

The Poplars Dental Practice The Poplars Dental Practice Inspection Report

104 High Street Yarm North Yorkshire TS15 9AU Tel: 01642 790500 Website: www.poplars-dental.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 12 March 2019 Date of publication: 18/04/2019

Overall summary

We carried out this announced inspection on 12 March 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

Poplar's Dental Practice is in Yarm, North Yorkshire and provides NHS and private treatment to adults and children.

The dental practice is located on the first and second floor of a building, with the entrance on the ground floor. A stairlift is available from the ground to the first floor for those who may need assistance ascending the stairs. Car parking spaces are available near the practice.

Summary of findings

The dental team includes a principal dentist, one associate dentist, a visiting specialist oral surgeon, the practice manager, five dental nurses (one of whom is also the reception manager), a sterilisation technician, a dental therapist and a dental hygienist. The practice has four treatment rooms.

The practice is owned by a partnership 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. At the time of inspection, a registered manager was not in place at Poplar's Dental Practice and there were changes to the partnership a few years prior which were not notified to us. We were assured by the principal dentist that they would ensure review their registration and make the appropriate changes.

On the day of inspection, we collected 49 CQC comment cards filled in by patients. These provided a positive view of the practice.

During the inspection we spoke with two dentists, the practice manager, the sterilisation technician and three dental nurses. We looked at practice policies and procedures and other records about how the service is managed.

The practice is open:

Monday, Wednesday and Friday 8.45am to 5pm

Tuesday and Thursday 8.45am to 7pm

Saturday once a month 9am to 12.30pm

Our key findings were:

- The practice appeared clean and a refurbishment programme was in place to improve the overall practice.
- The practice had infection control procedures which reflected published guidance.
- Staff knew how to deal with emergencies. Appropriate medicines and life-saving equipment were not available in accordance with national guidelines. A child's self-inflating and airway were not present; these were ordered on the inspection day.

- The practice had systems to help them manage risks. The practice needed to review their systems for risks associated with Legionella, radiation protection and fire.
- The provider had suitable safeguarding processes and staff knew their responsibilities for safeguarding adults and children.
- The practice had thorough staff recruitment procedures.
- 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 practice had effective leadership and culture of continuous improvement. Staff were welcoming of our feedback and took immediate measures to implement any necessary actions.
- Staff felt involved and supported and worked well as a team.
- The practice asked staff and patients for feedback about the services they provided.
- The practice dealt with complaints positively and efficiently.

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

- Review the practice's arrangements for receiving and responding to patient safety alerts, recalls and rapid response reports issued by the Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency, the Central Alerting System and other relevant bodies, such as Public Health England.
- Review the availability of equipment in the practice to manage medical emergencies taking into account the guidelines issued by the Resuscitation Council (UK) and the General Dental Council.
- Review the practice's Legionella risk assessment and ensure it is undertaken by a competent person, taking into account the guidelines issued by the Department of Health in the Health Technical Memorandum 01-05: Decontamination in primary care dental practices, and having regard to The Health and Social Care Act 2008: 'Code of Practice about the prevention and control of infections and related guidance.'

Summary of findings

- Review the practice's protocols and procedures for the use of X-ray equipment in compliance with The lonising Radiations Regulations 2017 and lonising Radiation (Medical Exposure) Regulations 2017 and taking into account the guidance for Dental Practitioners on the Safe Use of X-ray Equipment.
- Review the fire safety risk assessment and ensure that ongoing fire safety management is effective, in particular reference to the compressor room.
- Review the providers registration and registration conditions to ensure the regulated activities at Poplar's Dental Practice) are managed by an individual who is registered as a manager.

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.

