

Park Lane Dental

Croydon Dental Care

Inspection Report

60-62 Church Street,
Croydon,
Surrey
CR0 1RB
Tel: 020 8686 6222
Website: [www.croydondentalcare.co.uk/
dental-team.html](http://www.croydondentalcare.co.uk/dental-team.html)

Date of inspection visit: 12 August 2016
Date of publication: 20/09/2016

Overall summary

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection on 12 August 2016 to ask the practice the following key questions; Are services safe, effective, caring, responsive and well-led?

Our findings were:

Are services safe?

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

Are services effective?

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

Are services caring?

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

Are services responsive?

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

Are services well-led?

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

Background

Croydon Dental Practice is based in the London Borough of Croydon and provides private and NHS treatment. The opening hours for the practice were Monday to Friday 9.00am to 5.30am.

The premises consists of eight treatment rooms, three decontamination rooms and three waiting areas.

The practice comprises of two principal dentists, nine dentists, six receptionists, eight dental nurses and a practice administrator.

One of the principal 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.

During the inspection we asked patients to complete CQC comment cards. We received 19 completed comments cards. We spoke with three patients on the day of the inspection. The patients who provided feedback were positive about the care and treatment they received at the practice. They told us they were involved in all aspects of their care and found the staff to be caring, friendly and helpful and they were treated with care, dignity and respect.

Summary of findings

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.
- Staff were trained in and there was appropriate equipment for them to respond to medical emergencies.
- 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.

- There were suitable governance arrangements and an effective management structure was in place.

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

- Review the practice's waste handling policy and procedure to ensure waste is segregated and disposed of in accordance with relevant regulations giving due regard to guidance issued in the Health Technical Memorandum 07-01 (HTM 07-01).
- Review the storage of records related to people employed and the management of regulated activities giving due regard to current legislation and guidance.
- Review the protocol for completing accurate, complete and detailed records relating to employment of staff. This includes making appropriate notes of verbal reference taken and ensuring recruitment checks, including references, are suitably obtained and recorded.

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 children from abuse, 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 had policies for the safe recruitment of staff which included carrying out criminal record checks and obtaining references but these had not always been followed. Steps had not always been taken to ensure that relevant staff had appropriate and current registration with the professional regulatory body – General Dental Council (GDC).

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). 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 oral health 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.

No action



Summary of findings

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 feedback forms. There were arrangements to meet the needs of patients whose first language was not English and wheelchair users.

Are services well-led?

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

There was a vision for the practice that was shared with the staff. There were governance arrangements and an effective management structure. Appropriate policies and procedures were in place, and there was effective monitoring of various aspects of care delivery. Patients were given the opportunity to provide feedback about the practice through their own feedback forms.

No action



Croydon Dental Care

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

We received feedback from 22 patients. We also spoke with nine 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 this would mainly be through team meetings if an incident ever occurred. Staff were able to describe the type of incidents that would be recorded and the incident logging process. There had been one adverse incident over the past 12 months and it had been dealt with appropriately.

The majority of 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 affected 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 principal dentists was the safeguarding lead and staff we spoke with knew who they should go to if they had a safeguarding concern. There was a safeguarding policy that had last been reviewed in January 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 and it was updated on a regular basis. They were able to explain their understanding of safeguarding issues. There had been no safeguarding incident 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). All the dentists received the alerts directly and one of the principal dentists told us relevant information would be discussed with staff during team 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, sharps, 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 dental care records we saw were well structured and contained sufficient detail enabling another dentist to know how to safely treat a patient.

The practice used a rubber dam for root canal treatments in line with current guidance. [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 practice was spread over three floors and all the staff we spoke with were aware of where the kit was located. The kit contained the recommended

Are services safe?

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 and an automated external defibrillator (AED), in line with Resuscitation Council UK guidance. (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).

Staff recruitment

The practice had a policy for the safe recruitment of staff the policy had last been updated in June 2016. 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 the majority of staff who worked in the practice. However there were some gaps.

We found that suitable processes had not been followed for ensuring that all relevant staff had appropriate and current registration with the professional regulator. Two of the dental nurses employed had not been registered with the GDC. When we pointed this out to the provider we were told that the two nurses in question could not afford to register at this time.

We discussed this with the provider who took immediate action to address the issue and contacted the GDC.

Improvements could also be made to document a risk assessment for staff, such as the receptionists for whom DBS checks were not undertaken.

