

Dawood And Tanner

# Dawood and Tanner Montagu Mansions

## Inspection Report

47 Montagu Mansions

London

W1U 6LD

Tel:020 7935 3016

Website: [www.dawoodandtanner.co.uk](http://www.dawoodandtanner.co.uk)

Date of inspection visit: 16 May 2019

Date of publication: 25/06/2019

### Overall summary

We carried out this announced inspection on 16 May 2019 under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as part of our regulatory functions. We planned the inspection to check whether the registered provider was meeting the legal requirements in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 and associated regulations. The inspection was led by a CQC inspector who was supported by a specialist dental adviser.

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 form the framework for the areas we look at during the inspection.

#### **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**

Dawood and Tanner Montagu Mansions is Westminster and provides private treatment to adults and children.

There is ramped access for people who use wheelchairs and those with pushchairs. Car parking spaces, including some for blue badge holders, are available near the practice.

# Summary of findings

The dental team includes one dentist, two dental nurses, two dental hygiene therapists and a receptionist/dental nurse and a practice manager. The practice has four treatment rooms.

The practice is owned by a company and as a condition of registration must have a person registered with the Care Quality Commission as the registered manager. Registered managers have legal responsibility for meeting the requirements in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 and associated regulations about how the practice is run. The registered manager at Dawood and Tanner Montagu Mansions is one of the practice owners.

On the day of inspection, we received feedback from 17 patients.

During the inspection we spoke with the dentist, one hygienist therapist, one dental nurse the receptionist/dental nurse and the practice manager. One of the two principal dentists who owned the practice was also there on the day of the inspection. We looked at practice policies and procedures and other records about how the service is managed.

The practice is open:

Monday 8.30 – 5.30 pm

Tuesday 8.30 – 5.30 pm

Wednesday 8.30 – 5.30 pm

Thursday 8.30 – 5.30 pm

Friday 8.45 - Friday 5.15 pm

## **Our key findings were:**

- The practice appeared clean and well maintained.
- The provider had infection control procedures which reflected published guidance. However, some improvements were required as the treatment rooms contained items of furniture that could not be easily cleaned.
- Staff knew how to deal with emergencies. Appropriate medicines and life-saving equipment were available.
- The practice had systems to help them manage risk to patients and staff.

- The provider had suitable safeguarding processes and staff knew their responsibilities for safeguarding vulnerable adults and children. However, some improvements were required in regards to designating a safeguarding lead from amongst the staff who worked at the practice.
- The provider had thorough staff recruitment procedures.
- The clinical staff provided patients' care and treatment in line with current guidelines.
- Staff treated patients with dignity and respect and took care to protect their privacy and personal information.
- Staff were providing preventive care and supporting patients to ensure better oral health.
- The appointment system took account of patients' needs.
- The provider had effective leadership and culture of continuous improvement.
- Staff felt involved and supported and worked well as a team. However, some improvements were required regarding undertaking appraisals for staff.
- The provider asked staff and patients for feedback about the services they provided.
- The provider dealt with complaints positively and efficiently.
- The provider had suitable information governance arrangements.

There were areas where the provider could make improvements. They should:

- Review the practice's infection control procedures and protocols to take into account guidelines issued by the Department of Health - Health Technical Memorandum 01-05: Decontamination in primary care dental practices and have regard to The Health and Social Care Act 2008: 'Code of Practice about the prevention and control of infections and related guidance'
- Review the training, learning and development needs of individual staff members at appropriate intervals and ensure an effective process is established for the on-going assessment, supervision and appraisal of all staff.

# Summary of findings

## The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

### **Are services safe?**

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

The practice had systems and processes to provide safe care and treatment. They used learning from incidents and complaints to help them improve.

Staff received training in safeguarding people and knew how to recognise the signs of abuse and how to report concerns. However, some improvements were required in regards the practice identifying local safeguarding leads.

Staff were qualified for their roles and the practice completed essential recruitment checks.

Premises and equipment were clean and properly maintained. The practice followed national guidance for cleaning, sterilising and storing dental instruments. However, some improvements were required as the treatment rooms contained items of furniture that were not easy to wipe clean.