No action

The practice had systems and processes to provide safe care and treatment. The practice's risk management systems required improvement. We found the Legionella risk assessment was undertaken by the principal dentist who had not had training to do so, the risks associated with radiation and fire were not reviewed and the medical emergency equipment was not in accordance with national guidance. The practice subscribed to safety alerts however were not receiving all relevant alerts. The provider took prompt action to assure these areas were addressed on the inspection day. They used learning from incidents and complaints to help them improve. Staff received training in safeguarding and knew how to recognise the signs of abuse and how to report concerns. 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. Are services effective? No action We found that this practice was providing effective care in accordance with the relevant regulations. The dentists assessed patients' needs and provided care and treatment in line with recognised guidance. Patients described the treatment they received as excellent, professional and of a high standard. The dentists 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 practice supported all staff to complete training relevant to their roles and had systems to help them monitor this. The staff were involved in quality improvement initiatives, such as peer review, with other dentists in the region as part of its approach in providing high quality care. Are services caring? No action We found that this practice was providing caring services in accordance with the relevant regulations. We received feedback about the practice from 49 people. Patients were positive about all aspects of the service the practice provided. They told us staff were kind, professional and extremely friendly.

Summary of findings

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.		
 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 face to face interpreter services. 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. The provider was very responsive in addressing any areas which required review, including their risk management systems. The practice team discussed the quality and safety of the care and treatment provided. There was a clearly defined management structure and staff felt supported and appreciated.	No action	~
The practice team kept complete patient dental care records which were clearly 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.		

Are services safe?

Our findings

Safety systems and processes including staff recruitment, equipment & 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. 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.

The practice had a system to highlight vulnerable patients on records, for example, children with child protection plans, adults where there were safeguarding concerns, people with a learning disability or a mental health condition, or who require other support such as with mobility or communication.

The practice staff were aware of the need to identify adults that were in other vulnerable situations, for example, those who were known to have experienced modern-day slavery or female genital mutilation.

The practice had a whistleblowing policy. External contact details were not included in the policy and we were assured they would be added. Staff were confident they could raise concerns without fear of recrimination.

The dentists used dental dams in line with guidance from the British Endodontic Society when providing root canal treatment.

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

The practice had a staff recruitment policy and procedure to help them employ suitable staff. 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.

A fire risk assessment was undertaken by the principal dentist in line with the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005. This did not take into account all aspects of fire risk to the premises and we saw the room where the compressor was housed was cluttered with old equipment and cleaning materials which were potentially a fire risk. The premises had fire extinguishers on all floors, fire detection systems and we saw evidence of fire marshal training. We also saw fire drills were carried out every six months. 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. We spoke to the principal dentist about the need to review the fire risk assessment of the premises to ensure all risks were identified. They acted immediately to clear the compressor room and sent us e-mail confirmation that a new fire risk assessment was arranged to be undertaken by an external company.

The practice had intra-oral and extra-oral X-ray machines on-site. They did not have suitable arrangements to ensure the safety of the X-ray equipment and the X-ray machines had not undergone their 3-yearly maintenance tests which were due in January 2018. The practice did not have all the required information in their radiation protection file, such as critical examination reports. Following the inspection, the practice manager confirmed all X-ray machines had been serviced the next day and their radiation protection advisor would visit the practice to review their radiation protection measures.

We saw evidence that the dentists 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.

Are services safe?

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 updated.

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.

Staff knew how to respond to a medical emergency and completed training in emergency resuscitation and basic life support every year.

Emergency equipment was not available as described in recognised guidance. Missing items included an oral airway and a self-inflating bag with mask for children. We received evidence that these were ordered on the inspection day. We observed the Glucagon (medicine used for diabetic emergencies) had been stored in the fridge however the temperature was not being monitored. We received evidence that these issues were rectified on the inspection day. Staff kept records of their checks to make sure these were available, within their expiry date, and in working order.

The practice carried out sedation and staff carrying out sedation had not repeated their immediate life support (ILS) training in line with national guidance. We received evidence following the inspection that all staff were booked on to an ILS course in the next few weeks and the practice would not undertake any treatment under sedation until after they had completed the course.

A dental nurse worked with the dentists, dental hygienist and the dental therapist when they treated patients in line with GDC Standards for the Dental Team.

