

Mr. Steve Watkins

Steve Watkins Dental Practice

Inspection Report

131 High Street
Worle
Weston Super Mare
BS22 6HQ
Tel: 01934 517711
Website: N/A

Date of inspection visit: 15 October 2019
Date of publication: 17/01/2020

Overall summary

We carried out this announced inspection on 15 October 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 Care Quality Commission, (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 this practice was providing safe care in accordance with the relevant regulations.

Are services effective?

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

Are services caring?

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

Are services responsive?

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

Are services well-led?

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

Background

Steve Watkins Dental Practice is in Worle, Weston-Super-Mare and provides NHS and private dental care and treatment for adults and children.

There is level access to the practice for people who use wheelchairs and those with pushchairs. Car parking spaces are available near the practice in a public car park which has designated spaces for blue badge holders.

The dental team includes one dentist, two dental nurses, one dental hygienist and one receptionist. The practice has three treatment rooms.

Summary of findings

The practice is owned by an individual who is the principal dentist. They have legal responsibility for meeting the requirements in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 and associated regulations about how the practice is run.

On the day of inspection, we collected 45 CQC comment cards filled in by patients and spoke with three other patients.

During the inspection we spoke with one dentist, one dental nurse, and one receptionist. We looked at practice policies and procedures and other records about how the service is managed.

The practice is open:

- Monday to Thursday 09.00am – 12.30pm and 2.00pm – 5.30pm
- Friday 09.00am – 1.00pm and 1.30pm – 4.30pm
- Closed at weekends

Our key findings were:

- The practice appeared to be visibly 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 although improvements were needed to ensure all sizes of oropharyngeal airways were present.
- The provider had systems to help them manage risk to patients and staff.
- The provider had safeguarding processes and staff knew their responsibilities for safeguarding vulnerable adults and children.
- The provider had staff recruitment procedures which reflected current legislation.
- The clinical staff provided patients' care and treatment in line with current guidelines.
- Staff treated patients with dignity and respect and took care to protect their privacy and personal information.
- Staff provided preventive care and supported patients to ensure better oral health.
- The appointment system took account of patients' needs.
- The provider had effective leadership and a culture of continuous improvement.
- Staff felt involved, supported and worked 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 information governance arrangements.

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

- Take action to implement any recommendations in the practice fire safety risk assessment and ensure ongoing fire safety management is effective.
- Take action to ensure the availability of equipment and in the practice to manage medical emergencies as stated in the guidelines issued by the Resuscitation Council (UK) and the General Dental Council.
- Take action to ensure all clinical staff have adequate immunity for vaccine preventable infectious diseases through a post vaccination blood test.
- Take action to ensure the practice stores dental care records securely.
- Take action to ensure audits of radiography and infection prevention and control are undertaken at regular intervals to improve the quality of the service. The practice should also 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 asked the following question(s).

Are services safe?	No action ✓
Are services effective?	No action ✓
Are services caring?	No action ✓
Are services responsive to people's needs?	No action ✓
Are services well-led?	No action ✓

Are services safe?

Our findings

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

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

Staff 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 provider had safeguarding policies and procedures to provide staff with information about identifying, reporting and dealing with suspected abuse. We saw evidence staff had 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 provider had a system to highlight vulnerable patients and patients who required other support such as with mobility or communication, within dental care records.

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

The provider had 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 provider had suitable numbers of dental instruments available for the clinical staff and measures were in place to ensure they were decontaminated and sterilised appropriately.

The staff had systems in place to ensure that patient-specific dental appliances were disinfected prior to being sent to a dental laboratory and before treatment was completed.

We saw staff had procedures to reduce the possibility of Legionella or other bacteria developing in the water systems, in line with a risk assessment. All recommendations in the assessment had been actioned and records of water testing and dental unit water line management were maintained.

We observed the legionella risk assessment had not been completed by a recognised competent professional for a few years. The provider told us there had been no changes to the building so they had completed the risk assessment themselves. They recognised the need for a formal assessment by a recognised competent professional and took immediate action to arrange for this to be completed.

We saw effective cleaning schedules to ensure the practice was kept clean. When we inspected we saw the practice was visibly clean.

The provider had policies and procedures in place to ensure clinical waste was segregated and stored appropriately in line with guidance. The provider told us they did not have evidence of the waste management contract but forwarded this to us following the inspection.

The provider and infection control lead professional carried out infection prevention and control audits twice a year. The latest audit showed the practice was meeting the required standards.

The practice speaking up policies were in line with the NHS Improvement Raising Concerns (Whistleblowing) Policy. Staff felt confident they could raise concerns without fear of recrimination.

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

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

Are services safe?

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

We observed clinical staff were qualified and registered with the General Dental Council and had professional indemnity cover.