The practice had suitable arrangements for dealing with medical and other emergencies.

No action



### **Are services effective?**

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

The dentist assessed patients' needs and provided care and treatment in line with recognised guidance. Patients described the treatment they received as professional, supportive and efficient. The dentist discussed treatment with patients, so they could give informed consent and recorded this in their records.

The practice had clear arrangements when patients needed to be referred to other dental or health care professionals.

The provider supported staff to complete training relevant to their roles and had systems to help them monitor this.

No action



### **Are services caring?**

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

We received feedback about the practice from 17 people. Patients were positive about all aspects of the service the practice provided. They told us staff were impeccable, caring and attentive.

They said that they were given helpful, honest explanations about dental treatment, and said their dentist listened to them. Patients commented that they made them feel at ease, especially when they were anxious about visiting the dentist.

We saw that staff protected patients' privacy and were aware of the importance of confidentiality. Patients said staff treated them with dignity and respect.

No action



# Summary of findings

## **Are services responsive to people's needs?**

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

The practice's appointment system took account of patients' needs. Patients could get an appointment quickly if in pain.

Staff considered patients' different needs. This included providing facilities for patients with a disability and families with children. The practice had access to internet interpreter services and had arrangements to help patients with sight or hearing loss.

The practice took patients views seriously. They valued compliments from patients and responded to concerns and complaints quickly and constructively.

**No action** 

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

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

The practice had arrangements to ensure the smooth running of the service. These included systems for the practice team to discuss the quality and safety of the care and treatment provided. There was a clearly defined management structure and staff felt supported and appreciated.

The practice team kept complete patient dental care records which were, clearly written or typed and stored securely.

The provider monitored clinical and non-clinical areas of their work to help them improve and learn. This included asking for and listening to the views of patients and staff.

**No action** 

# Are services safe?

## Our findings

### **Safety systems and processes, including staff recruitment, equipment and premises and radiography (X-rays)**

The practice had clear systems to keep patients safe.

Staff knew their responsibilities if they had concerns about the safety of children, young people and adults who were vulnerable due to their circumstances. The practice had safeguarding policies and procedures to provide staff with information about identifying, reporting and dealing with suspected abuse. The policy had last been updated in May 2019. We saw evidence that staff received safeguarding training. Staff knew about the signs and symptoms of abuse and neglect and how to report concerns, including notification to the CQC.

However, some improvements were required in regard to the safeguarding process. The safeguarding policy identified two dentists that worked at a different practice owned by the same provider as the safeguarding leads. When we asked for information about the safeguarding training for these people the practice manager told us that they did not have this information and they would have to contact the practice manager from the practice they worked at. They tried to contact them but were unable to do so. The practice manager said they would review the process and decide if they should appoint safeguarding contact that worked at the practice.

The practice had a whistleblowing policy. Staff felt confident they could raise concerns without fear of reprimand.

The dentist used dental dams in line with guidance from the British Endodontic Society when providing root canal treatment. In instances where the dental dam was not used, such as for example refusal by the patient, and where other methods were used to protect the airway, this was documented in the dental care record and a risk assessment completed.

The provider had a business continuity plan describing how they would deal with events that could disrupt the normal running of the practice.

The practice had a recruitment policy and procedure to help them employ suitable staff and had checks in place for

agency and locum staff. These reflected the relevant legislation. We looked at three staff recruitment records. These showed the practice followed their recruitment procedure.

We noted that clinical staff were qualified and registered with the General Dental Council (GDC) and had professional indemnity cover.

The practice ensured that facilities and equipment were safe, and that equipment was maintained according to manufacturers' instructions, including electrical and gas appliances.

Records showed that fire detection equipment, such as smoke detectors and emergency lighting, were regularly tested and firefighting equipment, such as fire extinguishers, were regularly serviced.

The practice had suitable arrangements to ensure the safety of the X-ray equipment and had the required information in their radiation protection file.

We saw evidence that the dentist justified, graded and reported on the radiographs they took. The practice carried out radiography audits every year following current guidance and legislation.

Clinical staff completed continuing professional development (CPD) in respect of dental radiography.

