Feedback from patients identified staff were friendly, and treated patients with care and concern. Patients also said they were treated with dignity and respect.

There were systems for patients to be able to express their views and opinions.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

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

Patients who were in pain or in need of urgent treatment could usually get an appointment the same day.

The practice had four ground floor treatment rooms which allowed easy access for patients with restricted mobility or mothers with prams or pushchairs.

A formal disabled access audit in line with the Equality Act (2010) was completed the day after the inspection to consider the needs of patients with restricted mobility.

There were arrangements for emergency dental treatment outside of normal working hours, including Sundays and public holidays which were clearly displayed in the practice, and in the practice leaflet.

There were systems and processes to support patients to make formal complaints.

No action



Are services well-led?

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

There was a clear management structure at the practice. Staff were aware of their roles and responsibilities within the dental team, and knew who to speak with if they had any concerns.

The practice had a system for carrying out audits of both clinical and non-clinical areas to assess the safety and effectiveness of the services provided. The system for auditing could be more robust. Policies and procedures had been kept under review.

Patients were able to express their views and comments, and the practice listened to those views and acted upon them.

Staff said the practice was a friendly place to work, and they could speak with a senior colleague if they had any concerns.

No action



Rise Park Dental Practice

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 19 October 2016. The inspection team consisted of a Care Quality Commission (CQC) inspector and a dental specialist advisor.

Before the inspection we asked for information to be sent, this included the complaints the practice had received in the last 12 months; their latest statement of purpose; the details of the staff members, their qualifications and proof of registration with their professional bodies.

We reviewed the information we held about the practice and found there were no areas of concern.

We reviewed policies, procedures and other documents. We received feedback from 29 patients about the dental service.

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 systems for recording and investigating accidents, significant events and complaints. This allowed them to be analysed and any learning points identified and shared with the staff. Documentation showed there had been two recorded accident in the twelve months up to this inspection. The last being a minor injury to a patient. First aid had been given. We saw that learning points had been identified and shared with staff.

The practice had not made any RIDDOR (Reporting of Injuries, Diseases and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations 2013) reports although staff said they were aware how to make these on-line.

The practice had a significant event folder which contained guidance for staff on identifying a significant event and keeping suitable records about any such event. Records at the practice showed that significant events had been identified and logged within the practice. There had been no significant events recorded during 2016. The last recorded event had occurred in November 2010.

The practice received Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA) alerts. These were sent out centrally by a government agency (MHRA) to inform health care establishments of any problems with medicines or healthcare equipment. These were received by the principal dentist analysed and discussed in staff meetings as appropriate.

A review of the information in the complaints folder identified that patients were told when they had been affected by something that had gone wrong. This is known as the duty of candour. Patients had received an apology and been informed of the actions taken as a result of things going wrong. There was information within the practice regarding the duty of candour from the Care Quality Commission (CQC). The principal dentist was aware of when and how to notify CQC of incidents which cause harm.

Reliable safety systems and processes (including safeguarding)

The practice had a policy for safeguarding vulnerable adults and children. The policy had been reviewed and updated in November 2015. The policy identified how to

respond to and escalate any safeguarding concerns. The relevant contact telephone numbers and a flow chart were available for staff in the policies and on display in the staff room and behind reception. Information was also available for patients in the waiting room. Discussions with staff showed that they were aware of the safeguarding policies, knew who to contact and how to refer concerns to agencies outside of the practice when necessary. The principal dentist said there had been no safeguarding referrals made by the practice.

The principal dentist was the identified lead for safeguarding in the practice. They had received enhanced training in child protection to level two on 6 October 2016. A copy of their training certificate was displayed in the waiting room. We saw evidence that all staff had completed in-house safeguarding training at a staff meeting held on 13 October 2016.

The practice had guidance relating to the Control Of Substances Hazardous to Health (COSHH) Regulations 2002. This identified the risks associated with the Control Of Substances Hazardous to Health (COSHH) Regulations 2002. There were hard copies of manufacturers' product data sheets in the COSHH file together with risk assessments for each product. Data sheets provided information on how to deal with spillages or accidental contact with chemicals and advised what protective clothing to wear.

