

Goose Green Dental

Goose Green Dental

Inspection Report

5 Goose Green
Altrincham
WA14 1DW
Tel: 0161 928 4882
Website: N/A

Date of inspection visit: 7 February 2017
Date of publication: 16/03/2017

Overall summary

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection on 7 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

Goose Green Dental is located in the centre of Altrincham. The practice has a reception and waiting room, three

treatment rooms, decontamination rooms and patient toilet facilities all at ground floor level. Parking is available in a nearby car park. The practice is accessible to patients with disabilities, limited mobility, and to wheelchair users.

The practice provides general dental treatment to patients on an NHS or privately funded basis. The opening times are Monday to Thursday 8.30am to 5.00pm, and Friday 8.30am to 12.30pm. The practice is closed for lunch between 12.30pm and 1.30pm.

The practice is staffed by three principal dentists, two associate dentists, a hygienist, a practice manager, six dental nurses, and a receptionist.

One of the principal dentists 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.

We received feedback from 36 people during the inspection about the services provided. Patients commented that they found the practice excellent, and that staff were professional, friendly, and caring. They said the dentists listened to them and provided high quality care. Patients commented that the practice was clean, bright and comfortable.

Summary of findings

Our key findings were:

- The practice had procedures in place to record, analyse and learn from significant events and incidents.
- Staff had received safeguarding training, and knew the processes to follow to raise concerns.
- There were sufficient numbers of suitably qualified and skilled staff to meet the needs of patients.
- The premises and equipment were clean, secure and well maintained.
- Staff followed current infection control guidelines for decontaminating and sterilising instruments.
- Patients' needs were assessed, and care and treatment were delivered in accordance with current standards and guidance.
- Patients received information about their care, proposed treatment, costs, benefits, and risks and were involved in making decisions about it.
- Staff were supported to deliver effective care, and opportunities for training and learning were available.
- Patients were treated with kindness and respect, and their confidentiality was maintained.
- The appointment system met the needs of patients, and emergency appointments were available.
- Services were planned and delivered to meet the needs of patients.
- The practice gathered the views of patients and took their views into account.
- Staff were supervised, felt involved, and worked as a team.

- Staff had been trained to deal with medical emergencies, and most emergency medicines and equipment were available.
- Governance arrangements, systems and processes were in place for the smooth running of the practice. Most of these were operating effectively.

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

- Review the availability of equipment to manage medical emergencies having due regard to guidelines issued by the Resuscitation Council UK, and the General Dental Council standards for the dental team.
- Review the protocol for maintaining accurate, complete and detailed records relating to employment of staff. This includes ensuring recruitment checks, including references, are carried out and recorded.
- Review the systems for assessing, monitoring and mitigating the risks arising from undertaking of the regulated activities, specifically in relation to fire safety, display of warning signage and storage of cleaning chemicals.
- Review the protocols and procedures to ensure all staff are up to date with their continuing professional development.
- Review staff awareness of Gillick competency and ensure all staff are aware of their responsibilities.
- Review the practice's audit protocols of various aspects of the service, such as infection control, to ensure these are carried out at recommended intervals to help improve the quality of service.

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 provider had systems and processes in place to ensure care and treatment were carried out safely, for example, there were systems in place for infection prevention and control and for investigating and learning from incidents and complaints.

We found the equipment used in the practice was well maintained and tested at regular intervals.

The premises were secure, properly maintained and cleaned regularly.

There was guidance for staff on the decontamination of dental instruments which they were following.

The practice was following current legislation and guidance in relation to X-rays, to protect patients and staff from unnecessary exposure to radiation.

Staff were suitably trained and skilled but improvements were needed to the recruitment process.

The practice had emergency medicines and equipment available. One item of recommended equipment was not available. Staff were trained in responding to medical emergencies.

Procedures were in place to assess risks associated with delivering a dental service but not all reasonable measures had been implemented to minimise these risks.

No action



Are services effective?

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

The practice followed current guidelines when delivering dental care and treatment to patients.

Patients' medical history was recorded at their initial visit and updated at subsequent visits. Dentists assessed patients' dental health and monitored changes in it. Patients were given a written treatment plan which detailed the treatments considered and agreed, and fees involved. Patients' consent was obtained before treatment was provided; and treatment focused on the patients' individual needs.

Staff provided oral health advice to patients.

Patients were referred to other services, where necessary, in a timely manner.