### **Risks to patients**

There were systems to assess, monitor and manage risks to patient safety.

The practice's health and safety policies, procedures and risk assessments were reviewed regularly to help manage potential risk. The practice had current employer's liability insurance.

We looked at the practice's arrangements for safe dental care and treatment. The staff followed relevant safety regulation when using needles and other sharp dental items. A sharps risk assessment had been undertaken and was updated annually.

The provider had a system in place to ensure 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 checked.

# Are services safe?

Staff knew how to respond to a medical emergency and completed training in emergency resuscitation and basic life support (BLS) every year. BLS with airway management.

Emergency equipment and medicines were available as described in recognised guidance. Staff kept records of their checks of these to make sure these were available, within their expiry date, and in working order.

A dental nurse worked with the dentist when they treated patients in line with GDC Standards for the Dental Team. The hygienist therapists worked alone but were supported by practice staff with decontamination of instruments. A risk assessment was in place for when the dental hygiene therapist worked without chairside support.

The provider had suitable risk assessments to minimise the risk that can be caused from substances that are hazardous to health.

The practice had an infection prevention and control policy and procedures. They followed guidance in The Health Technical Memorandum 01-05: Decontamination in primary care dental practices (HTM 01-05) published by the Department of Health and Social Care. Staff completed infection prevention and control training and received updates as required.

The practice had suitable arrangements for transporting, cleaning, checking, sterilising and storing instruments in line with HTM 01-05. The records showed equipment used by staff for cleaning and sterilising instruments was validated, maintained and used in line with the manufacturers' guidance. However, some improvements were required. For example, one of the surgeries contained items of furniture such as chairs that could not be wiped cleaned. We spoke to the provider about this and they told us they would review these arrangements in the surgeries.

The practice had systems in place to ensure that any work was disinfected prior to being sent to a dental laboratory and before treatment was completed.

The practice had procedures to reduce the possibility of Legionella or other bacteria developing in the water systems, in line with a risk assessment. The assessment had been carried out in 2017. All recommendations had been actioned and records of water testing and dental unit water line management were in place.

We saw cleaning schedules for the premises. The practice was visibly clean when we inspected.

The provider had policies and procedures in place to ensure clinical waste was segregated and stored appropriately in line with guidance.

The practice carried out infection prevention and control audits twice a year. The latest audit was carried out in May 2019 and showed the practice was meeting the required standards.

## **Information to deliver safe care and treatment**

Staff had the information they needed to deliver safe care and treatment to patients.

We discussed with the dentist how information to deliver safe care and treatment was handled and recorded. We looked at a sample of dental care records to confirm our findings and noted that individual records were written and managed in a way that kept patients safe. Dental care records we saw were complete, legible, were kept securely and complied with General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) requirements.

Patient referrals to other service providers contained specific information which allowed appropriate and timely referrals in line with practice protocols and current guidance.

## **Safe and appropriate use of medicines**

The provider had reliable systems for appropriate and safe handling of medicines.

There was a suitable stock control system of medicines which were held on site. This ensured that medicines did not pass their expiry date and enough medicines were available if required.

The dentist was aware of current guidance with regards to prescribing medicines.

## **Track record on safety and Lessons learned and improvements**

There were comprehensive risk assessments in relation to safety issues. The practice monitored and reviewed incidents. This helped it to understand risks and gave a clear, accurate and current picture that led to safety improvements.

There were adequate systems for reviewing and investigating when things went wrong. The practice learned and shared lessons identified themes and acted to improve safety in the practice.

## Are services safe?

There was a system for receiving and acting on safety alerts. The practice learned from external safety events as well as patient and medicine safety alerts. We saw they were shared with the team and acted upon if required.



# Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

## Our findings

### **Effective needs assessment, care and treatment**

The practice had systems to keep dental practitioners up to date with current evidence-based practice. We saw that clinicians assessed patients' needs and delivered care and treatment in line with current legislation, standards and guidance supported by clear clinical pathways and protocols.