The practice had an up to date Employers' liability insurance certificate which was due for renewal on 19 September 2017. Employers' liability insurance is a requirement under the Employers Liability (Compulsory Insurance) Act 1969. The certificate was displayed behind reception.

The practice had a sharps policy which informed staff how to handle sharps (particularly needles and sharp dental instruments) safely. The policy had been reviewed in February 2016. We saw the practice used a recognised system for handling sharps safely in accordance with the Health and Safety (Sharp Instruments in Healthcare) Regulations 2013, and practice policy. Practice policy was that only dentists handled sharp instruments. We saw there were devices in each clinical area for the safe removal and disposal of needles and sharps.

There were sharps bins (secure bins for the disposal of needles, blades or any other instrument that posed a risk

Are services safe?

of injury through cutting or pricking.) We saw the sharps bins were stored securely in clinical areas which followed the guidance which indicated sharps bins should not be located on the floor, and should be out of reach of small children. Sharps bins were signed and dated. The National Institute for Healthcare Excellence (NICE) guidelines: 'Healthcare-associated infections: prevention and control in primary and community care' advise – sharps boxes should be replaced every three months even if not full. Signing and dating allowed the three month expiry date to be identified.

Discussions with dentists and a review of patients' dental care records identified the dentists were not using rubber dams when providing root canal treatment to patients. This was not in line with guidance from the British Endodontic Society. A rubber dam is a thin, square sheet, usually latex rubber, used in dentistry to isolate the operative site from the rest of the mouth and protect the airway. Rubber dams should be used when endodontic treatment (treatment involving the root canal of the tooth) is being provided. One dentist at the practice tended to complete all of the root canal treatments at the practice. They said they were not keen on using rubber dams. They had risk assessed and assessed this was a low risk as they used solid instruments which had no risk of falling into the patients' airway. The British Endodontic Society guidance identifies that on the rare occasions when it is not possible to use rubber dam the reasons should be recorded in the patient's dental care records giving details as to how the patient's safety was assured. We saw the practice had a supply of rubber dam kits in the practice.

Medical emergencies

The dental practice had equipment in preparation for any medical emergencies that might occur. This included emergency medicines and oxygen which were located in a secure central location. We checked the medicines and found they were all in date. There were robust systems in place to check expiry dates and monitor that equipment was safe and working correctly.

There was a first aid box in the practice and we saw evidence the contents were being checked regularly. Following the inspection we were informed the head dental nurse had been booked onto a three day first aid at work course.

There was an automated external defibrillator (AED) at the practice. An AED is a portable electronic device that automatically diagnoses life threatening irregularities of the heart and delivers an electrical shock to attempt to restore a normal heart rhythm. The AED was being checked regularly to ensure it was working correctly. This complied with the Resuscitation Council UK guidelines.

All staff at the practice had completed basic life support and resuscitation training on 19 July 2016. We saw certificates to evidence that staff had completed this training.

Discussions with staff identified they understood what action to take in a medical emergency. Staff said they had received training in medical emergencies.

Staff recruitment

The practice had a staff recruitment policy which had been reviewed in November 2015. We looked at the staff recruitment files for five staff members to check that the recruitment procedures had been followed. The Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014 identifies information and records that should be held in all staff recruitment files. This includes: proof of identity; checking the person's skills and qualifications; that they are registered with professional bodies where relevant; evidence of good conduct in previous employment and where necessary a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check was in place (or a risk assessment if a DBS was not needed). 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 found that all clinical members of staff had received a DBS check. The practice was routinely taking references for new members of staff. We discussed the records that should be held in the recruitment files with a dentist and the head dental nurse and saw the practice recruitment policy and the regulations had been followed.

Monitoring health & safety and responding to risks

The practice had a health and safety policy which had been reviewed in November 2015. The policy identified the principal dentist as the lead person who had responsibility within the practice for different areas of health and safety.

