

IDH Limited

IDH Wellington

Inspection Report

1 Station Road
Wellington
Somerset
TA21 8LA

Tel: 01823 662064
Website: www.mydentist.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 17 February 2017
Date of publication: 30/03/2017

Overall summary

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection on 17 February 2017 to ask the practice the following key questions; Are services safe, effective, caring, responsive and well-led?

Our findings were:

Are services safe?

We found 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

IDH Wellington is located in the town of Wellington, Somerset. The practice provides primary dental care services. The practice provides NHS and private patient care. There are four dental surgeries, with three currently in use due to a dentist vacancy. There is one ground floor surgery for patients who have mobility restrictions and level access from a lane at the back of the practice for wheelchair access. Approximately 8,300 patients are registered and the practice provides dental care to both adults and children.

The staff structure of the practice consists of two dentists and a dentist who is in their foundation year after qualifying, this involves the dentist being supervised and mentored by one of the qualified dentists at the practice, two dental hygienists, two qualified dental nurses, two trainee dental nurses, a practice manager, three receptionists and a cleaner. The practice is a training practice for dentists in their foundation years after graduating.

The practice is open on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Fridays from 8am – 6pm and on Thursdays from 8am – 5pm. 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

Summary of findings

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 inspection took place over one day and was carried out by a CQC inspector who had remote access to a dental specialist advisor if required.

Forty eight patients provided feedback directly to CQC about the service. All 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. However, a number of patients commented that there were some difficulties in getting non-urgent appointments at this busy practice and patients felt that there had been a high turnover of dentists; patients said they preferred consistency with who they saw.

Our key findings were:

- Patients' needs were assessed and care was planned in line with current guidance such as from the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE).
- There were effective systems in place 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.
- 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.
- Staff reported incidents and kept records of these which the practice used for shared learning.
- 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 with felt supported by the management team and were committed to providing a quality service to their patients.

There was one area where the provider could make improvements and should:

- Review the systems for the clinical audit cycle to ensure that audits are meaningful, and inspire improvements and learning.

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 to minimise the risks associated with providing dental services. The practice had policies and protocols, which staff were following, for the management of medical emergencies. There were systems 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 were safely managed. Equipment used in the practice was checked for effectiveness. Staff recruitment was robust ensuring that applicants for job vacancies had the right skills and aptitudes for the role.

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 National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). 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 had received an induction and were 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 feedback from 48 patients. The practice also received patient feedback via internal surveys. Feedback was consistently positive regarding care and treatment. Patients commented there were some difficulties in getting non-urgent appointments and that there had been a high turnover of dentists affecting the consistency with who they saw. Patients told us that the staff were kind and caring and that they were treated with dignity and respect at all times.

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 emergency appointments, which were available on the same day.

No
action


Summary of findings

There was a complaints policy. 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 sent directly to the practice and the use of the NHS Choices website. Systems were in place 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 as there was level access to the premises via a lane at the rear of 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.

The practice carried out a number of clinical audits. However these required improvement as they lacked sufficient analysis and comparison with previous audits to make the auditing process meaningful.

**No
action**


IDH Wellington

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 17 February 2017. The inspection was led by a CQC inspector who had access to remote advice from a specialist advisor.

We reviewed information received from the provider prior to the inspection. During our inspection we reviewed policy documents and spoke with eight members of staff (company regulatory officer, practice manager, a dentist, a dentist in their first year after qualifying who was being supervised and mentored by a senior dentist in the practice, a qualified dental nurse, a 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.

Forty eight patients provided feedback about the service. We also looked at written comments about the practice left about patient experiences on-line via NHS choices. 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 seven events related to patients, visitors or staff in the past year. The recording of events reflected the practice ethos of capturing low level risks at the practice and discussing within the whole staff team any learning from such events to prevent them from reoccurring.

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.

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 regularly. Team meetings were recorded and we looked at the last three team meeting minutes for November 2016, January 2017 and February 2017. We saw that there were clear records of when actions resulting from team meetings were addressed and signed off as 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 held in a file in the staff room and displayed in surgeries. 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 an appropriate level.

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, the practice used 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-free rubber, used in dentistry to isolate the operative site from the rest of the mouth).

