

Good Smiles Dental Limited

Good Smiles Dental

Inspection Report

105 Wollaton Road
Beeston
Nottingham
Nottinghamshire
NG9 2NP
Tel: 0115 9255767
Website: www.goodsmiles.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 20 March 2019
Date of publication: 09/04/2019

Overall summary

We carried out this announced inspection on 20 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

Good Smiles Dental is in the Beeston area of Nottingham and provides private and orthodontic dental treatment to adults and children.

There is ramped access for people who use wheelchairs and those with pushchairs. There is roadside parking close to the practice for patients.

The dental team includes two dentists, one orthodontist, and three dental nurses. The practice has one treatment room which is on the ground floor.

Summary of findings

The practice is owned by a limited 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 Good Smiles Dental is the principal dentist.

On the day of inspection, we collected 18 CQC comment cards filled in by patients.

During the inspection we spoke with one dentist, one orthodontist 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 to Friday from 9am to 5pm. The practice is closed on Saturday and Sunday.

Our key findings were:

- The practice appeared clean and well maintained.
- 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.
- Infection prevention and control audits were being completed annually as opposed to six monthly as identified in nationally recognised guidance.
- The provider had the staff recruitment information required by the Regulations.
- The clinical staff provided patients' care and treatment in line with current guidelines.
- The protocol for needlestick injuries did not reflect current guidelines
- Staff treated patients with dignity and respect and took care to protect their privacy and personal information.
- The practice consent policy needed review.
- Staff were providing preventive care and supporting patients to ensure better oral health.
- The appointment system took account of patients' needs.
- 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 practice's sharps procedures to ensure the practice is in compliance with the Health and Safety (Sharp Instruments in Healthcare) Regulations 2013.
- Review the practice's policies and procedures for obtaining patient consent to care and treatment to ensure they are in compliance with legislation, take into account relevant guidance, and staff follow them.

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.

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

The protocol for needlestick injuries did not reflect current guidelines.

The practice consent policy needed to include information about the Mental Capacity Act and Gillick competencies.

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.

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 comfortable, helpful and thorough. 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?

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

We received feedback about the practice from 18 people. Patients were positive about all aspects of the service the practice provided. They told us staff were friendly, welcoming and treated them with dignity and respect. They said that they were put at ease, had different treatment options explained and were given all of the relevant information. 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.

No action



Summary of findings

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 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.

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 was a designated lead person for safeguarding alerts within the practice. They had completed safeguarding appropriate 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 dental care records.

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 six 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 in November 2012. The assessment had been reviewed internally on an annual basis.

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 all the X-ray units 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.

We looked at the practice's arrangements for safe dental care and treatment. The protocol for needlestick injuries did not reflect current guidelines and should be updated and reviewed. The principal dentist said this would be done.

Are services safe?

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.

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 suitable 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.

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 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 and had been reviewed internally in March 2019.

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 annually. This was discussed with the principal dentist and the schedule was amended to twice a year.

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 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 dentists were aware of current guidance with regards to prescribing medicines.

Audits of antibiotic prescribing were not being completed annually. The principal dentist said this would be introduced and the results shared with clinical staff.

Track record on safety and lessons learned and improvements

The practice had a good safety record.

Are services safe?

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 no accident or safety incidents recorded. Historically, significant events and accidents had been 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 practice did not have a system for receiving and acting on safety alerts. During the inspection the principal dentist made arrangements to receive these alerts, and to review any which were relevant and could have been missed.

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

The practice provided an orthodontic service. One of the dentists was a specialist orthodontist. This service was provided to patients who met the criteria. Detailed assessments were carried out and treatments were provided in line with recognised guidance. Patients were recalled at suitable intervals for reviews of the treatment.

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 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 required review, as information about the Mental Capacity Act 2005 was not adequately covered. 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. This information needed to be reviewed to give more information, particularly as the orthodontic treatments were often delivered to patients below the age of 18.

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.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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.

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 friendly, welcoming and professional. We saw that staff treated patients with dignity and respect, were polite and reassuring. 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 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 the treatment 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.

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 Accessible Information Standards and the requirements under the Equality Act. The Accessible Information Standard is a requirement to make sure that patients and their carers can access and understand the information they are given:

- Interpreter services were available for patients who did not understand or speak English. This was through a telephone translation service. There was a staff member at the practice who could speak French.
- 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 and oral health promotion.

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. This included having a ground floor treatment room and ramped access to the front door.

Staff used e mails to remind patients who had agreed to receive them, 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 practice telephone number for advice on how to proceed.

The 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 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 principal dentist about any formal or informal comments or concerns straight away so patients received a quick response.

The principal dentist told us they 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 the practice had followed their complaints policy when dealing with complaints.

Are services well-led?

Our findings

Leadership capacity and capability

Leaders and managers 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. The principal dentist discussed the duty of candour and showed a clear understanding of the principles that underpinned it. A duty of candour policy was available to raise staff awareness and give guidance. The principal dentist gave an example of where the duty of candour policy had been used in the practice.

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.

There were three reviews on-line which had been received in the year up to this inspection. These reviews had provided positive 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. The results of feedback received from patients showed there was room to improve the process including the analysis of the results. We discussed this with the principal dentist who said a review would be undertaken.

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 identified and an action plan was produced when applicable.

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.