

Nishant Anand and Amar Shah Park Road Dental

Inspection Report

36 Chaddesden Park Road Derby Derbyshire DE21
6HD

Tel: 01509856041

Website: Currently there is no website

Date of inspection visit: 11 April 2019

Date of publication: 28/05/2019

Overall summary

We carried out this announced inspection on 11 April 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

Park Road Dental is in the Chaddesden area of Derby and provides NHS dental treatment to adults and children.

There is level access for people who use wheelchairs and those with pushchairs. The practice has three treatment rooms, one of which is on the ground floor.

The dental team includes three dentists, three dental nurses, including one trainee dental nurse and one receptionist.

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. The registered managers at Park Road Dental are the principal dentists.

Summary of findings

On the day of inspection, we collected 44 CQC comment cards filled in by patients.

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

The practice is open: Monday to Friday from 8.30am to 5pm. The practice closes between 1pm and 2pm for lunch.

Our key findings were:

- The practice appeared clean and well maintained in most areas, although the ground floor treatment room was in need of refurbishment.
- The provider had infection control procedures which reflected published guidance.
- 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.
- The provider had the staff recruitment information required by the Regulations.
- The clinical staff provided patients' care and treatment in line with current guidelines.
- Patients' privacy and dignity could be improved in the ground floor treatment room.
- Staff took care to protect patients' personal information.
- The security of NHS prescription pads could be improved.
- Staff were providing preventive care and supporting patients to ensure better oral health.
- The appointment system took account of patients' needs.
- The location and storage of the dental suction unit in the ground floor treatment room could be improved to minimise risks.
- Staff felt involved and supported and worked well as a team.
- 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 suitability of the premises and ensure all areas are fit for the purpose for which they are being used. In particular the cabinets, work surfaces and flooring in the ground floor treatment room.
- Review the location and storage of the suction unit in the ground floor treatment room considering the guidance: Health Technical Memorandum – Dental compressed air and vacuum systems (HTM 2022).
- Review the security of NHS prescription pads in the practice and ensure there are systems in place to track and monitor their use.
- Review how patients' privacy and dignity was protected in the ground floor treatment room.
- Review the practice's protocols to ensure that, where appropriate, audits have documented learning points and the resulting improvements can be demonstrated.

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.

The ground floor treatment room was in need of refurbishment. We noted there was damage to drawer fronts and work surfaces and there was an area of the floor where the floorboards were exposed.

The suction unit in this room was not boxed in or located in a cupboard. This could present risks to both staff and patients regarding noise and infection control as the unit vented directly into the room.

The practice provided implants but did not have a vacuum autoclave.

Staff received training in safeguarding people and knew how to recognise the signs of abuse and how to report concerns.

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

Premises and equipment were clean and properly maintained. The practice followed national guidance for cleaning, sterilising and storing dental instruments.

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

The practice kept a log of prescriptions issued but did not keep a log of unused prescription pads to monitor their security and use.

No action



Are services effective?

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 pleasant, caring and efficient. 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 provider supported staff to complete training relevant to their roles and had systems to help them monitor this.

No action



Are services caring?

Are services caring?

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

No action



Summary of findings

We received feedback about the practice from 44 people. Patients were positive about all aspects of the service the practice provided. They told us staff were caring, professional and approachable. They said that they were put at ease, and treatment was explained clearly. Patients said their dentist listened to them. Patients commented that they made them feel at ease, especially when they were anxious about visiting the dentist.

The ground floor treatment room did not have obscured glass and there were no window blinds or curtains. This meant that patients' privacy and dignity was not protected.

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 a translation and interpreting service 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. We noted that audits did not always have action plans or learning points identified.

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. 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. There were two designated people to take the lead for safeguarding alerts within the practice. They had completed safeguarding training to an appropriate level and were planning to take further training.

The practice had a system to highlight vulnerable patients on records e.g. 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. We saw examples of how this information was recorded within care records.