Are services safe?

As part of this policy environmental risk assessments had been completed. For example there were risk assessments for: exposure to bodily fluids, the use of mercury, and manual handling.

Records showed that fire extinguishers had been serviced in June 2016. During the inspection we saw no evidence that the practice had a formal fire risk assessment, although regular tests and staff training had been completed. Following the inspection we were sent a copy of the fire risk assessment dated 20 October 2016. We saw there were battery operated smoke detectors installed within the premises. The fire evacuation procedure was displayed within the practice for patients and staff. Fire exits were clearly marked. Records and discussion with staff showed the practice had not held any fire drills within the practice.

The practice had a health and safety law poster on display behind reception. Employers are required by law (Health and Safety at Work Act 1974) to either display the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) poster or to provide each employee with the equivalent leaflet.

Infection control

Dental practices should be working towards compliance with the Department of Health's guidance, 'Health Technical Memorandum 01-05 (HTM 01-05): Decontamination in primary care dental practices' in respect of infection control and decontamination of equipment. This document sets out clear guidance on the procedures that should be followed, records that should be kept, staff training, and equipment that should be available.

The practice had an infection control policy which had been reviewed in November 2015. A copy of the policy was available to staff in all clinical areas. Dental nurses had set responsibilities for cleaning and infection control in each individual treatment room. The practice had systems for testing and auditing the infection control procedures.

Records showed that an infection control audits had been completed on 1 October 2016. The audit had not produced any action points. Staff said that infection control audits had not been completed on a monthly basis as recommended by HTM 01-05. The principal dentist said audits would be completed on a six monthly basis going forward.

The practice had a clinical waste contract, and waste matter was collected regularly. Clinical waste was stored securely away from patient areas while awaiting collection. The practice had a separate waste contract which covered the collection of amalgam, a type of dental filling which contains mercury and is therefore considered a hazardous material and lead foil from the X-rays. The practice had spillage kits for mercury and bodily fluids. The mercury spillage kit was not dated and the Head dental nurse said this would be replaced as a result. The bodily fluids spillage kit was within its use by date.

Dental instruments were cleaned in the treatment rooms and sterilised in a central decontamination room. We saw staff wore personal protective equipment during the process to protect themselves from injury. This included the use of heavy duty gloves, aprons and protective eye wear. The practice was latex free to avoid any potential latex allergy. Daily check sheets were completed by nurses to record the decontamination process.

The practice used manual cleaning to clean dental instruments. We saw a long handled brush as identified in the guidance (HTM 01-05) was used for manual cleaning. However, we noted the water temperature during manual cleaning was not being monitored and recorded to demonstrate the water was at the correct temperature (less than 45 degrees centigrade). HTM01-05 identifies that water temperature should not exceed 45 degrees centigrade during manual cleaning as higher temperatures bind protein to the instruments.

After cleaning instruments were rinsed and examined using an illuminated magnifying glass. Finally the instruments were sterilised in one of the practice's autoclaves (a device for sterilising dental and medical instruments). The practice had three steam autoclaves which were designed to sterilise unwrapped or solid dental instruments. At the completion of the sterilising process, all instruments were dried, placed in pouches and dated with a use by date.

We checked the equipment used for cleaning and sterilising the dental instruments was maintained and serviced regularly in accordance with the manufacturers' instructions. There were records to demonstrate this and that equipment was functioning correctly. Records showed that the equipment was in good working order and being effectively maintained.

Are services safe?

The practice had a policy for dealing with blood borne viruses. There were records to demonstrate that clinical staff had received inoculations against Hepatitis B and had received blood tests to check the effectiveness of that inoculation. Health professionals who are likely to come into contact with blood products, or who are at increased risk of sharps injuries should receive these vaccinations to minimise the risk of contracting blood borne infections.

The practice had a risk assessment for dealing with the risks posed by Legionella. This had been reviewed and updated by an external contractor in June 2015. Legionella is a bacterium found in the environment which can contaminate water systems in buildings. The practice was aware of the risks associated with Legionella and had taken steps to reduce them with regular flushing of dental water lines as identified in the relevant guidance.

