

No 18 Dental Practice

No 18 Dental Practice

Inspection Report

18 High Street Knaresborough North Yorkshire HG5 0EO Tel: 01423862571

Website: www.no18-dental.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 19 January 2017 Date of publication: 03/02/2017

Overall summary

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection on 19 January 2017 to ask the practice the following key questions; Are services safe, effective, caring, responsive and well-led?

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

No 18 Dental Practice is located in Knaresborough and provides NHS treatment to children and private treatment to adults.

Wheelchair users or pushchairs can access the practice through step free access at the rear of the building. Car parking spaces are available near the practice.

The dental team is comprised of the principal dentist and three dental nurses who also work on reception. There are two surgeries with only one in use. The other has been decommissioned. The practice has a dedicated decontamination room for sterilising dental instruments, a staff room/kitchen and a general office.

On the day of inspection we received 41 CQC comment cards providing positive feedback. The patients who provided feedback were very positive about the care and attention to treatment they received at the practice. They felt involved in all aspects of their care and found staff to be caring, compassionate, friendly and the staff to be attentive to their needs. They mentioned staff had good communication skills, were efficient and they were treated with dignity and respect in a clean and tidy environment. Patients also commented they could access emergency care easily.

The practice is open:

Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday 9am – 5:30pm

Thursday 9am - 6pm

Friday 9am - 1pm

The principal dentist is registered with the Care Quality Commission (CQC) as an individual registered person. Registered persons 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 practice appeared clean and well maintained.
- Infection control procedures were robust and the practice followed published guidance.
- Staff had been trained to handle emergencies and appropriate medicines and equipment were readily available in accordance with current guidelines.
- The practice had systems in place to manage risks.
- Staff understood and received safeguarding training and knew how to recognise signs of abuse and how to report it.
- There were sufficient numbers of suitably qualified staff to meet the needs of patients.
- Appropriate recruitment of staff was in place.
 Treatment was well planned and provided in line with current guidelines.

- Patients were treated with dignity and respect and confidentiality was maintained.
- The appointment system met patients' needs.
- The service was aware of the needs of the local population and took these into account in how the practice was run
- The practice was well-led and staff felt involved and supported and worked well as a team.
- The practice sought feedback from staff and patients about the services they provided.
- Complaints were responded to in an efficient and responsive manor.

There were areas where the provider could make improvements and should:

- Review the storage of prescription pads and prescription only medicines in the practice and ensure there are systems in place to monitor and track their use.
- Review the need for a lone worker policy and risk assessment for staff.

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 in place to ensure all care and treatment was carried out safely. For example, there were systems in place for infection prevention and control, clinical waste control, dental radiography and management of medical emergencies. All emergency medicines were in date and in accordance with the British National Formulary (BNF) and Resuscitation Council UK guidelines.

We found prescription pads and prescription only medicines in the practice were stored securely but there was no system in place to monitor and track their use.

Staff told us they felt confident about reporting incidents, accidents and Reporting of Injuries, Diseases and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations 2013 (RIDDOR).

Staff had received training in safeguarding patients and knew how to recognise the signs of abuse and who to report them to including external agencies such as the local authority safeguarding team.

Staff were suitably qualified for their roles and the practice had undertaken the relevant recruitment checks to ensure patient safety.

Infection prevention and control procedures followed recommended guidance from the Department of Health: Health Technical Memorandum 01-05 (HTM 01-05): Decontamination in primary care dental practices.

We reviewed the legionella risk assessment from 2012. Evidence of regular water testing was being carried out in accordance with the assessment.

Are services effective?

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

Patients' dental care records provided comprehensive information about their current dental needs and past treatment. The practice monitored any changes to the patient's oral health and made in house referrals for specialist treatment or investigations where indicated. We found areas of improvement to review the recording of the justification of X-rays, risk factors and any extra oral examination that had been completed.

The practice followed best practice guidelines when delivering dental care. These included Faculty of General Dental Practice (FGDP), National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) and guidance from the British Society of Periodontology (BSP).

Staff were encouraged and supported to complete training relevant to their roles and this was monitored by the principal dentist. The clinical staff were up to date with their continuing professional development (CPD).

No action





Are services caring?

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

Patients were very positive about the staff, practice and treatment received. We left CQC comment cards for patients to complete two weeks prior to the inspection. There were 41 responses all of which were very positive, with patients stating they felt listened to and received the best treatment at that practice.

Dental care records were kept securely in locked cabinets.

We observed patients being treated with respect and dignity during interactions at the reception desk, over the telephone and as they were escorted through the practice. Privacy and confidentiality were maintained for patients using the service on the day of the inspection. We also observed staff to be welcoming and caring towards the patients.