The practice safeguarding policy identified that adults that were in other vulnerable situations could be at risk. For example, those who were known to have experienced modern-day slavery or female genital mutilation.

The practice had a whistleblowing policy. Staff felt 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. In instances where the rubber 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. These reflected the relevant legislation. We looked at five staff recruitment records. The files contained the information required by the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

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

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. A fire risk assessment had been completed externally and reviewed in March 2019.

The practice had suitable arrangements to ensure the safety of the X-ray equipment. They met current radiation regulations and had the required information in their radiation protection file. The practice had suitable arrangements to ensure the safety of the X-ray equipment. They met current radiation regulations and had the required information in their radiation protection file. The provider had registered with the Health and Safety Executive in line with changes to legislation relating to radiography. Local rules for each X-ray unit were available in line with the current regulations. The provider used digital X-rays and had rectangular collimators fitted to reduce the dose of radiation received by patients.

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.

Are services safe?

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.

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

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

Staff were aware of the risks associated with sepsis. There was a poster in the practice to give staff information and raise awareness, and a sepsis risk assessment form was available in each treatment room.

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 (HTM01-05) published by the Department of Health and Social Care. Staff completed infection prevention and control training and received updates as required.

There was a lead for infection control as recommended by the published guidance. The lead had undertaken infection control training in line with their continuing professional development.

The practice had arrangements for transporting, cleaning, checking, sterilising and storing instruments in line with HTM01-05. The records showed equipment used by staff for cleaning and sterilising instruments were validated, maintained and used in line with the manufacturers'

guidance. We saw that the decontamination process was not centralised although the provider told us there were plans to refurbish the decontamination room which would allow a centralised process.

We noted the provider did not have a vacuum autoclave. This type of autoclave should be used when providing an implant service to ensure effective sterilization.

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. This was identified in the practice's infection control policy.

The provider had procedures to reduce the possibility of Legionella or other bacteria developing in the water systems, in line with a risk assessment. The risk assessment had been completed by an external company. The risk rating was low.

The ground floor treatment room needed refurbishment. We noted there was damage to drawer fronts and work surfaces and there was an area of the floor where the floorboards were exposed. Discussions with the provider identified there was a refurbishment plan in place, and an acknowledgment the treatment room needed improvement.

The suction unit in the ground floor treatment room was not boxed in or located in a cupboard. This could present risks to both staff and patients regarding noise and infection control as the unit vented directly into the treatment room. The guidance: Health Technical Memorandum – Dental compressed air and vacuum systems (HTM 2022) outlines the necessary steps required. The provider identified this would be addressed when the room was refurbished.

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

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

The practice carried out infection prevention and control audits twice a year. There was no evidence of action plans. We noted that the most recent audit had not highlighted concerns over the ground floor treatment room, such as damaged flooring and work surfaces.

Information to deliver safe care and treatment

Are services safe?

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 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. Systems within the practice ensured medicines were used safely and were secure.

The practice kept a log of prescriptions issued but did not keep a log of unused prescription pads to monitor their security and use. The dentists were aware of current guidance with regards to prescribing medicines.

Track record on safety and lessons learned and improvements

The practice had a good safety record.

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 12 months up to this inspection there had been one accident recorded. The records showed the accident had been investigated, documented and discussed with the rest of the dental team to prevent such occurrences happening again. There was a system for recording and analysing critical incidents, and the records showed no significant incidents had occurred in the year up to this inspection.

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.

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 needs and delivered care and treatment in line with current legislation, standards and guidance supported by clear clinical pathways and protocols.

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

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

The practice had access to equipment such as digital X-rays and digital cameras to enhance the delivery of care.

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 dentist told us that where applicable they discussed smoking, alcohol consumption and diet with patients during appointments. The practice provided health promotion leaflets to help patients with their oral health. We saw evidence of these discussions in dental care records.