Equipment and medicines

The practice kept records to demonstrate that equipment was maintained and serviced in line with manufacturer's guidelines and instructions. Portable appliance testing (PAT) had been completed on electrical equipment at the practice in November 2015. There were also electrical and mechanical safety certificates dated October 2016 which demonstrated electrical equipment in the treatment rooms had been checked. The practice had a Landlords Gas safety certificate dated 23 October 2015. Following the inspection we were sent evidence the gas boiler had been serviced on 20 October 2016. Certificates in the practice identified that pressure vessel checks on the compressor which produced the compressed air for the dental drills had been completed in October 2016. The three autoclaves had been serviced in July 2016. This was in accordance with the Pressure Systems Safety Regulations (2000)

Medicines for use in an emergency were available at the practice as identified in the Guidance on Emergency Medicines set out in the 'British National Formulary' (BNF).

Radiography (X-rays)

There was a Radiation Protection file which contained the relevant information and records relating to the X-ray machines and their safe use on the premises.

The practice had one intraoral X-ray machine (intraoral X-rays concentrate on one tooth or area of the mouth) and one extra-oral X-ray machine (an orthopantomogram known as an OPG) for taking X-rays of the entire jaw and lower skull.

X-rays were carried out in one designated area within the practice. We saw three local rules that were relevant to the practice and each piece of specific equipment. The local rules for the use of each X-ray machine were on display beside each X-ray machine.

The Radiation Protection file identified the practice had a radiation protection supervisor (RPS) this being one of the principal dentists. The provider had appointed an external radiation protection advisor (RPA). This was a company specialising in servicing and maintaining X-ray equipment, who were available for technical advice regarding the machinery. The Ionising Radiation Regulations 1999 (IRR 99) requires that an RPA and an RPS be appointed and identified in the local rules. Their role is to ensure the equipment is operated safely and by qualified staff only.

The practice had critical examination documentation for both X-ray machines. Critical examinations are completed when X-ray machines are installed to document they have been installed and are working correctly. Critical examination documentation was dated March 2012.

Records showed the X-ray equipment had been inspected in October 2016. The Ionising Radiation Regulations 1999 (IRR 99) require that X-ray equipment is inspected at least once every three years. The regulations also required providers to inform the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) that X-rays were being carried out on the premises. Documentary evidence dated 1 April 2010 confirmed this had been completed when the practice changed ownership.

The practice used standard non-digital X-rays. The principal dentist said there were plans to move towards digital X-rays which would allow the image to be viewed almost immediately, and rely on lower doses of radiation. Therefore reducing the risks to both the patients and staff.

All patients were required to complete a medical history form and the dentist considered each patient's individual circumstances to ensure it was safe for them to receive X-rays. This included identifying where patients might be

Are services safe?

pregnant. The patients signed the form to confirm any changes or that the information was unchanged and to confirm any information that might influence them having an X-ray.

Patients' dental care records showed that information related to X-rays was recorded in line with guidance from

the Ionising Radiation (Medical Exposure) Regulations 2000. This included grading of the X-ray, views taken, justification for taking the X-ray and the clinical findings. We saw that the Faculty of General Dental Practice (FGDP UK) guidelines: 'selection criteria for dental radiography' (2013) were being followed.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Monitoring and improving outcomes for patients

The practice held paper dental care records for each patient. Dental care records contained information about the assessment, diagnosis, and treatment and also recorded the discussion and advice given to patients by dental healthcare professionals. The care records showed a thorough examination had been completed, and identified with risk factors such as smoking and diet for each patient.

Patients at the practice completed a medical history form which was checked by the dentist in the treatment room with the patient. The form was checked and updated at following appointments in necessary and signed by the patient at that time. The patients' medical histories included any health conditions, medicines being taken and whether the patient had any allergies.

