

Dr. David Kaplan

Dr David Kaplan

Inspection Report

21 Addison Place,
London,
W11 4RJ
Tel: (020) 7602 1856
Website: www.addisonplace.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 8 July 2016
Date of publication: 19/08/2016

Overall summary

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection on 8 July 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

Dr. David Kaplan is located in the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and provides private dental services.

The staff structure of the practice comprises of five dentists, three nurses, two hygienists, a receptionist and a practice manager.

The practice was open 8:00 am-5:30 pm Monday to Friday. Facilities within the practice include four treatment rooms, a dedicated decontamination room and a waiting area.

One of the dentists was 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.

Before the inspection we sent Care Quality Commission (CQC) comment cards to the practice for patients to complete to tell us about their experience of the practice. We received 27 comment cards from patients and spoke with three patients on the day of the inspection. The feedback we received for patients gave a positive view of the services the practice provides. The patients commented that the quality of care was good.

Summary of findings

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection on 8 July 2016 as part of our planned inspection of all dental practices. The inspection took place over one day and was carried out by an inspector and a dental specialist advisor.

Our key findings were:

- There were effective processes in place to reduce and minimise the risk and spread of infection.
 - Patients' needs were assessed and care was planned in line with best practice guidance such as from the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Patients were involved in their care and treatment planning.
 - There was appropriate equipment for staff to undertake their duties and equipment was well maintained.
 - Patients told us that staff were caring and treated them with dignity and respect.
 - Patients indicated that they felt they were listened to and that they received good care from a helpful and caring practice team.
 - There were processes in place for patients to give their comments and feedback about the service including making complaints and compliments.
 - Governance arrangements were in place and there was a clear vision for the smooth running of the practice.
- There were areas where the provider could make improvements and should:
- Review the protocols for obtaining and maintaining accurate, complete and detailed records relating to staff employed for the purpose of carrying on the regulated activities, giving due regard to current legislation and guidance.
 - Review availability of equipment to manage medical emergencies taking into account guidelines issued by the Resuscitation Council (UK), and the General Dental Council (GDC) standards for the dental team.
 - Review the practice's protocols for recording in the patients' dental care records or elsewhere the reason for taking the X-ray and quality of the X-ray giving due regard to the Ionising Radiation (Medical Exposure) Regulations (IR(ME)R) 2000.
 - Review the systems for checking and monitoring equipment to ensure that all equipment is well maintained.

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.

There were systems in place to help ensure the safety of staff and patients. These included policies for safeguarding, maintaining the required standards of infection prevention and control and maintenance of equipment used at the practice.

The practice assessed risks to patients and managed these well. We found that staff were trained and there was appropriate equipment to respond to medical emergencies. In the event of an incident or accident occurring, the practice had a system in place to document, investigate and learn from it. The practice followed procedures for the safe recruitment of staff which included carrying out criminal record checks. However, improvements could be made in regards to the recording of references.

No action



Are services effective?

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

The practice followed guidance, such as that issued by National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) for example, in regards to recalls. Patients were given appropriate information to support them to make decisions about the treatment they received. The practice kept detailed dental care records of treatments carried out and monitored any changes in the patient's' medical and oral health. Records showed patients were given health promotion advice appropriate to their individual oral health needs such as dietary advice.

Staff were supported by the practice in maintaining their continuing professional development (CPD) and were meeting the requirements of their professional registration.

No action



Are services caring?

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

The patient feedback we received was very positive about the service provided by the practice. We observed that staff treated patients with dignity and respect. We found that dental care records were stored securely, and patient confidentiality was well maintained.

No action



Are services responsive to people's needs?

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

Patients had good access to routine and emergency appointments at the practice. There was sufficient well maintained equipment to meet the dental needs of their patient population. There was a complaints policy. Patients were given the opportunity to give feedback through the practices own surveys.

No action



Summary of findings

Are services well-led?

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

There was a clear vision for the practice that was shared with the staff. There were good governance arrangements and an effective management structure. There were regular meetings where staff were given the opportunity to give their views of the service. Appropriate policies and procedures were in place, and there was some monitoring of various aspects of care delivery. Patients were given the opportunity to provide feedback about the practice.

No action



Dr David Kaplan

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 July 2016. The inspection was led by a CQC inspector. They were accompanied by a dental specialist advisor.