Medical emergencies

The practice had arrangements 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 practice 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.

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 dentists and a dentist in their foundation year after qualifying as a dentist being supervised and mentored by one of the



Are services safe?

qualified dentists at the practice, two dental hygienists, two qualified dental nurses, two trainee dental nurses, a practice manager, three receptionists and a cleaner. The practice is a training practice for dentists in their foundation years after graduating.

There was a qualified dentist in their foundation year after graduating due to start at the practice in April 2017 and one other full time dentist vacancy, which was currently advertised. When the new dentist starts in April a fourth surgery would be operational. This would provide greater availability of appointments to patients and address the wait for non-urgent appointments.

There was a recruitment policy 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, where relevant, 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. All required information was included in the files we viewed.

Monitoring health & safety and responding to risks

There were arrangements 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 with a premises risk assessment, last reviewed during October 2016. There were clearly marked exits and an evacuation plan. There were also fire extinguishers situated at suitable points in the premises. The fire system was serviced during February 2017. The practice carried out fire drills. The last was carried out during February 2017. 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 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 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 staff meetings which facilitated shared learning.

Infection control

There were systems 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. The last audit completed during November 2016 had concluded that there were only minor issues to be addressed. A record of completed actions following the audit had been maintained. We noted that there was an X-ray developing machine and a notice board in the decontamination room which was covered with felt and as a porous material is difficult to clean. Staff also had to walk through the decontamination room to access staff toilet facilities. These issues had not been considered in the audit in terms of how this impacted upon effective cleaning and infection control in the decontamination room. We raised this with the practice manager who told us that these issues would be risk assessed and acted on.

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



Are services safe?

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 explained the decontamination of the decontamination room and dental surgeries. 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. Environmental cleaning was carried out in accordance with the national colour coding scheme by the cleaning staff employed to work throughout the building.

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

In the decontamination room instruments were cleaned in a washer disinfectant or, where applicable, manually cleaned then inspected under an illuminated 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 premises. Waste was stored in separate, locked bins outside of the practice in a secure area 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 during November 2014 and was due for review by May 2017. The practice was following recommendations to reduce the risk of legionella, for example, through the regular testing of the water temperatures. The practice kept a record 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 and was next due by January 2019. 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. Dental care products requiring refrigeration were stored in a fridge in line with the manufacturer's guidance.

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 August 2015, within the three yearly recommended maintenance cycle.

No action



Are services safe?

We saw evidence that the dentists had completed radiation training in the last 12 months.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

No action



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 two 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 checking for 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.

The patients' 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 private or NHS. 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 care records, for the three dentists and two hygienists, to confirm the findings. 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.

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 discussions 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.

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.

Staff told us that the management team was supportive and invested in their staff through regular training opportunities to promote clinical excellence at the practice.

Working with other services

The practice had suitable arrangements 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 and hygienist 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 complex orthodontic work.

We reviewed the systems for referring patients to specialist consultants in secondary care. A referral letter was prepared and posted to the hospital via recorded delivery with full details of the dentist's findings and a copy was stored on the practice's records system. We looked at 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

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

No action



the appointment had been completed and further actions required for follow up. They contacted other providers to check on the progress of their patients and kept the referring dentist informed about the outcomes.

Consent to care and treatment

The practice ensured valid consent was obtained for all care and treatment. We spoke to the dentist about their understanding of consent issues. They explained that individual treatment options, risks, benefits and costs were discussed with each patient. Patients were asked to sign formal written consent forms for specific treatments. We looked at a selection of patient electronic records and saw consent to treatment was suitably recorded in the patient dental care records.

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

We received 48 comments cards, all who completed them made positive remarks about the staff's caring, professional and helpful attitude. Patients indicated that they felt comfortable and relaxed with their dentists 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/hygienist could not be heard from outside the rooms, which protected patients' privacy.

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 in a dedicated lockable staff only area. There were also electronic records for X-rays and 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 and payment options (such as membership of private dental schemes). A poster detailing NHS and private treatment costs was displayed in the waiting area.

We spoke with eight 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 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 with hearing loss?

(for example, to feedback?)