Staff ensured facilities and equipment were safe, and that equipment was maintained according to manufacturers' instructions, including electrical and gas appliances. We observed the periodic appliance testing (PAT) was out of date and the provider took action to arrange for this to be completed.

A fire risk assessment was carried out in line with the legal requirements by the provider but had not been complete by a recognised competent person for a few years. We saw there were fire extinguishers and fire detection systems throughout the building and fire exits were kept clear.

The practice had arrangements to ensure the safety of the X-ray equipment and we saw the required radiation protection information was available.

We were shown evidence the dentists justified, graded and reported on the radiographs they took. The provider carried out radiography audits every year. These audits did not always follow current guidance and legislation and required improvement.

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

Risks to patients

The provider had implemented systems to assess, monitor and manage risks to patient safety.

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

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

The provider had a system in place to ensure clinical staff had received appropriate vaccinations, including

vaccination to protect them against the Hepatitis B virus. They had not checked the effectiveness of the vaccination. The provider told us they had been unable to obtain post vaccination checks but confirmed to us at the end of the inspection they were taking action to address this.

Staff had completed sepsis awareness training. Sepsis prompts for staff and patient information posters were displayed throughout the practice. This helped ensure staff made triage appointments effectively to manage patients who presented with a dental infection and where necessary refer patients for specialist care.

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

Not all emergency equipment and medicines were available as described in recognised guidance. The provider took immediate action to obtain the missing items, some sizes of oropharyngeal airways and buccal midazolam, and confirmed in writing they had obtained them the day after the inspection. We found staff kept records of their checks of these to make sure they were available, within their expiry date, and in working order.

A dental nurse worked with the dentist and sometimes with the dental hygienist when they treated patients in line with General Dental Council Standards for the Dental Team. A risk assessment had not been completed for when the dental hygienist worked without chairside support. The provider addressed this shortfall immediately.

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

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 dental care records with clinicians to corroborate our findings and observed that individual records were written and managed in a way which kept patients safe. Dental care records we saw were complete, legible, were kept securely and complied with General Data Protection Regulation requirements.

Are services safe?

We observed paper dental care records were stored behind the reception area on open shelves. The provider told us they were looking into providing more secure storage for these. They sent us their plans following the inspection.

The provider had systems for referring patients with suspected oral cancer under the national two-week wait arrangements. These arrangements were initiated by National Institute for Health and Care Excellence to help make sure patients were seen quickly by a specialist.

Safe and appropriate use of medicines

The provider had some systems for appropriate and safe handling of medicines, but they were not robust. Following discussion, the provider told they would no longer store or supply medicines. They confirmed this in writing following the inspection.

We saw staff stored and kept records of NHS prescriptions as described in current guidance.

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

Track record on safety, and lessons learned and improvements

The provider had implemented systems for reviewing and investigating when things went wrong. There were comprehensive risk assessments in relation to safety issues.

Staff monitored and reviewed incidents. This helped staff to understand the potential risks and led to effective risk management systems in the practice as well as safety improvements.

In the previous 12 months there had been no safety incidents.

The provider had a system for receiving and acting on safety alerts. Staff 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

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

Effective needs assessment, care and treatment

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

Helping patients to live healthier lives

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

The dentists prescribed high concentration fluoride products if a patient's risk of tooth decay indicated this would help them.

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

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

Records showed patients with severe gum disease were recalled at more frequent intervals for review and to reinforce preventative advice.

Consent to care and treatment

Staff 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 staff were aware of the need to obtain proof of legal guardianship or Power of Attorney for patients who lacked capacity or for children who are Looked After.

The dentist gave patients information about treatment options and the risks and benefits of these, so they could

make informed decisions. We saw this documented in patients' records. Patients confirmed their dentist listened to them and gave them clear information about their treatment.

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

The policy also referred to Gillick competence, by which a child under the age of 16 years of age may give consent for themselves in certain circumstances. 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 patient's current dental needs, past treatment and medical history, however in some records seen improvements could be made. The dentists assessed patient's treatment needs in line with recognised guidance.

The provider had quality assurance processes to encourage learning and continuous improvement. Staff kept records of the results of these audits but there were no resulting action plans and documented improvements.

Effective staffing

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

Staff new to the practice would have a structured induction programme. All practice staff had been in post for more than five years and the practice did not use any locum or agency staff. 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 dentist confirmed they referred patients to a range of specialists in primary and secondary care for treatment the practice did not provide.

Are services caring?

Our findings

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

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 reassuring, capable and professional. We saw staff treated patients respectfully, supportively and in a person-centred, kindly manner. They were friendly towards patients at the reception desk and over the telephone.

Patients said staff were compassionate and understanding.

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

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

Privacy and dignity

Staff respected and promoted patients' privacy and dignity.

Staff were aware of the importance of privacy and confidentiality. The layout of reception and waiting area provided privacy when reception staff were dealing with patients.