The practice used minimal intervention dental treatment techniques for patients including the use of a wand to assist with local anaesthetic placement and air abrasion technology for investigating small areas of decay or teeth to have preventative sealants placed.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

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

The practice had dedicated slots each day for emergency dental care and every effort was made to see all emergency patients on the day they contacted the practice.

Patients commented they could access treatment for urgent and emergency care when required. There were clear instructions for patients requiring urgent care when the practice was closed.

There was a procedure in place for responding to patients' complaints. This involved acknowledging, investigating and responding to individual complaints or concerns. Staff were familiar with the complaints procedure.

Patients had access to telephone interpreter services when required and the practice provided a range of aids for different disabilities such as hand rails, large print leaflets and accessible toilet facilities.

Are services well-led?

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

There was a clearly defined management structure in place and all staff felt supported and appreciated in their own particular roles. The principal dental was responsible for the day to day running of the practice.

The principal dentist regularly audited clinical and non-clinical areas as part of a system of continuous improvement and learning.

The practice conducted patient satisfaction surveys and there was also a comments box in the waiting room for patients to make suggestions to the practice.

No action



No action



No action \checkmark



Staff were encouraged to share ideas and feedback as part of their appraisals and personal development plans. All staff were supported and encouraged to improve their skills through learning and development.

The practice held monthly staff meetings which were minuted and gave everybody an opportunity to openly share information and discuss any concerns or issues.



No 18 Dental Practice

Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

We carried out this inspection under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as part of our regulatory functions. This inspection was planned to check whether the registered provider was meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008

The inspection was led by a CQC inspector who was supported by a specialist dental adviser.

We informed NHS England area team and Healthwatch that we were inspecting the practice; we received no information of concern from them.

During the inspection we spoke with the principal dentist and two dental nurses/receptionists. To assess the quality of care provided we looked at practice policies and protocols and other records relating to the management of the service.

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 therefore formed the framework for the areas we looked at during the inspection.

Are services safe?

Our findings

Reporting, learning and improvement from incidents

The practice had detailed policies and procedures in place to report, investigate, respond and learn from accidents, incidents and significant events. Staff were aware of and understood the process for reporting. Staff understood the Reporting of Injuries, Disease and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations 2013 (RIDDOR) and the principal dentist provided guidance to staff within the practice's health and safety policy. All staff were aware of the notifications which should be reported to the CQC.

The practice had recorded, responded to and discussed all incidents to minimise risk and support future learning.

The practice received national patient safety and medicines alerts from the Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Authority (MHRA) and through the Central Alerting System (CAS). Relevant alerts which affected the dental profession were discussed with staff, actioned and stored for future reference.

Reliable safety systems and processes (including safeguarding)

The practice had safeguarding policies and procedures in place. These provided staff with information about identifying, reporting and dealing with suspected abuse. We saw evidence all staff had received safeguarding training in vulnerable adults and children. Staff demonstrated their awareness of the signs and symptoms of abuse and neglect. They were also aware of the process they needed to follow to address concerns.

Staff could easily access the safeguarding policy kept within the staff room. Staff demonstrated their awareness of the signs and symptoms of abuse and neglect. They were also aware of the procedures they needed to follow to address safeguarding concerns.

We spoke with staff about the use of safer sharps in dentistry as per the Health and Safety (Sharp Instruments in Healthcare) Regulations 2013. The practice had carried out a thorough sharps risk assessment which was reviewed in June 2016.

The principal dentist told us they routinely used a rubber dam when providing root canal treatment to patients in line with guidance from the British Endodontic Society. A rubber dam is a thin, rectangular sheet, usually latex free rubber, used in dentistry to isolate the operative site from the rest of the mouth and protect the airway. Rubber dams should be used when endodontic treatment is being provided. On the rare occasions when it is not possible to use rubber dam the reasons is recorded in the patient's dental care records giving details as to how the patient's safety was assured.

The practice had a whistleblowing policy which staff were aware of. Staff told us they felt confident they could raise concerns about colleagues without fear of recriminations.

Medical emergencies

The practice had procedures in place which provided staff with clear guidance about how to deal with medical emergencies. This was in line with the Resuscitation Council UK guidelines and the British National Formulary (BNF). Staff were knowledgeable about what to do in a medical emergency and had completed training in emergency resuscitation and basic life support within the last 12 months.

The emergency medicines, emergency resuscitation kits and medical oxygen were stored in an easily accessible location. Staff knew where the emergency kits were kept.

The practice had an Automated External Defibrillator (AED) to support staff in a medical emergency. (An AED is a portable electronic device that analyses life threatening irregularities of the heart and delivers an electrical shock to attempt to restore a normal heart rhythm).