No action



Our findings

Responding to and meeting patients' needs

The practice had a system to schedule enough time to assess and meet patients' dental needs. The dentists and hygienists decided on the length of time needed for their patient's consultation and treatment according to patient need. Additional same day urgent appointments were also scheduled for patients. 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 up to 12 months in advance to see the dentist. The feedback we received from patients confirmed that they could get urgent appointments on the day that they needed to be seen but that routine appointments could be difficult to arrange because of high patient demand. We raised these comments with the practice manager. They acknowledged patient feedback and also recognised that there had been a lot of changes to the dentist team over the last two years, affecting continuity at the practice. They told us the staff team was now more settled and that with the appointment of another dentist in April 2017, more routine dental appointments would be available. We were told that the practice had an agreement with the commissioning body, NHS England, for a temporary stop on registering any new patients with the practice.

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 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. The dentists were aware of cultural or dietary factors that could affect dental treatment or options, such as patients fasting to adhere to religious practices or vegetarian and vegan patients receiving prescriptions that may contain products made from animal sources. Reception staff told us they could provide written information for people who were hard of hearing and translation services were available for

patients speaking English as a second language. The practice has a hearing loop for patients who had hearing loss. There were both female and male dentists to facilitate requests for same gender examinations or treatment.

The practice was a converted Victorian town house. This meant there were restrictions on how accessible the building was for people with mobility restrictions. There were stairs to access the premises from the front of the building. Patients who used a wheelchair could access the practice from the rear of the building, via a back lane with level access and there was a ground floor treatment rooms. However, there was no accessible toilet.

Access to the service

The practice opening hours were Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Fridays from 8am – 6pm and on Thursdays from 8am – 5pm. There was an answer phone message directing patients to emergency contact numbers when the practice was 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 comment cards confirmed that patients had good access to the dentist in the event of needing urgent 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 16 complaints recorded in the last 12 months regarding dental work, fees or staff attitudes. We looked at the complaints in detail. They were handled in a timely way and resolved to the satisfaction of the patient complaining. All complaints were shared with the provider senior managers, with records of action taken to resolve the complaint. The practice manager also shared details of complaints with the staff team in staff meetings as a standing agenda item. The practice manager also recorded learning for the staff as a result of each complaint. This showed that the practice manager and provider took complaints seriously and sought to learn from patient feedback in order to improve services.

Are services responsive to people's views? (for example, to feedback?)

No action



Patients were also invited to give feedback through patient surveys, in which patients could remain anonymous. There were systems in place which publicised the action taken by the practice as a result of patient feedback through a notice board in the 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 area manager and practice owners. There were relevant policies and procedures. 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. There was also a fortnightly internal bulletin sent from the provider to each of the practice locations in the group. This bulletin included details of clinical updates from evidence based guidance institutions and sharing of good practice within the group.

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 senior managers at the practice. 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.

Learning and improvement

We found there were clinical audits taking place at the practice. These included clinical record keeping and X-ray quality. There was evidence of repeat audits at appropriate

intervals but there were no comparisons of audits between repeat audit cycles and the audit depth of analyses were not sufficient to be meaningful, as there was no overall summary, recommendations and action plans resulting from these audits. However, dentists told us they had received feedback on their performance as a result of audits. We raised the quality of auditing analyses with the practice manager and regional manager. The regional manager told us that auditing processes and guidance to managers was under review with the group and new guidance was being drafted to improve the auditing cycle. We were told that additional staff training would accompany the roll out of the revised guidance.

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 and through monitoring and responding to patient comments left on the NHS Choices website. The practice also participated in the NHS Friends and Family test survey. Actions had been taken as a result. For example, advertising to recruit additional dentists to ease patient waiting times for routine appointments.

Staff told us that the management team were open to feedback regarding the quality of the care. Staff said they felt able to suggest changes to make improvements at the practice. One dentist gave an example of liaising with reception staff to ensure the system for informing the dentists of any changes to their daily diary was revised to ensure that the dentists were kept updated of any changes, so that they could effectively manage appointment times.

All staff were aware of the practice whistleblowing policy and felt they could raise concerns, which would be acted upon by the management team.