If a patient asked for more privacy, the practice would respond appropriately. 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. They were aware of the Accessible Information Standard and the requirements of the Equality Act.

The Accessible Information Standard is a requirement to make sure patients and their carers can access and understand the information they are given. We saw:

- Interpreter services were available for patients who did not speak or understand English.
- Staff communicated with patients in a way they could understand, and communication aids and easy-read materials were available.
- 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.

Staff gave patients clear information to help them make informed choices about their treatment. Patients confirmed staff listened to them, did not rush them and discussed options for treatment with them.

The dentist described the conversations they had with patients to satisfy themselves they understood their treatment options.

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

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

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

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

Responding to and meeting people's needs

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

Staff were clear about the importance of emotional support needed by patients when delivering care. They conveyed a good understanding of support which may be needed by more vulnerable members of society such as patients with dementia, and adults and children with a learning difficulty.

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

Two weeks before our inspection, CQC sent the practice 50 feedback comment cards, along with posters for the practice to display, encouraging patients to share their views of the service.

45 cards were completed, giving a patient response rate of 90%.

100% of views expressed by patients were positive.

Common themes within the positive feedback were: friendliness of staff; easy access to dental appointments; flexibility of appointment times; reassurance for nervous patients; knowledge and professionalism of staff.

We were able to talk to three patients on the day of inspection. Feedback they provided aligned with the views expressed in completed comment cards.

The practice currently had no patients for whom they needed to make adjustments to enable them to receive treatment.

The practice had made reasonable adjustments for patients with disabilities. This included step free access, a hearing loop, and a partially accessible toilet with hand rails.

Staff had carried out a disability access audit and had formulated an action plan to continually improve access for patients.

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

Timely access to services

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

The practice displayed its opening hours in the premises and included it in their information leaflet.

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

The practice information leaflet and answerphone provided telephone numbers for patients needing emergency dental treatment during the working day and when the practice was closed. 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

Staff told us the provider took complaints and concerns seriously and responded to them appropriately to improve the quality of care.

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

The provider was responsible for dealing with complaints. Staff told us they would tell the provider about any formal or informal comments or concerns straight away so patients could receive a quick response.

The provider 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 provider had dealt with their concerns.

We looked at comments, compliments and complaints the practice had received in the last 12 months.

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

Are services well-led?

Our findings

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

The provider demonstrated a transparent and open culture in relation to people's safety. There was clear leadership and an emphasis to continually provide a good service. Systems and processes that existed were embedded and staff worked together.

During the inspection we identified some systems which required improvement and these related to ensuring all maintenance requirements were completed in a timely manner, for example PAT testing. Other systems in place required review to ensure they were robust and had taken account of recent changes in guidance.

The information and evidence presented during the inspection process was clear and well documented. The practice team demonstrated how they sustained a high-quality sustainable service.

Leadership capacity and capability

We found the principal dentist had the capacity, values and skills to deliver high-quality, sustainable care.

The principal dentist was knowledgeable about issues and priorities relating to the quality and future of the service. They understood the challenges and were addressing them.

Leaders at all levels were visible and approachable. Staff told us they worked closely with them to make sure they prioritised compassionate and inclusive leadership.

We saw the provider had processes to maintain leadership capacity and skills.

The provider had a strategy for delivering the service which was in line with health and social priorities across the region. Staff planned the services to meet the needs of the practice population.

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.

Staff discussed their training needs at an annual appraisal, in informal discussions and during practice meetings. They also discussed learning needs, general wellbeing and aims for future professional development. We saw evidence of completed appraisals in the staff folders.

The staff focused on the needs of patients as seen in the feedback received via CQC comment cards.

We saw the provider had systems in place to deal with poor staff performance.

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

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

Governance and management

Staff had clear responsibilities, roles and systems of accountability to support good governance and management.

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

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

We saw there were clear processes for managing risks, issues and performance. These were not always as effective as they could be. For example, the provider had not had a legionella or fire risk assessment undertaken by a recognised competent professional for a few years. They took immediate action during the inspection to address this shortfall.

Appropriate and accurate information

Staff 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.

Are services well-led?

The provider 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

Staff involved patients, the public, staff and external partners to support the service.

The provider used patient surveys and encouraged verbal comments to obtain staff and patients' views about the service.

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

The provider 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 upon.

Continuous improvement and innovation

The provider had systems and processes for learning, continuous improvement and innovation.

The provider had some quality assurance processes to encourage learning and continuous improvement. These included audits of dental care records, radiographs and infection prevention and control.

The audits seen were incomplete in that they had not been fully analysed and an action plan drawn up. The provider acknowledged the shortfalls and told us they would address these in the next audits undertaken.

The principal dentist showed a commitment to learning and improvement and valued the contributions made to the team by individual members of staff.

Staff completed 'highly recommended' training as stated in the General Dental Council professional standards. The provider supported and encouraged staff to complete continuing professional development.