Records showed weekly checks were carried out on the emergency medicines, medical oxygen cylinder and the AED. These checks ensured the oxygen cylinder was sufficiently full and in good working order, the AED was charged and the emergency medicines were in date. We saw that the oxygen cylinder was serviced on an annual basis.

Staff recruitment

The practice had a policy and a set of procedures for the safe recruitment of staff which included advertising the job through an agency, a job application form, an interview process, seeking two references, proof of identity, checking relevant qualifications and professional registration. We reviewed a sample of recruitment files and found the recruitment procedure had been followed.

Are services safe?

The principal dentist told us they carried out Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks for all newly employed staff. These checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable. We reviewed a sample of recruitment files and these showed that all checks were in place.

All clinical staff were qualified and registered with the General Dental Council (GDC). There were copies of current registration certificates and personal indemnity insurance available, (insurance professionals are required to have in place to cover their working practice).

Monitoring health & safety and responding to risks

The staff had undertaken risk assessments to cover health and safety concerns to manage and mitigate risks within the practice: this included fire, waste management and safe storage of materials.

All clinical staff were supported by another member of the team when providing treatment to patients.

The practice maintained a detailed Control of Substances Hazardous to Health (COSHH) folder. COSHH was implemented to protect workers against ill health and injury caused by exposure to hazardous substances - from mild eye irritation through to chronic lung disease. COSHH requires employers to eliminate or reduce exposure to known hazardous substances in a practical way. If any new materials were implemented into the practice a new risk assessment was put in place.

We noted there had been a fire risk assessment completed for the premises in 2011. We saw as part of the checks by the team the smoke alarms were tested and the fire extinguishers were regularly serviced. There was evidence that a fire drill had been undertaken with staff and discussion about the process reviewed at practice meetings.

We saw the business continuity plan had details of all staff, contractors and emergency numbers should an unforeseen emergency occur.

Infection control

There was a detailed infection prevention and control folder with various policies and procedures to keep patients safe. These included hand hygiene, safe handling of instruments, managing waste products and decontamination guidance. The practice followed the guidance about decontamination and infection prevention and control issued by the Department of Health, namely 'Health Technical Memorandum 01-05 -Decontamination in primary care dental practices (HTM 01-05)'.

We spoke with dental nurses about decontamination and infection prevention and control. The process of instrument collection, processing, inspecting using a magnifying light, sterilising and storage was clearly described and shown. We also saw the daily and weekly tests were being carried out by the dental nurses to ensure the sterilisers were in working order.

We found instruments were being cleaned and sterilised in line with published guidance (HTM01-05). The dental nurses were well-informed about the decontamination process and demonstrated correct procedures.

The practice had carried out an Infection Prevention Society (IPS) self- assessment audit in September 2016 relating to the Department of Health's guidance on decontamination in dental services (HTM01-05). This is designed to assist all registered primary dental care services to meet satisfactory levels of decontamination of equipment. The audit showed the practice was meeting the required standards.

We inspected the decontamination and treatment rooms. The rooms were clean, drawers and cupboards were tidy with adequate dental materials. There were hand washing facilities, liquid soap and paper towel dispensers in each of the treatment rooms, decontamination room and toilets.

The recruitment files we reviewed showed all clinical staff had received inoculations against Hepatitis B. It is recommended that people who are likely to come into contract with blood products or are at increased risk of needle-stick injuries should receive these vaccinations to minimise risks of acquiring blood borne infections.

Records showed the practice had completed a Legionella risk assessment in 2012. The practice undertook processes to reduce the likelihood of Legionella developing which included flushing the dental unit water lines in the treatment rooms at the beginning and end of each session and between patients, the use of purified water and monitoring hot and cold water temperatures. [Legionella is a bacterium found in the environment which can contaminate water systems in buildings].

Are services safe?

The practice stored clinical waste in a secure manner and an appropriate contractor was used to remove it from site. Waste consignment notices were available for the inspection and this confirmed that all types of waste including sharps and amalgam was collected on a regular basis.

We saw evidence of cleaning schedules that covered all areas of the premises. We found, and patients commented the practice was consistently clean.

Equipment and medicines

We saw evidence of servicing certificates for all equipment, X-ray machines and Portable Appliance Testing (PAT). (PAT is the term used to describe the examination of electrical appliances and equipment to ensure they are safe to use).

Checks were carried out in line with the manufacturer's recommendations and guidelines.

We found no system in place to log the administration and storage of medicines and no log for NHS prescriptions. We brought this to the attention of the principal dentist who said they would implement this immediately.

