

Dr. Simon Godley

# 42 The Dental Practice

## Inspection Report

42 Pembridge Road,  
Notting Hill Gate,  
London,  
W11 3HN

Tel: 02072295542

Website: [www.42thedentalpractice.com](http://www.42thedentalpractice.com)

Date of inspection visit: 15 July 2016

Date of publication: 02/09/2016

### Overall summary

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection on 15 July 2016 to ask the practice the following key questions; Are services safe, effective, caring, responsive and well-led?

#### **Our findings were:**

##### **Are services safe?**

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

##### **Are services effective?**

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

##### **Are services caring?**

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

##### **Are services responsive?**

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

##### **Are services well-led?**

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

#### **Background**

42 The Dental Practice is located in the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and provides private dental services. The service offers routine and specialist dental care including Periodontics, Endodontics, Orthodontics and Oral Surgery. The practice is open Monday to Saturday 9am to 6.00pm.

The premises consists of three treatment rooms, a decontamination room and a waiting area.

The practice comprises of a principal dentist, seven dentists and five dental nurses and a practice manager.

The principal dentist is registered with the Care Quality Commission (CQC) as an individual 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 20 comment cards back from patients and 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.

#### **Our key findings were:**

# Summary of findings

- 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 good governance arrangements and an effective management structure.
- Review the practice's safeguarding policy to ensure staff are aware of local safeguarding contacts.
- Review the practice's sharps procedures giving due regard to the Health and Safety (Sharp Instruments in Healthcare) Regulations 2013.
- Review staff awareness of the requirements of the Mental Capacity Act (MCA) 2005 and ensure all staff are aware of their responsibilities under the Act as it relates to their role.
- Review the practice's protocols for conscious sedation, giving due regard to 2015 guidelines published by The Intercollegiate Advisory Committee on Sedation in Dentistry in the document 'Standards for Conscious Sedation in the Provision of Dental Care 2015'.
- Review the protocols and procedures to ensure staff are up to date with their mandatory training and their Continuing Professional Development.
- Review the practice's audit protocols to ensure audits of various aspects of the service, such as radiography and dental care records are undertaken at regular intervals to help improve the quality of service. Practice should also check that where applicable audits have documented learning points and the resulting improvements can be demonstrated.
- Review stocks of medicines and the system for identifying and disposing of out-of-date stock.

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

- Review its responsibilities as regards to the Control of Substances Hazardous to Health (COSHH) Regulations 2002 and, ensure all documentation is up to date and staff understand how to minimise risks associated with the use of and handling of these substances.

# 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 and vulnerable adults 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 followed procedures for the safe recruitment of staff which included carrying out criminal record checks and obtaining references. However improvements could be made in regards to the recording of references.

No action



### Are services effective?

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

The practice followed guidance, such as that issued by National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). 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 patients' 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. Although improvements could be made in regards the recording of training undertaken.

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 a feedback book and the practice website. There were arrangements to meet the needs of patients whose first language was not English.

### **Are services well-led?**

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

There was a clear vision for the practice that was shared with the staff. There were good governance arrangements and an effective management structure. Appropriate policies and procedures were in place. There was effective monitoring of various aspects of care delivery, although improvements could be made in regards to audits undertaken. Patients were given the opportunity to provide feedback about the practice through the practice website.

**No action**



# 42 The Dental Practice

## Detailed findings

### Background to this inspection

We carried out this inspection under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as part of our regulatory functions. This inspection was planned to check whether the practice was meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008.

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection on 15 July 2016. The inspection was led by a CQC inspector. They were accompanied by a dental specialist advisor.

We received feedback from 23 patients. We also spoke with four members of staff. We reviewed the policies, toured the premises and examined the cleaning and decontamination of dental equipment.

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

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

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

# Are services safe?

## Our findings

### Reporting, learning and improvement from incidents

The practice had suitable processes around reporting and discussion of incidents. We saw there was a system in place for learning from incidents. Staff told us 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 no adverse incidents over the past 12 months.

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

The principal dentist was the safeguarding lead and staff knew who they should go to if they had a safeguarding concern. There were adult and children safeguarding policies that had last been reviewed in 2014. 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. However not all staff were aware of where safeguarding contact information was kept in the practice.

The practice had a system in place for receiving patient safety alerts issued from the Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA). However, the principal dentist told us they did not routinely distribute this information to all relevant staff. They told us they would distribute this information to staff in the future.

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 using equipment safely, 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, use of equipment, Legionella, health and safety and infection control. However we found that improvements could be made to the COSHH file. There were a number of substances used by the practice that had not been included in the file. We pointed this out to the principal dentist and they told us they would ensure that improvements were made to the COSHH file.

The practice carried out conscious sedation and had procedures in place for this. (Sedation/Conscious sedation – a process in which a combination of medicines is used to help a patient to relax (a sedative) and to block pain (an anaesthetic) during a medical or dental procedure. The patient remains awake during the whole procedure).

This included meeting with patients prior to undertaking the procedure to discuss appropriateness of sedation, training for those involved in sedation and medications used for sedation stored appropriately. However, improvements could be made to these arrangements. For example, there were no written protocols for undertaking sedation procedures and the practice did not undertake sedation audits. We pointed this out to the principal dentist and they told us that improvements would be made. Following the inspection we were sent proof that improvements were taking place. This included the appointment of a practice sedation lead and the development of written protocols for sedation.