We also found there were no references for the dentists. One of the principal dentists told us this was because the majority of the dentists had initially been employed as vocational training (VT) dentists and the practice was their first employed work. We saw that there was no reference for one of the dentist who had not been employed as a VT; the principal dentist told us that a verbal reference had been taken for them, though this was not documented.

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. For example, we saw risk assessments for fire, radiation, pregnant women and infection control. The assessments included the controls and actions to manage risks.

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 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.

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 suitably cleaned 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 about the 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 records that confirmed these checks were carried out.

We saw evidence that staff had been vaccinated against Hepatitis B to protect patients from the risks of contracting the infection. (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.)

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. Bins were collected weekly. The bins were appropriately stored safely away from public access while awaiting collection. However we found that staff were not disposing of all waste appropriately, we found they were disposing of study models and suction tips in the sharps bin.

Are services safe?

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.

A legionella risk assessment had been completed in May 2016 by an external organisation and the results were negative for bacterium [Legionella is a bacterium found in the environment which can contaminate water systems in buildings]. The dental unit water lines were flushed daily and weekly.

There was a cleaning plan, schedule and checklist, which was regularly checked by the practice staff. The practice employed a cleaner to carry out the environmental cleaning.

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.

Portable appliance testing (PAT) had been undertaken in August 2016. PAT is the name of a process where electrical appliances are routinely checked for safety. We saw evidence that staff at the practice had undertaken visual checks of electrical appliance on a yearly basis.

The practice had clear guidance regarding the prescribing, recording and stock control of the medicines used in the practice.

Radiography (X-rays)

One of the principal dentists 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. A radiation audit had taken place in January 2016.

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 guidance. This included following the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidance, for example in regards to the use of antibiotics. The practice gave patients oral health guidance. We found advice leaflets in the waiting area.

During the course of our inspection we spoke with 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, details of examinations undertaken and treatment plans.

Information about the cost of treatment and some information of treatment options available were on the practice website and the reception area of the practice.

Health promotion & prevention

Patients' medical histories were updated regularly which included questions about diet. 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. We saw that oral health advice was available via leaflets kept in the practice waiting areas.

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. Examples of staff training included topics such as safeguarding, medical emergencies and infection

control. We reviewed the system in place for recording training that had been attended by staff working within the practice. We also reviewed information about continuing professional development (CPD) and saw there was a system in place to monitor the number of CPD hours staff had completed.

Working with other services

The practice worked, where appropriate with other professionals in delivering care of their patients. This included for example referrals to hospitals for oral surgery. 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 22 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.

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. One of the principal dentists had received MCA training and ran sessions on the MCA for staff. 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).

Are services caring?

Our findings

Respect, dignity, compassion & empathy

We received feedback from 22 patients. The feedback we received was positive. Staff were described as, friendly and helpful. 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 in the waiting area that gave details of fees. Information was also available on the practice website. We spoke with one of the principal dentists, three dentists three nurse and the practice administrator 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 practice telephone answering machine.

Tackling inequity and promoting equality

The practice had recognised the needs of different groups in the planning of its services. The practice staff spoke a number of different languages to support patients for whom English was not their first language. If necessary they would contact an interpreter for them. There was wheelchair access and accessible toilet facilities on the ground floor.

Access to the service

The opening hours for the practice were Monday to Friday 9.00am to 5.30am. . We saw there were arrangements for emergency appointments. There were out of hours arrangements in place to deal with emergencies that took place when the practice was closed, these were on the telephone answering machine and on a poster at the front of the practice.

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 reception area. The policy had last been reviewed in January 2016. There had been four complaints logged in the last year and it had been dealt with appropriately. 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 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, employment policies and infection control. There was a clear management structure in place with identified staff leading on specific roles such as safeguarding. Staff told us they felt supported and were clear about their areas of responsibility.

Staff told us regular meetings were held to discuss issues in the practice and update on things affecting the practice. Staff we spoke with confirmed that regular meeting took place and we saw notes of these meetings. For example we saw that staff appraisals had been discussed during a June 2016 meeting.

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

Leadership, openness and transparency

Staff we spoke with said they felt the owner of the practice was open and transparent. Staff told us they were

comfortable about raising concerns with the owners. They felt they were listened to and responded to when they did so. They described the culture encouraged candour, openness and honesty.

The practice was also keen to ensure that all of their staff provided highly-skilled care.

Learning and improvement

Staff told us they had 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

The practice had gathered feedback from patients through their own surveys, and through the NHS friends and family test. For example, we saw the results of the 2015 asked patients to give feedback on the treatment by receptionists, booking of appointments and overall satisfaction. The survey found the majority of patients were happy with the service provided.