Radiography (X-rays)

The practice had a radiation protection file and a record of all X-ray equipment including service and maintenance history. A Radiation Protection Advisor (RPA) and a Radiation Protection Supervisor (RPS) had been appointed to ensure the equipment was operated safely and by qualified staff only.

The practice demonstrated compliance with current radiation regulations this included information stored within the radiation protection file.

We saw a grade and a report were documented in the dental care records for X-rays which had been taken. We discussed with the dentist a justification was not always recorded and they assured us this would be actioned immediately.

X-ray audits were carried out by the principal dentist bi-annually. The audit and the results were in line with current guidance.

We saw all the staff were up to date with their continuing professional development training in respect of dental radiography.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Monitoring and improving outcomes for patients

The practice kept up to date detailed paper records and electronic X-ray records. They contained information about the patient's current dental needs and past treatment. The dentist carried out assessments in line with recognised guidance from the Faculty of General Dental Practice (FGDP), National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) and guidance from the British Society of Periodontology (BSP). This was repeated at each examination if required in order to monitor any changes in the patient's oral health.

The dentist used NICE guidance to determine a suitable recall interval for the patients. This takes into account the likelihood of the patient experiencing dental disease. The practice also recorded the medical history information within the patients' dental care records for future reference. In addition, the dentist told us they discussed patients' lifestyle and behaviour such as smoking and alcohol consumption and where appropriate offered them health promotion advice, this was recorded in the patients' dental care records. We found risks factors were not always recorded in patients notes but staff assured this was completed just not recorded.

We saw patient dental care records had been audited to ensure they complied with the guidance provided by the Faculty of General Dental Practice. The audits had action plans and learning outcomes in place. This helps address any issues that arise and sets out learning outcomes.

Health promotion & prevention

The practice focused strongly on preventative care and minimal intervention treatments to support patients. For example, fluoride varnish was applied to the teeth of all children who attended for an examination and high fluoride toothpastes were prescribed for patients at high risk of dental disease in line with the 'Delivering Better Oral Health' toolkit (DBOH). DBOH is an evidence based toolkit used by dental teams for the prevention of dental disease in a primary and secondary care setting. Staff told us the dentist would always provide detailed oral hygiene advice to patients where appropriate and use the patient information screen in the surgery to show the patient X-rays to help reinforce messages.

The practice had a selection of dental products and health promotion leaflets to assist patients with their oral health.

The medical history form patients completed included questions about smoking and alcohol consumption. We were told by the dentist and saw in dental care records that smoking cessation advice was given to patients who smoked. Patients would also be made aware if their alcohol consumption was above the national recommended limit. There were health promotion leaflets available in the waiting room to support patients.

Staffing

New staff to the practice had a period of induction and a training programme was in place. We confirmed staff were supported to deliver effective care by undertaking continuous professional development for registration with the General Dental Council.

Staff told us they had annual appraisals in which training requirements were discussed. We saw evidence of completed appraisals. Staff also felt they could approach the principal dentist at any time to discuss continuing training and development as the need arose.

Working with other services

The principal dentist confirmed they would refer patients to a range of specialists in primary and secondary care if the treatment required was not provided by the practice. Referral letters were either typed up or pro formas were used to send all the relevant information to the specialist.

Details included patient identification, medical history, reason for referral and X-rays if relevant.

The practice also ensured any urgent referrals were dealt with promptly such as referring for suspicious lesions under the two-week rule. The two-week rule was initiated by NICE in 2005 to enable patients with suspected cancer lesions to be seen within two weeks. We were told of an area of good practice where a suspicious lesion had been reviewed by the practice and referred three times to ensure the changes were logged and investigated appropriately.

Consent to care and treatment

We spoke with staff about how they implemented informed consent. Informed consent is a patient giving permission to a dental professional for treatment with full understanding of the possible options, risks and benefits.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Patients informed us they were given suitable information and appropriate consent was obtained before treatment commenced.

Staff were clear on the principles of the Mental Capacity Act and the competency assessment for children under 16. [The Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA) provides a legal

framework for health and care professionals to act and make decisions on behalf of adults who lack the capacity to make particular decisions]. Staff described to us how they involved patients' relatives or carers when required and ensured there was sufficient time to explain the treatment options.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Respect, dignity, compassion & empathy

We were told staff would take into account the needs of people's diversity, values and human rights.

Feedback from patients was positive and they commented they were treated with care, respect and dignity. We observed staff interacted with patients in a respectful, appropriate and kind manner and to be friendly towards patients during interactions at the reception desk and over the telephone.