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 practice was aware of national oral health campaigns and local schemes available in supporting patients to live healthier lives. For example, local stop smoking services. They directed patients to these schemes when necessary.

The dentists 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 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 detailed information about the Mental Capacity Act (MCA) 2005 and had a sample MCA assessment form. The team understood their responsibilities under the act when treating adults who may not be able to make informed decisions. The policy contained information on Gillick competence, by which a child under the age of 16 years of age may give consent for themselves.

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. The relevant information was recorded in a detailed and clear manner and was easily accessible for clinical staff.

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.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

All staff had received an annual appraisal of their performance and the records relating to appraisals were held in individual staff records.

Co-ordinating care and treatment

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

The 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 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 weeks wait arrangements. This was initiated by NICE in 2005 to help make sure patients were seen quickly by a specialist.

The practice monitored referrals through an electronic referral and tracking system 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 pleasant, caring and professional. We saw that staff treated patients in a friendly, polite and considerate way. Staff were friendly towards patients at the reception desk and over the telephone.

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

The costs for NHS and private dental treatments were on display in the practice.

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. Staff told us that if a patient asked for more privacy they would take them into a private room next to reception. The reception computer screens were not visible to patients and staff did not leave patients' personal information where other patients might see it.

The ground floor treatment room did not have obscured glass and there were no window blinds. This meant that

passers-by or people waiting at the bus stop outside the practice could see into the treatment room and could see patients who were receiving treatment. The provider told us that finding a blind to fit the bay window had proved a problem and they were exploring further options.

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 Equality Act 2010.

- Interpreting services were available for patients who did not understand or speak English through the NHS Clinical Commissioning Group. There were staff who could speak Urdu, Gujarati, Punjabi and Lithuanian.
- Staff communicated with patients in a way that they could understand, for example, communication aids were available.

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 information leaflets provided patients with information about the range of treatments available at the practice.

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.

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

The practice had some patients for whom they needed to make adjustments to enable them to receive treatment. These included having a ramp up to the front door with hand rails to assist patients with restricted mobility. There was one ground floor treatment room and an adapted toilet for patients with mobility issues.

Staff used text messaging to remind patients who had agreed they had an appointment.

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.

The practice had an efficient appointment system to respond to patients' needs. The practice had emergency appointments for patients who were in pain or who telephoned in an emergency. 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.

If patients required emergency out-of-hours treatment, they could contact the NHS 111 telephone number, or contact the practice telephone number for advice on how to proceed.

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. This was displayed within the practice for the benefit of patients. The practice information leaflet explained how to make a complaint. The principal dentist was responsible for dealing with these. Staff told us they would tell the one of the principal dentists 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, compliments and complaints the practice received in the year up to this inspection. These showed the practice responded to concerns appropriately and discussed outcomes with staff to share learning and improve the service. The records showed that historically, the practice had followed their complaints policy when dealing with complaints.

Are services well-led?

Our findings

Leadership capacity and capability

Leaders had the capacity and skills to deliver high-quality, sustainable care. They also 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.

Leaders at all levels were visible and 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. Staff were proud to work in the practice. The practice focused on the needs of patients. Managers acted on behaviour and performance inconsistent with the vision and values.

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. A duty of candour policy was available to raise staff awareness and give guidance. The principal dentist showed a clear understanding of the principles that underpinned the policy.

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

Governance and management

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.

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, 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. During the three-month period between January 2019 and March 2019 the practice received 25 FFT responses. All 25 provided positive feedback.

We noted on-line reviews including the NHS Choices website. Patient feedback was mixed with no themes identified for either the positive or negative feedback.

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.

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. Learning points were not always identified and an action plan was not always produced when applicable. The provider told us the audit process would be reviewed.

The whole staff team 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 the General Dental Council professional standards. This included undertaking medical emergencies and basic life support training annually. The provider supported and encouraged staff to complete their continuing professional development to meet the professional standards.