### **Helping patients to live healthier lives**

The dentist prescribed high concentration fluoride toothpaste if a patient's risk of tooth decay indicated this would help them. They used fluoride varnish for children and adults based on an assessment of the risk of tooth decay.

The clinicians where applicable, discussed smoking, alcohol consumption and diet with patients during appointments. The practice had a selection of dental products for sale and provided health promotion leaflets to help patients with their oral health.

The dentist and hygiene therapists described to us the procedures they used to improve the outcomes for patients with gum disease. This involved providing patients preventative advice, taking plaque and gum bleeding scores and recording detailed charts of the patient's gum condition

Patients with more severe gum disease were recalled at more frequent intervals for review and to reinforce home care preventative advice.

### **Consent to care and treatment**

The practice obtained consent to care and treatment in line with legislation and guidance.

The practice team understood the importance of obtaining and recording patients' consent to treatment. The dentist gave patients information about treatment options and the risks and benefits of these so they could make informed decisions. Patients confirmed their dentist listened to them and gave them clear information about their treatment.

The practice's consent policy included information about the Mental Capacity Act 2005. The team understood their responsibilities under the act when treating adults who may not be able to make informed decisions. The policy

also referred to Gillick competence, by which a child under the age of 16 years of age may give consent for themselves. The staff were aware of the need to consider this when treating young people under 16 years of age.

Staff described how they involved patients' relatives or carers when appropriate and made sure they had enough time to explain treatment options clearly.

### **Monitoring care and treatment**

The practice kept detailed dental care records containing information about the patients' current dental needs, past treatment and medical histories. The dentist assessed patients' treatment needs in line with recognised guidance.

We saw the practice audited patients' dental care records to check that the dentist/clinicians recorded the necessary information.

### **Effective staffing**

Staff new to the practice had a period of induction based on a structured programme. We confirmed clinical staff completed the continuing professional development required for their registration with the General Dental Council.

Staff discussed their training needs at informal meetings. The practice did not carry out formal appraisals for staff. We spoke with the practice manager about this and they told us they would review these arrangements.

### **Co-ordinating care and treatment**

Staff worked together and with other health and social care professionals to deliver effective care and treatment.

The dentist confirmed they referred patients to a range of specialists in primary and secondary care if they needed treatment the practice did not provide.

The practice had systems to identify, manage, follow up and where required refer patients for specialist care when presenting with dental infections.

The practice also had systems for referring patients with suspected oral cancer under the national two week wait arrangements. This was initiated by NICE in 2005 to help make sure patients were seen quickly by a specialist.

The practice monitored all referrals to make sure they were dealt with promptly.



# Are services caring?

## Our findings

### **Kindness, respect and compassion**

Staff treated patients with kindness, respect and compassion.

Staff were aware of their responsibility to respect people's diversity and human rights.

Patients commented positively that staff were impeccable, caring and attentive. We saw that staff treated patients in a respectful way and were friendly towards patients at the reception desk and over the telephone.

Patients said staff were compassionate and understanding.

Patients told us staff were kind and helpful when they were in pain, distress or discomfort.

### **Privacy and dignity**

The practice respected and promoted patients' privacy and dignity.

Staff were aware of the importance of privacy and confidentiality. The layout of reception and waiting areas provided privacy when reception staff were dealing with patients. If a patient asked for more privacy, staff would take them into another room. The reception computer screens were not visible to patients and staff did not leave patients' personal information where other patients might see it.

Staff password protected patients' electronic care records and backed these up to secure storage. They stored paper records securely.

### **Involving people in decisions about care and treatment**

Staff helped patients to be involved in decisions about their care and were aware of the requirements under the Equality Act. Interpretation services were available for patients who did not use English as a first language.

- There was a hearing loop for patients with hearing difficulties.

The practice gave patients clear information to help them make informed choices about their treatment. Patients confirmed that staff listened to them, did not rush them and discussed options for treatment with them. The dentist described the conversations they had with patients to satisfy themselves they understood their treatment options.

The practice's website and information leaflet provided patients with information about the range of treatments available at the practice.

The dentist described to us the methods they used to help patients understand treatment options discussed. These included for example photographs, models, videos and X-ray images.

# Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

## Our findings

### Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice organised and delivered services to meet patients' needs. It took account of patient needs and preferences.

Patients described high levels of satisfaction with the responsive service provided by the practice.

A disability access audit had been completed in 2018 and an action plan formulated to continually improve access for patients.

Staff telephoned some patients on the morning of their appointment to make sure they could get to the practice.

### Timely access to services

Patients could access care and treatment from the practice within an acceptable timescale for their needs.

The practice displayed its opening hours on their website.

The practice had an appointment system to respond to patients' needs. Patients who requested an urgent appointment were seen the same day. Patients had enough time during their appointment and did not feel rushed. Appointments ran smoothly on the day of the inspection and patients were not kept waiting.

The staff took part in an emergency on-call arrangement with another local practice owned by the same provider.

The practice's website and answerphone provided telephone numbers for patients needing emergency dental treatment during the working day and when the practice was not open. Patients confirmed they could make routine and emergency appointments easily and were rarely kept waiting for their appointment.

### Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

The practice took complaints and concerns seriously and responded to them appropriately to improve the quality of care.

The practice had a policy providing guidance to staff on how to handle a complaint. The practice information leaflet explained how to make a complaint.

The practice manager was responsible for dealing with these. Staff would tell the practice manager about any formal or informal comments or concerns straight away so patients received a quick response.

The practice manager aimed to settle complaints in-house and invited patients to speak with them in person to discuss these. Information was available about organisations patients could contact if not satisfied with the way the practice dealt with their concerns.

We looked at comments, compliments and complaints the practice received in a twelve month period.

These showed the practice responded to concerns appropriately and discussed outcomes with staff to share learning and improve the service.

# Are services well-led?

## Our findings

### Leadership capacity and capability

We found the two owners of the practice had the capacity and skills to deliver high-quality, sustainable care. They had the experience, capacity and skills to deliver the practice strategy and address risks to it.

They were knowledgeable about issues and priorities relating to the quality and future of services. They understood the challenges and were addressing them.

The practice had effective processes to develop leadership capacity and skills, including planning for the future leadership of the practice.

### Culture

The practice had a culture of high-quality sustainable care.

Staff stated they felt respected, supported and valued. They were proud to work in the practice.

The practice focused on the needs of patients.

Openness, honesty and transparency were demonstrated when responding to incidents and complaints. The provider was aware of and had systems to ensure compliance with the requirements of the Duty of Candour.

Staff could raise concerns and were encouraged to do so. They had confidence that these would be addressed.

### Governance and management

There were clear responsibilities, roles and systems of accountability to support good governance and management.

The two owners of the practice had overall responsibility for the management and clinical leadership of the practice. The practice manager was responsible for the day to day running of the service. Staff knew the management arrangements and their roles and responsibilities.

The provider had a system of clinical governance in place which included policies, protocols and procedures that were accessible to all members of staff and were reviewed on a regular basis.

There were clear and effective processes for managing risks, issues and performance.

### Appropriate and accurate information

The practice acted on appropriate and accurate information.

The practice had information governance arrangements and staff were aware of the importance of these in protecting patients' personal information.

### Engagement with patients, the public, staff and external partners

The practice involved patients, the public, staff and external partners to support high-quality sustainable services.

The practice used patient surveys and social media feedback to obtain patients' views about the service.

The practice gathered feedback from staff through meetings and informal discussions. Staff were encouraged to offer suggestions for improvements to the service and said these were listened to and acted on.

### Continuous improvement and innovation

There were systems and processes for learning, continuous improvement and innovation.

The practice had quality assurance processes to encourage learning and continuous improvement. These included audits of dental care records, radiographs and infection prevention and control. They had clear records of the results of these audits and the resulting action plans and improvements.

The owners of the practice and the practice manager showed a commitment to learning and improvement and valued the contributions made to the team by individual members of staff.

The practice manager discussed learning needs, general wellbeing and aims for future professional development with staff. However, they did not undertake formal staff appraisals.

Staff completed 'highly recommended' training as per General Dental Council professional standards. This included undertaking medical emergencies and basic life support training annually. The provider supported and encouraged staff to complete CPD.