We observed privacy and confidentiality was maintained for patients who used the service on the day of inspection. We were told if patients wanted to talk in private a room for this would be made available.

Patients, who were nervous about treatment, commented they were supported in a compassionate and empathic way.

Dental care records were not visible to the public on the reception desk. Paper records were securely stored in a locked cabinet.

Involvement in decisions about care and treatment

The practice provided patients with information to enable them to make informed choices. Patients commented they felt involved in their treatment and it was fully explained to them. Staff described to us how they involved patients' relatives or carers when required and ensured there was sufficient time to explain fully the care and treatment they were providing in a way patients understood.

The practice provided clear treatment plans to their patients that detailed possible treatment options and costs. Posters showing NHS and private treatment costs were displayed in the waiting area. The practice's website provided patients with information about the range of treatments which were available at the practice.

The surgery had a screen for patients to be shown X-rays findings and discuss treatment options and reinforce oral health messages.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting patients' needs

We found the practice had an efficient appointment system in place to respond to patients' needs. Staff told us that patients who requested an urgent appointment would be seen the same day. We were told the patients were given sufficient time during their appointment so they would not feel rushed. We observed the clinics ran smoothly on the day of the inspection and patients were not kept waiting.

The practice had an information leaflet and a website. The information leaflet included details of the staff, dental treatments which are available and a description of the facilities. The practice's website provided patients with information about the range of treatments which were available at the practice. This included minimal intervention dentistry, treatments for gum disease and preventative information.

Tackling inequity and promoting equality

The practice had made reasonable adjustments to prevent inequity to any patient group such as step free access at the rear of the building and an accessible toilet with hand rails and an alarm.

Staff had access to a translation service with contact details of braille and transcription services also available for staff to refer to should the need arise. We were told patient information was available in different formats and languages.

Access to the service

The practice displayed its opening hours in the premises, in the practice information leaflet and on the practice website.

The patients told us they were rarely kept waiting for their appointment. Where treatment was urgent staff told us patients would be seen the same day so that no patient was turned away. The patients told us when they had required an emergency appointment this had been organised the same day. There were clear instructions on the practice's answer machine for patients requiring urgent dental care when the practice was closed. The practice was part of a local on call rota system to ensure all patients had a point of contact out of normal working hours.

Concerns & complaints

The practice had a complaints policy which provided guidance to staff on how to handle a complaint. The policy was detailed in accordance with the Local Authority Social Services and National Health Service Complaints (England) Regulations 2009 and as recommended by the GDC.

The principal dentist was responsible for responding to complaints when they arose. Staff told us they would raise any formal or informal comments or concerns with the principal dentist to ensure responses were made in a timely manner. Staff told us they aimed to resolve complaints in-house initially.

We reviewed comments, compliments and complaints the practice had received and found they were responded to appropriately and outcomes were shared with staff to prevent, learn and improve services.

Are services well-led?

Our findings

Governance arrangements

There was an effective management structure in place. Staff were supported, managed and were clear about their roles and responsibilities. We were told staff met their professional standards and followed their professional code of conduct.

The practice had an approach for identifying where quality or safety was being affected and addressing any issues. Health and safety and risk management policies were in place and we saw a process to ensure the safety of patients and staff members. For example, we saw risk assessments relating to the use of equipment and infection prevention and control.

Leadership, openness and transparency

Staff told us they were aware of the need to be open, honest and apologetic to patients if anything was to go wrong; this is in accordance with the Duty of Candour principle which states the same.

All staff were aware of whom to raise any issue with and told us the principal dentist was approachable, would listen to their concerns and act appropriately. We were told there was a no blame culture at the practice. Staff told us there was an open culture within the practice and they were encouraged and confident to raise any issues at any time. These were discussed openly at staff meetings and it was evident the practice worked as a team and dealt with any issue in a professional manner.

The practice held meetings to ensure staff could raise any concerns and discuss clinical and none clinical updates. If there was more urgent information to discuss with staff then an informal staff meeting would be organised to discuss the matter

Learning and improvement

Quality assurance processes were used at the practice to encourage continuous improvement. This included clinical audits such as dental care records, X-rays and infection prevention and control. We saw audits were carried out thoroughly with results and action plans clearly detailed.

Staff told us they had access to training which helped ensure mandatory training was completed each year; this included medical emergencies and basic life support. Staff working at the practice were supported to maintain their continuous professional development as required by the General Dental Council.

Practice seeks and acts on feedback from its patients, the public and staff

The practice had systems in place to involve, seek and act upon feedback from staff and people using the service. These systems included carrying out annual patient satisfaction surveys, comment cards in the waiting rooms and verbal feedback. We confirmed the practice responded to feedback.

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