The dental care records showed that dentists assessed the patients' periodontal tissues (the gums) and soft tissues of the mouth. The dentists used the basic periodontal examination (BPE) screening tool. BPE is a simple and rapid screening tool used by dentists to indicate the level of treatment needed in relation to a patient's gums.

We saw the dentist used national guidelines on which to base treatments and develop treatment plans for managing patients' oral health. Discussions with the dentist showed they were aware of National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidelines, particularly in respect of recalls of patients, prescribing of antibiotics for patients at risk of infective endocarditis (a condition that affects the heart) and lower wisdom tooth removal. A review of the records identified that the dentists were following NICE guidelines in their treatment of patients.

Health promotion & prevention

The practice had one waiting room where posters and leaflets relating to good oral health and hygiene were on display. These included posters giving advice to parents about good oral hygiene and care for their children. Leaflets with advice to stop smoking and leaflets about sensitive teeth.

Children seen at the practice were offered fluoride varnish application and fluoride toothpaste if they were identified as being at risk. This was in accordance with the government document: 'Delivering better oral health: an

evidence based toolkit for prevention.' This has been produced to support dental teams in improving patients' oral and general health. Discussions with the dentist showed they had a good knowledge and understanding of 'delivering better oral health' toolkit.

We saw several examples in patients' dental care records that the dentist had provided advice on the harmful effects of smoking, alcohol and diet and their effect on oral health. With regard to smoking, the dentist had particularly highlighted the risk of dental disease and oral cancer. The dental care records contained an oral cancer risk assessment.

Staffing

The practice has seven dentists; one dental hygienist; seven qualified dental nurses; Dental nurses also worked on the reception desk when required. Before the inspection we checked the registrations of all dental care professionals with the General Dental Council (GDC) register. We found all staff were up to date with their professional registration with the GDC. On the day of our inspection we also saw evidence of current professional indemnity cover for all relevant staff.

Records within the practice showed there were sufficient numbers of staff to meet the needs of patients attending the practice for treatment.

We looked at staff training records for six staff members and these showed that staff were maintaining their continuing professional development (CPD). CPD is a compulsory requirement of registration with the GDC. The training records showed how many hours training staff had undertaken together with training certificates for courses attended. This was to ensure staff remained up-to-date and continued to develop their dental skills and knowledge. Clinical staff were up to date with their recommended CPD as detailed by the GDC including medical emergencies, radiography (X-rays), infection control and safeguarding.

Records at the practice showed that not all staff had an annual appraisal. Staff who had received an appraisal had completed a review of their own learning objectives and completed a self-assessment. However, records did not demonstrate that appraisals had been completed annually.

Working with other services

The practice made referrals to other dental professionals based on risks or if a service was required that was not

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

offered at the practice. We saw the practice referred to the clinical assessment service where referrals were sorted and triaged. The clinical assessment service allowed the patients to choose where they went for their treatment rather than only having the option of treatment in-house. The practice also made referrals for orthodontics (where badly positioned teeth are repositioned to give a better appearance and improved function) and sedation. Children who required multiple extractions or patients with special needs were referred to community services. Internal referrals were made for the dental hygienist. Dental care records identified why referrals were being made and the action taken following the referral.

Where there was suspected oral cancer the referral was fast tracked to the local Queens Medical Centre (QMC). These referrals were made in-line with the recommended two week window for urgent suspected cancer referrals.

Consent to care and treatment

The practice had a consent policy which had been reviewed in November 2015. However this had a page missing which had crucial information relating to the Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA). Following the inspection we received an updated copy of the consent policy which

contained all of the information including making reference to the Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA). The issue of capacity was explored within the guidelines and this included making best interest decisions as identified in the MCA. The MCA provides a legal framework for acting and making decisions on behalf of adults who lacked the capacity to make particular decisions for themselves. The policy also provided guidance on Lasting Power of Attorney (LPA).

We saw how consent was recorded in the patients' dental care records. The records showed the dentist had discussed the treatment plan with the patients, which allowed patients to give their informed consent. Patients provided verbal consent or signed the FP17DC form (the standard NHS treatment plan and consent form).