We received feedback from 30 patients. We also spoke with four members of staff. We reviewed the policies, toured the premises and examined the cleaning and decontamination of dental equipment.

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 suitable processes around reporting and discussion of incidents. We saw there was a system in place for learning from incidents. Staff told us if an incident occurred it would be discussed at team meetings. Staff were able to describe the type of incidents that would be recorded and the incident logging process. There had been no incidents in the last twelve months.

Staff we spoke with understood the Reporting of Injuries, Diseases and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations 2013 (RIDDOR). Staff were able to describe the type of incidents that would need to be recorded under these requirements. There had been no RIDDOR incidents over the past 12 months.

Staff understood the importance of the Duty of Candour and the need to inform the appropriate bodies and patients effected of any relevant incidents [Duty of candour is a requirement under The Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014 on a registered person who must act in an open and transparent way with relevant persons in relation to care and treatment provided to service users in carrying on a regulated activity].

Reliable safety systems and processes (including safeguarding)

One of the dentists was the safeguarding lead and staff knew who they should go to if they had a safeguarding concern. There were adult and child safeguarding policy that had last been reviewed in 2016. The practice had details of what should be considered abuse and the practice was aware of the relevant people to contact in the local safeguarding team if they had any safeguarding concerns. Staff had completed safeguarding training that was updated on a regular basis. They were able to explain their understanding of safeguarding issues. There had been no safeguarding incidents that needed to be referred to the local safeguarding teams.

The practice had a system in place for receiving and responding to patient safety alerts issued from the Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA). One of the dentists told us relevant information would be distributed to staff via emails and staff meetings.

The practice had safety systems in place to help ensure the safety of staff and patients. This included for example having a COSHH (Control of Substances Hazardous to Health, 2002 Regulations) file, infection control protocols, procedures for the safe use of sharps, health and safety process, procedures and risk assessments.

Risk assessments had been undertaken for issues affecting the health and safety of staff and patients using the service. This included for example risks associated with radiography, fire, and Legionella, health and safety and infection control.

During our visit we found that the dental care and treatment of patients was planned and delivered in a way that ensured patients' safety and welfare. During the course of our inspection we checked dental care records to confirm the findings. Dental care records contained patient's medical history that was obtained when patients first registered with the practice and was updated when they returned.

The practice followed national guidelines in regards the use of a rubber dam for root canal treatments. [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 and protect the airway. Rubber dams should be used when endodontic treatment is being provided. 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.].

Medical emergencies

There were arrangements in place to deal with on-site medical emergencies. Staff had received basic life support training which included cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) training. The practice had a medical emergency kit which included emergency medicines and equipment in line with Resuscitation Council (UK) and British National Formulary guidance. The kit contained the recommended medicines. We checked the medicines that were in the kit and we found that all the medicines were within their expiry date. The emergency equipment included oxygen. However staff did not have access to an automated external defibrillator (AED) in line with current guidance and had not undertaken and documented a risk assessment as regards its absence. [An AED is a portable

Are services safe?

electronic device that analyses life threatening irregularities of the heart and delivers an electrical shock to attempt to restore a normal heart rhythm]. We pointed this out to staff and they advised that they would review this situation.

Staff recruitment

The practice had a policy for the safe recruitment of staff. In order to reduce the risks of employing unsuitable staff the provider is required to complete a number of checks. They must obtain a full employment history, check the authenticity of qualifications, obtain references, including one from the most recent employer, and complete an up to date Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks. We saw that the provider had satisfactorily carried out the necessary required checks for staff who worked in the practice.

However, we found that improvements could be made in the maintenance of staff records in relation to recording of references obtained for staff. For example we found no references for two members of staff. We pointed this out to the practice manager and were advised verbal references had been taken but not recorded. The provider assured us that references would be taken up in the future.

Monitoring health & safety and responding to risks

The practice had arrangements in place to deal with foreseeable emergencies. A health and safety policy was in place. The practice had a risk management process which was updated and reviewed to ensure the safety of patients and staff members. The assessments included the controls and actions to manage risks. For example a risks assessment associated with electrical equipment had highlighted the importance of visual checks and we saw these were part of monthly checks carried out by the practice manager.

Infection control

The practice had an infection control policy that outlined the procedure for issues relating to minimising the risk and spread of infections. This included details of procedures for hand hygiene, clinical waste management and personal protective equipment. 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. The lead dental nurse was the infection control lead.