Staff were registered with their professional body, the General Dental Council, where relevant, and were supported in meeting the requirements of their professional regulator. Staff received on-going training to assist them in carrying out their roles.

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

Patients commented that staff were caring and friendly. They told us they were treated with respect, and they were happy with the care and treatment given.

Staff understood the importance of emotional support when delivering care to patients who were nervous of dental treatment. Patient feedback on CQC comment cards confirmed that staff were understanding and made them feel at ease.

The practice had separate rooms available if patients wished to speak in private.

We found that treatment was clearly explained, and patients were given time to decide before treatment was commenced. Patients commented that information given to them about options for treatment was helpful.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

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

Patients had access to appointments to suit their preferences, and emergency appointments were available on the same day. The practice opening hours and the 'out of hours' appointment information was readily available.

The practice captured social and lifestyle information on the medical history forms completed by patients which helped the dentists to identify patients' specific needs and direct treatment to ensure the best outcome for the patient.

The provider had taken into account the needs of different groups of people and put adjustments in place. Staff were prompted to be aware of patients' specific needs or medical conditions.

The practice had a complaints policy in place which was clearly displayed. Complaints were thoroughly investigated and responded to appropriately.

No action



Are services well-led?

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

The provider had effective systems and processes in place for monitoring and improving services. Most were operating effectively.

The practice had a management structure in place, and some of the staff had lead roles. Staff reported that the provider and manager were approachable and helpful, and took account of their views.

The provider had put in place a range of policies, procedures and protocols to guide staff in undertaking tasks and to ensure that the service was delivered safely. We saw that these were regularly reviewed.

Staff were aware of the importance of confidentiality and understood their roles in this. Dental care records were complete, accurate, and securely stored.

No action



Summary of findings

The practice held regular staff meetings, and these gave everybody an opportunity to openly share information and discuss any concerns or issues. Staff told us they were encouraged to raise any issues or concerns.

The provider used a variety of means to monitor quality and safety at the practice and to ensure continuous improvement in the practice, for example, learning from complaints, audits, and patient feedback. Infection control audits were undertaken annually and not within the recommended time interval of six months.

Goose Green Dental

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 registered provider was meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008.

The inspection took place on 7 February 2017 and was led by a CQC Inspector with remote access to a dental specialist adviser.

Prior to the inspection we asked the practice to send us some information which we reviewed. This included details of complaints they had received in the last 12 months, their latest statement of purpose, and staff details, including their qualifications and professional body registration number where appropriate. We also reviewed information we held about the practice.

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

During the inspection we spoke to three dentists, the practice manager, dental nurses and the receptionist. We reviewed policies, protocols and other documents and observed procedures. We also reviewed CQC comment cards which we had sent prior to the inspection for patients to complete about the services provided at the practice.

To get to the heart of patients' experiences of care and treatment, we always ask the following five questions:

- Is it safe?
- Is it effective?
- Is it caring?
- Is it responsive to people's needs?
- Is it well-led?

These questions therefore formed the framework for the areas we looked at during the inspection.

Are services safe?

Our findings

Reporting, learning and improvement from incidents

The provider had systems and processes in place to ensure care and treatment were carried out safely.

We reviewed the practice's procedures for reporting and learning from significant events, accidents and incidents. Staff described examples of those which had occurred. We saw these had been reported and analysed in order to learn from them, and improvements had been put in place to prevent re-occurrence.

Staff had an understanding of the Reporting of Injuries, Diseases, and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations 2013 and were aware of how and what to report.

Staff understood their responsibilities under the Duty of Candour. Duty of Candour means relevant people are told when a notifiable safety incident occurs, and in accordance with the statutory duty, are given an apology and informed of any actions taken as a result. The provider knew when and how to notify CQC of incidents which could cause harm.

The practice received safety alerts from the Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency and Department of Health. These alerts identify problems or concerns relating to medicines or equipment, or detail protocols to follow, for example, in the event of an outbreak of pandemic influenza. The practice manager brought relevant alerts to the attention of the staff, retained copies of them and recorded actions taken in response. The dentists were able to discuss examples of recent alerts with us.

Reliable safety systems and processes (including safeguarding)

We saw that the practice had systems, processes and practices in place to keep people safe and safeguard them from abuse.

The provider had a whistleblowing policy in place with an associated procedure to enable staff to raise issues and concerns.