Risk assessments had been undertaken for issues affecting the health and safety of staff and patients using the service. This included for example risks associated with radiography, fire, 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 patients' medical history that was obtained when patients

# Are services safe?

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 kit contained the recommended medicines. We checked the medicines that were in the kit and we found that all the medicines were within their expiry date. The emergency equipment included oxygen 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. 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) check. We saw that the provider had satisfactorily carried out some of the necessary required checks for staff who worked in the practice. However, we found that improvements could be made in the maintenance of staff records in relation to recording of references obtained for staff. For example we found no references for four members of staff. We pointed

this out to the principal dentist and were advised verbal references had been taken but not recorded. The provider assured us that written references would be taken up in the future.

## Monitoring health & safety and responding to risks

The practice had arrangements in place to deal with foreseeable emergencies. A Health and Safety Policy was in place. The practice had a risk management process which was updated and reviewed to ensure the safety of patients and staff members. For example, we saw risk assessments for fire, radiation and infection control. The assessments included the controls and actions to manage risks. For example a January 2016 risk assessment for manual handling had highlighted the importance of staff receiving information of the correct manual handling techniques and we saw this information was made available to staff.

## 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.

One of the nurses was the infection control lead. There was a clear flow from dirty to clean areas to minimise the risks of cross contamination. Staff gave a demonstration of the decontamination process which was in line with HTM 01-05 published guidance. This included carrying used instruments in a lidded box from the surgery, cleaning instruments suitably 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.

However, we noted that improvements were required to ensure the practice conformed to the Health and Safety (Sharp Instruments in Healthcare) Regulations 2013. There was no system in place to prevent the re-capping of needles and there was no risk assessment of these arrangements. We pointed this out to the principal dentist. They told us they had not changed their sharps handling system because there had been only two sharps injuries

# Are services safe?

since the practice had opened over ten years back. They told us they would however review the sharps protocol; following the inspection we were provided evidence that this review was being carried out.

Staff told us about the daily and weekly 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.

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 2012 and the results were negative for bacterium [Legionella is a bacterium found in the environment which can contaminate water systems in buildings]. The 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 October 2015. PAT is the name of a process where electrical appliances are routinely checked for safety.

The practice had guidance regarding the prescribing, recording and stock control of the medicines used in the practice. However, improvements could be made to the medicine management system. We found some of the medication was out of date, there was no drug stock log available to ensure there had been no misuse/ abuse of the drug, which included controlled drugs. Following the inspection the provider sent us details of improvements that had been made to the medicine management systems. This included the development of a drug stock log for controlled drugs.

## Radiography (X-rays)

The principal dentist was the Radiation Protection Supervisor (RPS). An external organisation covered the role of Radiation Protection Adviser (RPA). The practice kept a radiation protection file in relation to the use and maintenance of X-ray equipment. There were 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. Evidence was seen of radiation training for staff undertaking X-rays. A radiographic audit was undertaken 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 recalls. The practice gave patients oral health guidance.

During the course of our inspection we spoke with the 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 each 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 in the waiting area. For example we saw that information about gum health could be found in the waiting area.

### Staffing

Staff told us they had received appropriate professional development and training and the records we saw reflected this. The practice maintained a programme of professional development to ensure that staff were up to date with the latest practices. 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. However, improvements could be made to this system as not all training undertaken by staff had been appropriately recorded. For example there were five clinicians involved in sedation but training records only noted training for one of these on the day of the inspection. Following the inspection we were provided with evidence of training for the other staff involved in undertaking dental procedures under conscious sedation.

### Working with other services

The practice worked, where appropriate with other professionals in delivering care of their patients. This included referrals for CT scanning and oral medicine. . 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 23 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,

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. There was a copy of the MCA on the wall in the staff room but none of the staff at the practice had received formal training on the MCA and some staff did not demonstrate an awareness of their responsibilities under the Act.

# Are services caring?

## Our findings

### **Respect, dignity, compassion & empathy**

We received feedback from 23 patients. The feedback we received was positive. Staff were described as, caring and friendly. Patients said staff treated them with dignity and respect during consultations. We observed staff interaction with patients and saw that staff interacted well with patients, speaking to them in a respectful and considerate manner.

### **Involvement in decisions about care and treatment**

The practice displayed information in the waiting area that gave details of fees. Information was also available on the practice website. We spoke with the principal dentist, a dentist, two nurses and the practice manager on the day of our visit.

We noted 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. They would advise patients who could not speak English to be accompanied by people who could speak English but the practice staff spoke a number of different languages if patients could not bring someone with them. If necessary they would contact an interpreter for them.

### Access to the service

The opening hours for the practice were Monday to Saturday 9am to 6.00pm. There were out of hours arrangements in place to deal with emergencies that took place when the practice was closed; these were available on the telephone answering machine.

### 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 2014. The policy included contact details of 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.

We were told there had been no complaints in the last year.

# 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 on infection control and safeguarding. Staff told us they felt supported and were clear about their areas of responsibility.

The principal dentist 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 meetings took place and we saw notes of these meetings.

The quality audits undertaken at the practice included infection control and health and safety. However, improvements could be made in regards to the frequency and range of audits undertaken. A Quality Assurance Radiograph audit had not been undertaken in the last twelve months. There had not been a sedation audit in the last twelve months.

### **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 owner. 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. Staff working at the practice were supported to maintain their continuing professional development (CPD) as required by the General Dental Council (GDC), but improvements could be made to the monitoring of this.

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

The practice had gathered feedback from patients through a patient feedback book. We saw that feedback received from patients was very complimentary about the service received. We also saw that patients could leave feedback via the practice website.