The consent policy made reference to obtaining consent from children under the age of 18. We talked with dental staff about this and identified they were aware of Gillick competency. This refers to the legal precedent set that a child may have adequate knowledge and understanding of a course of action that they are able to consent for themselves without the need for parental permission or knowledge.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Respect, dignity, compassion & empathy

During the inspection we observed staff speaking with patients. We saw that staff were polite, and had a professional approach. We saw that staff spoke with patients with due regard to dignity and respect.

The reception desk was located in the waiting room. We asked reception staff how patient confidentiality was maintained at reception. Staff said that details of patients' individual treatment were never discussed at the reception desk. In addition if it were necessary to discuss a confidential matter, there were areas of the practice where this could happen such as an unused treatment room or the back office.

We saw examples that showed patient confidentiality was maintained at the practice. For example the reception desk could not be overlooked so that information with the receptionist was secure. Patients' dental care records were held securely.

Involvement in decisions about care and treatment

We received positive feedback from 29 patients about the services provided. This was through CQC comment cards left at the practice prior to the inspection and by talking with patients in the practice.

The practice offered both NHS and private dental treatment and the costs were clearly displayed in the practice, with posters in the waiting rooms and at reception. Private fees were also on display in the reception area.

We spoke with the three dentists about how patients had their diagnosis and dental treatment discussed with them. The dentists demonstrated in the patient care records how the treatment options and costs were explained and recorded. Patients were given a written copy of the treatment plan which included the costs. We noted that patients' dental care records identified the diagnosis and treatment options discussed with patients.

Where necessary the dentist gave patients information about preventing dental decay and gum disease. In particular the dentist had highlighted the risks associated with smoking and diet, and we saw examples of this recorded in the dental care records. Patients were monitored through follow-up appointments in line with National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidelines.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting patients' needs

The practice was located the ground floor of premises in the Rise Park area of Nottingham. The practice provided a mixture of NHS and private dental treatments (50/50). There was a free car park in the area which patients could use and a small car park to the front of the practice.

The practice had separate staff and patient areas, to assist with confidentiality and security.

We saw there was a good supply of dental instruments, and there were sufficient instruments to meet the needs of the practice.

Staff said that when patients were in pain or where treatment was urgent the practice made efforts to see the patient the same day. To facilitate this the practice had a sit and wait service for emergency patients or those in pain.

We reviewed the appointment book, and saw that patients were allocated sufficient time to receive their treatment and have discussions with the dentist.

Tackling inequity and promoting equality

The practice had an equality and diversity policy which had been reviewed in November 2015.

Patient areas were situated on the ground floor with four treatment rooms available. This allowed patients with restricted mobility easy access for treatment. The treatment rooms were large enough for patients to manoeuvre a wheelchair or push chair.

The practice had one toilet which was suitable for patients with restricted mobility, but not for anyone in a wheelchair. The toilet had wall mounted grab bars to assist any patient with restricted mobility.

The practice had information relating to access in line with the Equality Act (2010) however, no formal access audit had been completed. Following the inspection we were sent a copy of the access audit which had been completed on 20 October 2016. The practice could accommodate patients with restricted mobility; with level access from the street to the ground floor treatment room.

The practice did not have a hearing induction loop to assist patients who used a hearing aid. The Equality Act requires where 'reasonably possible' hearing loops are to be installed in public spaces, such as dental practices. The principal dentist placed an order for a hearing induction loop during the inspection when this was brought to their attention.

Access to the service

The practice's opening hours were – Monday to Friday: 9 am to 5:30 pm. The practice was closed at weekends.

Access for urgent treatment outside of opening hours is by telephoning the practice and following the instructions on the answerphone message or by telephoning the 111 NHS service.

The practice had a text message reminder service and patients received a text reminder two working days before their appointment was due.

The practice did not have a website. Patients were therefore not able to access the latest information or check opening times or treatment options on-line. Information was available on the NHS Choices website: www.nhs.uk. This included opening times, facilities and contact details.