The provider had a policy for safeguarding children and vulnerable adults. One of the staff had a lead role for safeguarding and provided advice and support to staff where required. Local safeguarding authority's contact

details for reporting concerns and suspected abuse to were displayed in the treatment rooms. Staff were trained to the appropriate level in safeguarding, and were aware of how to identify abuse and follow up on concerns.

The clinicians were assisted at all times by a dental nurse.

We observed that the dental care and treatment of patients was planned and delivered in a way that ensured patients' safety and welfare. Patients completed a medical history form at their first visit which was reviewed by the clinician at subsequent visits. The dental care records we looked at were well structured and contained sufficient detail. Details of medicines used in the dental treatments were recorded which would enable a specific batch of a medicine to be traced to the patient in the event of a safety recall or alert.

We saw that staff followed recognised guidance and current practice to keep patients safe, for example, we reviewed the provider's protocols for root canal treatment.

Medical emergencies

The provider had procedures in place for staff to follow in the event of a medical emergency. Staff had received training in medical emergencies and life support as a team and this was updated annually. The provider did not have arrangements in place for staff to practice together regularly as a team in simulated emergency situations but staff described to us how they would respond to a variety of medical emergencies. One of the staff was also trained in the provision of first aid.

The practice had most emergency medicines and equipment available, including an automated external defibrillator (AED), in accordance with the British National Formulary, the Resuscitation Council UK guidance, and the General Dental Council standards for the dental team. (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 did not have self-inflating bags available to assist in resuscitating unconscious people.

We saw records to show that the medicines and equipment were checked regularly.

The practice stored emergency medicines and equipment centrally and staff were able to tell us where they were located.

Staff recruitment

Are services safe?

The provider used the skill mix of staff in a variety of clinical roles, for example, dentists, a dental hygienist and dental nurses, to deliver care in the best possible way for patients. Two of the dental nurses had completed enhanced skills courses.

The practice had a recruitment policy and associated procedures in place which did not fully reflect the requirements of current legislation. The provider maintained recruitment records for each member of staff. The provider was not carrying out Disclosure and Barring checks for each new member of staff but did check that one had been carried out by the most recent previous employer. We reviewed the record for the newest member of staff and saw evidence of the following was available; qualification, registration with their professional body, the General Dental Council and indemnity insurance, but photographic identification and references were not available and a DBS check was last carried out in 2014 and was from a previous employer. We also reviewed records for longer term staff and saw these contained, where relevant, evidence of the following; qualifications, registration with their professional body, the General Dental Council, indemnity insurance.

Staff recruitment and employment records were stored securely to prevent unauthorised access.

We were informed an induction programme was in place to familiarise new staff with practice policies and procedures, for example, health and safety and patient confidentiality requirements but the provider did not record the induction process.

Monitoring health and safety and responding to risks

The provider had systems in place to assess, monitor, and mitigate risks, with a view to keeping patients and staff safe but they were not all operating effectively.

The practice had an overarching health and safety policy in place, underpinned by several specific policies and risk assessments. A range of other policies, procedures, protocols and risk assessments were in place to inform and guide staff in the performance of their duties, and to manage risks at the practice.

We reviewed the practice's control of substances hazardous to health risk assessment. Staff maintained records of products used at the practice, for example dental materials and cleaning products, and retained manufacturer's safety

details to inform staff what action to take in the event of, for example, spillage, accidental swallowing, or contact with the skin. Some measures had been implemented to reduce risks associated with these products, for example, the use of personal protective equipment for staff and patients. We observed that cleaning chemicals were not stored securely and radiation and oxygen warning signs were not displayed.

We saw that the provider had carried out a sharps risk assessment and implemented measures to mitigate the risks associated with the use of sharps, for example, a sharps policy was in place. The policy identified responsibility for the dismantling and disposal of sharps. Sharps containers were suitably located in the clinical areas to allow appropriate disposal.

The sharps policy also detailed procedures to follow in the event of an injury from a sharp instrument. These procedures were displayed in the treatment rooms for quick reference. Staff were familiar with the procedures and able to describe the action they would take should they sustain an injury.

The provider ensured that clinical staff had received appropriate vaccinations, including the vaccination to protect them against the Hepatitis B virus, and that the effectiveness of the vaccination was identified. People who are likely to come into contact with blood products, and are at increased risk of injuries from sharp instruments, should receive the Hepatitis B vaccination to minimise the risks of acquiring blood borne infections.