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 followed guidance in The Health Technical

Memorandum 01-05: Decontamination in primary care dental practices (HTM01-05) published by the Department of Health. 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.

The practice had in place systems and protocols to ensure that any dental laboratory work was disinfected prior to being sent to a dental laboratory and before the dental laboratory work was fitted in a patient's mouth.

The practice's Legionella risk assessment was undertaken by the principal dentist and was brief. They confirmed they felt they were not competent to undertake this. There was no schematic drawing nor records to demonstrate a legionella management scheme was in place. We discussed this with the provider who assured us they would review this. The day after the inspection, we received confirmation that the practice had arranged for a competent person to carry out the Legionella risk assessment.

We saw cleaning schedules for the premises. The practice was visibly clean when we inspected and patients confirmed that this was usual.

The practice 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 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 dentists 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

Are services safe?

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 practice 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 practice stored and kept records of NHS prescriptions as described in current guidance.

The dentists were 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.

In the previous 12 months there had been three incidents. These were investigated, documented and discussed with the rest of the dental practice team to prevent such occurrences happening again in the future.

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.

The provider should review their systems for receiving and acting on safety alerts. The practice had not received all safety alerts relevant to their practice. They assured us they would subscribe to all safety alerts and review previous ones to ensure none affected their practice.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment, care and treatment

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

The provider took into account guidelines as set out by the British Society for Disability and Oral Health when providing dental care in domiciliary settings such as care homes or in people's residence. They provider should review the need for a risk assessment for undertaking domiciliary visits with no medical emergency drugs and equipment.

The practice offered dental implants. These were placed by a visiting specialist who had undergone appropriate post-graduate training in this speciality. The provision of dental implants was in accordance with national guidance.

The staff were involved in quality improvement initiatives including peer review as part of their approach in providing high quality care.

Helping patients to live healthier lives

The practice was providing preventive care and supporting patients to ensure better oral health in line with the Delivering Better Oral Health toolkit.

The dentists 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 dentists and dental therapists, 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 practice was aware of national oral health campaigns and local schemes available in supporting patients to live healthier lives. We spoke with the dentists who described to us the procedures they used to improve the outcome of periodontal treatment. This involved preventative advice, taking plaque and gum bleeding scores and 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 dentists 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 can 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 dentists assessed patients' treatment needs in line with recognised guidance.

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

The practice carried out conscious sedation for patients who were nervous. This included people who were very nervous of dental treatment and those who needed complex or lengthy treatment. The practice had systems to help them do this safely. These were in accordance with guidelines published by the Royal College of Surgeons and Royal College of Anaesthetists in 2015.

Are services effective? (for example, treatment is effective)

The practice's systems included checks before and after treatment, emergency equipment requirements, medicines management, sedation equipment checks, and staff availability and training. They also included patient checks and information such as consent, monitoring during treatment, discharge and post-operative instructions.

The staff assessed patients appropriately for sedation. The dental care records showed that patients having sedation had important checks carried out first. These included a detailed medical history, blood pressure checks and an assessment of health using the American Society of Anaesthesiologists classification system in accordance with current guidelines.

The records showed that staff recorded important checks at regular intervals.

The operator-sedationist was supported by a trained second individual. The name of this individual was recorded in the patients' dental care record.

Effective staffing

Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to carry out their roles.

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

Staff discussed training needs at annual appraisals and during clinical supervision. We saw evidence of completed appraisals and how the practice addressed the training requirements of staff.

Co-ordinating care and treatment

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

Dentists 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 and processes to identify, manage, follow up and where required refer patients for specialist care when presenting with dental infections.

The practice also had systems and processes 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.

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 kind, caring and helpful. We saw that staff treated patients respectfully and appropriately. They were friendly towards patients at the reception desk and over the telephone.

Patients said staff were compassionate and understanding and they could choose whether they saw a male or female dentist. They said staff were kind and helpful when they were in pain, distress or discomfort.

Information folders, patient survey results and thank you cards were available for patients to read.