There was a clear flow from dirty to clean areas to minimise the risks of cross contamination. Staff gave a demonstration of the decontamination process which was in line with HTM 01-05 published guidance. This included carrying used instruments in a lidded box from the surgery, cleaning instruments in an ultrasonic cleaner and using an illuminated magnifying glass to visually check for any remaining contamination (and re-washed if required); placing in the autoclave, pouching and then date stamping.

Staff told us that daily, weekly and monthly checks that were carried out on equipment used in the practice including the autoclave, to ensure they were working effectively. We saw evidence that staff had been vaccinated against Hepatitis B to protect patients from the risks of contracting the infection.

There was a contract in place for the safe disposal of clinical waste and sharps instruments. Clinical waste was stored appropriately and in lockable bins. The bins were appropriately stored away from the public while awaiting collection which took place every two weeks.

The practice was visibly clean and tidy. There were stocks of PPE (personal protective equipment) such as gloves and aprons for both staff and patients. We saw that staff wore appropriate PPE. Hand washing solution was available.

A Legionella risk assessment had been completed in March 2012 and the results were negative for bacterium. Another assessment had been completed in July 2016 but the report was not yet available to review [Legionella is a bacterium found in the environment which can contaminate water systems in buildings]. The practice used distilled water in all dental lines. The water lines were flushed daily and weekly.

There was a cleaning plan, schedule and checklist, which was regularly checked by the practice staff.

Equipment and medicines

We found the equipment used in the practice was maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. This included the equipment used to clean and sterilise the instruments and X-ray equipment. However, portable appliance testing (PAT) had not been

Are services safe?

completed since 2012. (PAT is the name of a process where electrical appliances are routinely checked for safety). The practice manager told us arrangements would be made for a test to be carried out.

The practice had clear guidance regarding the prescribing, recording and stock control of the medicines used in the practice. Medicines were stored, recorded and dispensed appropriately.

Radiography (X-rays)

The dentist was the Radiation Protection Supervisor (RPS). An external organisation covered the role of Radiation

Protection Adviser (RPA). The practice kept a radiation protection file in relation to the use and maintenance of X-ray equipment. There were suitable arrangements in place to ensure the safety of the equipment. The local rules relating to the equipment were held in the file and displayed in clinical areas where X-rays were used. Staff had undertaken radiation training. However there had not been a recent comprehensive radiography audit undertaken. An audit had been completed in 2014 but only looked at justifications. The practice manager told us arrangements would be made for a comprehensive radiographic audit to be undertaken.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Monitoring and improving outcomes for patients

Patients' needs were assessed and care and treatment was delivered in line with current legislation. This included following the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidance, for example in regards to dental recalls.

The practice was promoting the maintenance of good oral health in regards to oral hygiene.

During the course of our inspection we spoke with the three dentists and checked dental care records to confirm the findings. We saw evidence of comprehensive detailed assessments that were individualised. This included having an up to date medical history visit, details of the reason for visit, medical alerts, and a full clinical assessment with an extra- and intra-oral examination. An assessment of the periodontal tissue was taken and recorded using the basic periodontal examination (BPE) tool was taken in most of the records we reviewed.

Information about the costs of treatment and treatment options available were also given to patients and made available on the practice website. A price list was displayed on the wall in the practice waiting area.

Health promotion & prevention

Patients' medical histories which included, where applicable, questions about diet and alcohol intake were updated regularly. Appropriate advice was provided by staff to patients based on their medical histories. We saw they provided preventive care advice on tooth brushing and oral health instructions as well as fluoride application, and dietary advice. Health promotion and preventative advice was available on posters located in the reception area.

Staffing

Staff told us they had received appropriate professional development and training and the records we saw reflected this. The practice maintained a programme of professional development to ensure that staff were up to date with the latest practices. This was to ensure that patients received

high quality care as a result. Examples of staff training included core issues such as safeguarding, medical emergencies and infection control. We also reviewed information about continuing professional development (CPD) and found that staff had undertaken the required number of CPD hours.

Working with other services

The practice worked with other professionals in the care of their patients where this was in the best interest of the patient. For example patients were referred to other services for endodontics. Dental care records we looked at contained details of the referrals made and information that was shared between the practice and the referring organisations. The records showed the practice worked well with other services.