We saw that a fire risk assessment had been carried out in August 2015. The assessment identified actions to be carried out. Most, but not all had been completed, for example, no warning signs had been placed in relation to the storage of oxygen, no evacuation procedure had been identified and no fire drills were carried out. Some of these were identified as high risk actions. Fire safety training was not included in the induction process. The assessment was reviewed annually by the provider. The provider had some arrangements in place to mitigate the risks associated with fire, for example, one of the staff undertook a lead role for fire safety and fire-fighting equipment was available.

Infection control

The practice had an overarching infection prevention and control policy in place, underpinned by policies and

Are services safe?

procedures which detailed decontamination and cleaning tasks. Procedures were displayed in appropriate areas such as the decontamination rooms and treatment rooms for staff to refer to.

One member of staff had a lead role for infection prevention and control and provided guidance to staff where required.

Staff undertook infection prevention and control audits annually. Actions were identified in the audits and we saw that these had been carried out.

We observed there were adequate hand washing facilities available in the treatment rooms, the decontamination room, and in the toilet facilities. Hand washing protocols were displayed appropriately near hand washing sinks.

The practice had dedicated decontamination rooms which were accessible to staff only. The decontamination rooms were designated for 'dirty' and 'clean' tasks. Staff used sealed containers to transfer used instruments from the treatment rooms to the decontamination rooms. Staff followed a process of cleaning, inspecting, sterilising and packaging of instruments to minimise the risk of infection. Staff wore appropriate personal protective equipment during the decontamination process.

We observed that packaged instruments were stored in drawers in the treatment rooms. The packages were sealed and marked with an expiry date which was within the recommendations of the Department of Health.

We noted the practice was meeting some of the best practice recommendations of HTM 01-05.

Staff showed us the systems in place to ensure the decontamination process was tested, and decontamination equipment was checked, tested, and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions and HTM 01-05. We saw records of these checks and tests.

Staff changing facilities were available and staff wore their uniforms inside the practice only.

The provider had had a Legionella risk assessment carried out in August 2015 to determine if there were any risks associated with the premises. (Legionella is a bacterium found in the environment which can contaminate water systems in buildings). Actions to reduce the likelihood of Legionella developing were identified in the assessment

and staff had carried these out, for example, we saw records of checks on water temperatures. Staff described to us the procedures for the cleaning and disinfecting of the dental water lines. This was in accordance with guidance to prevent the growth and spread of Legionella bacteria.

The treatment rooms had sufficient supplies of personal protective equipment for staff and patient use.

The practice had a cleaning policy in place, with an associated cleaning schedule identifying tasks to be completed and timescales for their completion. We observed that the practice was clean, and treatment rooms and the decontamination rooms were clean and uncluttered. The practice largely followed current HTM 01 05 guidance on cleaning. Cleaning equipment was not stored appropriately but the practice manager assured us this would be rectified immediately.

The segregation and disposal of dental waste was in accordance with current legislation and guidelines. The practice had arrangements for all types of dental waste to be removed from the premises by a contractor. Kits were available for contaminated spillages. We observed that clinical waste awaiting collection was stored securely.

Equipment and medicines

We saw that the provider had systems and processes in place to protect people from the unsafe use of materials, medicines and equipment used in the practice.

Staff showed us the recording system for the prescribing, storage, and stock control of medicines.

We saw contracts for the maintenance of equipment, and recent test certificates for the

decontamination equipment, the air compressor and the X-ray machines and portable appliances.

We saw records to demonstrate that fire detection and fire-fighting equipment, for example, the fire alarm and extinguishers were regularly tested.

We saw that the practice was storing NHS prescription pads securely and maintaining records for all prescriptions on the premises in accordance with current guidance. Private prescriptions were printed out when required following assessment of the patient.

Radiography (X-rays)

Are services safe?

We saw that the provider was acting in compliance with the Ionising Radiations Regulations 1999, the Ionising Radiation (Medical Exposure) Regulations 2000 and national radiological guidelines.

The provider had appointed a Radiation Protection Advisor and a Radiation Protection Supervisor.

The provider did not have evidence that the Health and Safety Executive had been notified of the use of X-ray equipment on the premises when it opened in 2013.

We saw a critical examination pack for the X-ray machines. Routine testing and servicing of the X-ray machines had been carried out in accordance with the current recommended maximum interval of three years.

We observed that local rules were displayed in areas where X-rays were carried out. These included specific working instructions for staff using the X-ray equipment.

Records confirmed that X-rays were justified, graded and reported on. We saw evidence of regular auditing of the quality of the X-ray images.