Concerns & complaints

The practice had a complaints procedure for private patients which had been reviewed in September 2016. The procedure explained how to complain and identified time scales for complaints to be responded to, and other agencies to contact if the complaint was not resolved to the patients satisfaction.

Information about how to complain was available in the practice leaflet.

From information received before the inspection we saw that there had been two formal complaints received in the 12 months prior to this inspection. Documentation within the practice showed the complaints had been handled appropriately and in a timely way. Negative comments on the NHS Choices website were also treated as complaints despite there being no contact information available for the 'complainants'. Learning points had been identified and shared with staff.

Are services well-led?

Our findings

Governance arrangements

We saw a number of policies and procedures at the practice and saw they had been reviewed and where relevant updated during the year up to this inspection. Staff said if they had any concerns they would raise these with the principal dentist. We spoke with two members of staff who said they liked working at the practice and there was a good team. Staff said there was a supportive approach from management at the practice and personal development was encouraged.

We saw a selection of dental care records to assess if they were complete, legible, accurate, and secure. The dental care records we saw contained sufficient detail and identified patients' needs, care and treatment.

Leadership, openness and transparency

We saw that full staff meetings were scheduled for once a month throughout the year. However staff said there had been some slippage. Staff meetings were minuted and minutes were available to all staff. We saw that often a staff meeting had a particular learning topic such as safeguarding or infection control. At these meetings learning points were shared with staff.

Discussions with staff showed there was a good understanding of how the practice worked, and knowledge of policies and procedures.

The practice had an underperformance and whistleblowing policy which had been reviewed in November 2015. The whistleblowing policy identified how staff could raise any concerns they had about colleagues' under-performance, conduct or clinical practice. This was both internally and with external agencies. A copy of the policy was available in the policy folder at the practice.

The practice had information relating to the duty of candour which had been taken from the Care Quality Commission (CQC). This information led the practice to be open and honest in their dealings with patients. Discussions with a dentist identified the practice was in the process of writing a specific duty of candour policy.

Learning and improvement

There were a range of audits completed throughout the year. This was for clinical and non-clinical areas of the

practice. The audits identified both areas for improvement, and where quality had been achieved. Examples of completed audits included: an audit of radiography (X-rays) in February 2016 and a record keeping audit in October 2016. We saw that regular six monthly infection control audits had not been completed. The Department of Health's guidance, 'Health Technical Memorandum 01-05 (HTM 01-05): Decontamination in primary care dental practices' in respect of infection control and decontamination of equipment, recommends six monthly infection control audits. The most recent infection control audit at the practice had been completed on 1 October 2016.

The practice ensured that all staff underwent basic life support and resuscitation training, infection control, safeguarding of children and vulnerable adults and dental radiography (X-rays). Staff development was by means of internal training, staff meetings and attendance on external courses.

Clinical staff working at the practice were supported to maintain their continuing professional development (CPD) as required by the General Dental Council. Training records at the practice showed that clinical staff were completing their CPD and the hours completed had been recorded. Dentists are required to complete 250 hours of CPD over a five year period, while other dental professionals are required to complete 150 hours over the same period. We saw that key CPD topics such as IRMER (related to X-rays) and safeguarding had been completed by all relevant staff.

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

The practice had its own patient satisfaction survey which was completed on an on-going basis. Patient surveys completed during 2016 identified that all 18 patients were happy with their treatment with scores of good or very good in all areas.

The practice had a NHS Friends and Family Test (FFT) comment box which was located in the reception area. The FFT is a national programme to allow patients to provide feedback on the services provided. The FFT comment box being used specifically to gather regular feedback from NHS patients, and to satisfy the requirements of NHS England. The latest data in the practice showed three patients had responded and 100% said they would recommend the practice to their family and friends.

Are services well-led?

The NHS Choices website: www.nhs.uk had ten patient reviews recorded in the year up to this inspection. These were mixed reviews with five positive and five negative comments. The provider had not made any response to the patient reviews posted on the NHS Choices website.