Consent to care and treatment

Patients who used the service were given appropriate information and support regarding their dental care and treatment. We received feedback from four patients. Patients said they were given clear treatment options which were discussed in an easy to understand language by practice staff. Patients understood and consented to treatment. This was confirmed when we checked dental care records and noted evidence that dentists discussed treatment options including risks and benefits, as well as costs with patients.

One of the dentists had received training on the MCA and had distributed information to other staff on the act. Staff were aware of how they would support a patient who lacked the capacity to consent to dental treatment. They explained how they would involve the patient and carers to ensure that the best interests of the patient were met. Staff showed an understanding of the Mental Capacity Act (MCA) 2005. MCA 2005 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). This meant where patients did not have the capacity to consent, the dentist acted in accordance with legal requirements and that vulnerable patients were treated with dignity and respect.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Respect, dignity, compassion & empathy

We received feedback from 30 patients. All the feedback we received was positive. Staff were described as caring and friendly. Patients said staff treated them with dignity and respect during consultations. We observed staff interaction with patients and saw that staff interacted well with patients, speaking to them in a respectful and considerate manner.

Involvement in decisions about care and treatment

The practice displayed information about fees in leaflets and posters in the waiting area. We also saw that the practice had a website that included information about dental care and treatments, and opening times.

We spoke with the dentists, dental nurse and practice manager on the day of our visit. There was a culture of promoting patient involvement in treatment planning which meant that all staff ensured patients were given clear explanations about treatment. Staff told us that treatments, costs, risks and benefits were discussed with each patient to ensure that patients understood what treatment was available so they were able to make an informed choice.

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' needs. Staff told us there was enough time to treat patients, and that patients could generally book an appointment in good time to see a dentist. Feedback from patients confirmed that patients felt they could get appointments when they needed them. There were arrangements in place for out of hours appointments. These arrangements were advertised on the telephone answering machine and on the practice website.

Tackling inequity and promoting equality

The practice had recognised the needs of different groups in the planning of its services. The practice had staff fluent in different languages. The practice manager told us that they would use a language line if they ever needed to communicate with any patients that did not speak a language spoken by the practice staff, but most of these patients to date had been accompanied by people who could speak English.

Access to the service

The practice was open 8:00 am-5:30 pm Monday to Friday. There were clear instructions for patients requiring urgent dental care when the practice was closed. These instructions were on the telephone answering machine and on the practice website.

Concerns & complaints

The practice had effective arrangements in place for handling complaints and concerns. There was a complaints policy, and information for patients about how to complain was available in the waiting area. The policy had last been reviewed in 2016 and was scheduled to be reviewed in June 2016 and was scheduled to be reviewed again in June 2017. The policy included contact details of two external organisations that patients could contact if they were not happy with the practice's response to a complaint. This included the Dental Complaints Service and the General Dental Council.

Are services well-led?

Our findings

Governance arrangements

The practice manager was the infection control lead. The provider had governance arrangements in place for the effective management of the service. This included having a range of policies and procedures in place including health and safety, complaints, employment policies and infection control. There was a clear management structure and staff leading on specific roles such as infection control and safeguarding. Staff told us they felt supported and were clear about their areas of responsibility. Risk assessments had been undertaken to cover various aspects of the service delivery.

Staff told us practice meetings were held regularly to discuss issues in the practice and update on things affecting the practice. We saw that these meetings were used as an opportunity to let staff know about the ongoing business of the practice. For example a May 2016 meeting had discussed the approach to welcoming new patients.

The quality audits undertaken at the practice included infection control, dental care records and radiography audits.

Leadership, openness and transparency

Staff we spoke with said they felt the practice culture was one of openness and a place where all staff felt included. Staff told us they were comfortable about raising concerns with the principal dentist. They felt they were listened to and responded to when they did so. They described the culture encouraged candour, openness and honesty.

Learning and improvement

Staff told us they had good access to training. There was a system in place to monitor staff training to ensure essential training was completed each year. Staff working at the practice were supported to maintain their continuing professional development (CPD) as required by the General Dental Council (GDC).

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

Patients had the opportunity to provide feedback through the practice's own surveys. We saw that the practice responded to issues identified during these surveys. For example we found that chair cushions had been re-covered in March 2016 following feedback received from patients.