We saw evidence of recent radiology training for relevant staff in accordance with GDC recommendations.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Monitoring and improving outcomes for patients

The dentists carried out assessments, and treatment in accordance with current guidance and standards. Patients completed a medical history form with details of their health which enabled clinicians to identify specific oral health needs. Patients were made aware of the condition of their oral health and whether it had changed since the last appointment. Dentists assessed each patient's risks and needs to determine how frequently to recall them.

We checked dental care records to confirm what was described to us.

Health promotion and prevention

We saw that staff adhered to guidance issued in the Department of Health publication 'Delivering better oral health: an evidence-based toolkit for prevention'. Clinicians gave tailored preventive dental advice, and information on diet and lifestyle to patients to improve their health outcomes. Information in leaflet form was available in the waiting room in relation to improving oral health and lifestyles, for example, smoking cessation.

Staffing

New staff and trainees undertook a programme of training and supervision before being allowed to carry out duties at the practice unsupervised.

The provider did not carry out formal staff appraisals but staff we spoke to confirmed they were able to discuss training needs and work related issues with the provider on an informal basis anytime.

All qualified dental professionals are required to be registered with the General Dental Council, (GDC), in order to practice dentistry. Registration requires dental professionals to be appropriately qualified and to meet the requirements relating to continuing professional development, (CPD). We saw that the qualified dental professionals were registered with the GDC.

The GDC highly recommends certain core subjects for CPD, such as medical emergencies and life support, safeguarding, infection prevention and control, and radiology. The provider had not carried out a training needs analysis but some training was delivered to the practice as a team. This included the General Dental Council core

topics. The provider monitored training for most staff to ensure essential training was completed each year, however had not carried out any monitoring to ensure two of the clinicians had carried out core CPD training within the recommended time period.

Working with other services

We reviewed the practice's arrangements for working with other health professionals. Clinicians referred patients to a variety of secondary care and specialist options if the treatment required was not provided by the practice, not within the clinician's competency, or in response to patient preference.

Information was shared appropriately when patients were referred to other health care providers. Urgent referrals were made in line with current guidelines. Referral outcome letters were first seen by the dentists to see if action was required then stored in the patient's dental care records.

Consent to care and treatment

The dentists described how they obtained valid, informed, consent from patients by explaining their findings to them. These explanations were supported with treatment and cost information for patients in a variety of formats, for example leaflets, visual displays and demonstrations.

Patients were given a treatment plan after assessments, and prior to commencing dental treatment. The signed treatment plan and consent form were retained in the patients' dental care records. The plan and discussions with the clinicians made it clear that a patient could withdraw consent at any time. We saw this confirmed in the treatment plans we looked at.

The dentists described to us how they re-confirmed consent at each subsequent treatment appointment.

The dentists explained that they would not normally provide treatment to patients on their examination appointment unless they were in pain, or their presenting condition dictated otherwise. We saw that the dentists allowed patients time to think about the treatment options presented to them.

The dentists told us they would generally only see children under 16 who were accompanied by a parent or guardian to ensure consent was obtained before treatment was undertaken. Not all staff we spoke to were clear about

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

involving children in decision making and ensuring their wishes were respected in accordance with Gillick competency principles. (Gillick competency is a term used in medical law to decide whether a child of 16 years or under is able to consent to their own treatment).

The Mental Capacity Act 2005, (MCA), provides a legal framework for acting and making decisions on behalf of adults who lack the capacity to make decisions for themselves. The dentists had an understanding of the principles and application of the MCA.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Respect, dignity, compassion and empathy

The practice had a separate room available should patients wish to speak in private. Treatment rooms were situated away from the main waiting area, and we saw that the doors were closed when patients were with the dentists. Staff understood the importance of emotional support when delivering care to patients who were nervous of dental treatment. Several patients confirmed in CQC comment cards that staff put them at ease and always treated them kindly.

We observed staff to be friendly and respectful towards patients during interactions at the reception desk and over the telephone.

Involvement in decisions about care and treatment

The dentists discussed treatment options with patients and allowed time for patients to decide before treatment was commenced. CQC comment cards we reviewed told us treatments were always explained in a language patients could understand. Patients confirmed that treatment options, risks, and benefits were discussed with them and that they were provided with helpful information to assist them in making an informed choice.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting patients' needs

We saw evidence that services were planned and delivered to meet the needs of people.

The practice was well maintained and provided a comfortable environment. The provider had a maintenance programme in place to ensure the premises was maintained to a high standard.