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 they 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 be involved in decisions about their care and were aware of the Accessible Information Standards (a requirement to make sure that patients and their carers can access and understand the information they are given) and the requirements under the Equality Act:

- Interpretation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language.
- Staff communicated with patients in a way that they could understand, for example, braille and easy read materials were available if required.
- Staff helped patients and their carers find further information and access community and advocacy services. They helped them ask questions about their care and treatment.

The practice gave patients clear information to help them make informed choices. Patients confirmed that staff listened to them, did not rush them and discussed options for treatment with them. A 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 dentists described to us the methods they used to help patients understand treatment options discussed. These included for example photographs, models 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.

Staff were clear on the importance of emotional support needed by patients when delivering care.

The practice met the needs of more vulnerable patients, for example, by arranging appointments at times convenient to the patient and ensuring a sufficient appointment length was provided. For example, for patients with dental phobia, appointments were offered where waiting time would be kept to an absolute minimum. Any vulnerable people, for example, those with learning difficulties and any patients with dementia or other long-term conditions, continuity of care was prioritised, double or treble appointment slots were booked and patient records were annotated to ensure patient preferences were recorded.

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

The practice currently had some patients for whom they needed to make adjustments to enable them to receive treatment.

A disability access assessment was in place and detailed how the practice would consider various patient's needs. The practice had made reasonable adjustments for patients with disabilities. These included a stair lift from the ground to first floor, a treatment room on the first floor and a lowered reception desk for those who may benefit. They were undergoing a refurbishment plan and assured us they would revisit the needs of patients as part of this plan.

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 in the premises, and included it in their practice information leaflet and on their website.

The practice had an efficient appointment system to respond to patients' needs. Patients who requested an

urgent appointment were seen the same day. Patients told us they 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.

They took part in an emergency on-call arrangement with 111 out of hour's service.

The practice website, information leaflet 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 complaints policy providing guidance to staff on how to handle a complaint. The policy did not include all the external organisations that patients could approach should they require further support; we were assured this would be added. The practice information leaflet explained how to make a complaint.

The principal dentist 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 principal dentist 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 and compliments the practice received within the last 12 months. The practice had received one complaint in that period. We observed the practice responded to this complaint appropriately and shared learning with the entire dental team. We saw any comments were analysed appropriately and discussed outcomes with staff to share learning and improve the service.

Are services well-led?

Our findings

Leadership capacity and capability

The principal dentist was the overall leaders of the practice. 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. Any shortcomings raised during the inspection were prioritised and addressed appropriately. Staff were welcoming of the inspection feedback and gave assurance that they would strengthen their risk management and governance protocols.

The principal dentist was very approachable. They worked closely with staff and others to make sure they prioritised compassionate and inclusive leadership.

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.

We saw the provider took effective action to deal with poor performance.

Openness, honesty and transparency were demonstrated when responding to incidents and complaints. Staff were 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 principal dentist had the overall responsibility for the management and clinical leadership of the practice. The practice manager was responsible for the day to day running of the practice. Staff knew the management arrangements and their roles and responsibilities.

There was 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.

Risk management systems needed improvement in relation to medical emergency equipment provision, Legionella, radiation and fire. We received confirmation that all risks would be reviewed and the practice's management systems would be strengthened to ensure a maintenance programme was in place.

Appropriate and accurate information

The practice acted on appropriate and accurate information.

Quality and operational information was used to ensure and improve performance. Performance information was combined with the views of patients.

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 comment cards and verbal comments to obtain staff and patients' views about the service.

Patients were encouraged to complete the NHS Friends and Family Test (FFT). This is a national programme to allow patients to provide feedback on NHS services they have used.

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

Examples of suggestions from patients and staff that were acted upon include:

Are services well-led?

- Notice board in the staff room
- Magazines for patients
- Different art work on walls.

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 dental nurses had annual appraisals. They discussed learning needs, general wellbeing and aims for future professional development. We saw evidence of completed appraisals in the staff folders.

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.