We saw that the clinicians tailored appointment lengths to patients' individual needs and patients choose from appointments at various times of the day.

The practice captured social and lifestyle information on the medical history forms completed by patients. This enabled clinicians to identify any specific needs and direct treatment to ensure the best outcome was achieved for the patient. Staff were prompted to be aware of patients' specific needs or medical conditions via the use of a flagging system on the dental care records which helped them treat patients individually.

We saw that the provider gathered the views of patients when planning and delivering the service via patient surveys, for example, the provider had consulted patients in relation to the practice opening times.

Tackling inequity and promoting equality

The provider had taken into account the needs of different groups of people, for example, people with disabilities and people whose first language was not English and put reasonable adjustments in place to ensure these needs were met.

The practice, reception and waiting room, treatment rooms and patient toilet were accessible to people with disabilities, impaired mobility, and to wheelchair users. Parking was available in a car park adjacent to the practice. Staff provided assistance should patients require it.

The reception desk was at a suitable height for wheelchair users and hand rails had been installed internally to assist patients with mobility difficulties. Seating was provided at a range of heights and in various styles.

The practice offered interpretation services to patients whose first language was not English and to patients with impaired hearing.

The practice made provision for patients to arrange appointments and receive appointment reminders by a variety of methods. Where patients failed to attend their dental appointments, staff contacted them to re-arrange the appointment and to establish if the practice could assist by providing adjustments to enable patients to receive their treatment.

Access to the service

We saw that patients could access treatment and care in a timely way.

The practice opening hours, and the 'out of hours' appointment information, were readily available. Emergency appointments were available daily.

Concerns and complaints

The practice had a complaints policy and sufficiently detailed procedure which was available in the waiting room. We saw that complaints were promptly and thoroughly investigated and responded to. Staff told us they raised any formal or informal comments or concerns with the practice manager to ensure responses were made in a timely manner.

Are services well-led?

Our findings

Governance arrangements

We reviewed the provider's systems and processes for monitoring and improving the services provided for patients and found most were operating effectively but the recruitment procedures required improvement.

Policies, procedures and risk assessments were regularly reviewed.

The provider had implemented a range of policies and procedures to guide staff in the performance of their duties.

The provider had arrangements in place to ensure risks were identified and managed and had put some measures in place to mitigate risks. Not all measures had been implemented, for example, in relation to fire safety.

The provider used a variety of means to monitor quality and performance and improve the service, for example, via the analysis of patient feedback, carrying out a range of audits and the analysis of complaints.

Most dental professionals' continuing professional development was monitored by the provider to ensure they were meeting the requirements of their professional registration. Staff were supported to meet these requirements by the provision of training.

Staff were aware of the importance of confidentiality and understood their roles in this. Dental care records were maintained electronically and were complete and accurate. Records were maintained securely and data was backed up appropriately.

Leadership, openness and transparency

We saw systems in place to support communication about the quality and safety of the service for staff but not for patients.

The practice held monthly staff meetings. We saw recorded minutes of the meetings, and noted that items discussed included clinical and non-clinical issues. The meetings were also used to deliver training updates.

The practice was managed by the provider and a practice manager, and some staff had lead roles. We saw that staff had access to supervision and support in order to undertake their roles. Staff were aware of their own competencies, skills, and abilities.

The provider operated an open door policy. Staff said they could speak to the manager or provider if they had any concerns, and that both were approachable and helpful. Staff confirmed their colleagues were supportive.

Learning and improvement

The provider used quality assurance measures, for example, auditing, to encourage improvement in service delivery. Audits we reviewed included X-rays, infection prevention and control, and health and safety. Where appropriate, audits had identified actions, and we saw these had been carried out and re-auditing used to measure improvement.

The provider gathered information on the quality of care from a range of sources, including patient feedback and the NHS Family and Friends Test, and used this to evaluate and improve the service.

Staff confirmed that learning from complaints, incidents, audits, and feedback was discussed at staff meetings to share learning in order to improve future practice.

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

We saw that people who used the service and staff were engaged and involved.

The provider had a system in place to seek the views of patients about all areas of service delivery, carried out patient surveys, and looked at the results to identify areas for improvement.

We saw that the provider acted on patient feedback, for example, internal handrails had been installed in response to patient feedback.

Staff told us they felt valued and involved. They were encouraged to offer suggestions for improvements to the service and said these were listened to and acted on. Staff said they were encouraged to challenge any aspect of practice which caused concern.