

Ashfield House Dental Practice Limited

Ashfield House Dental Practice Limited

Inspection report

Foxholes
Wem
Shrewsbury
SY4 5UJ
Tel: 01939233766

Date of inspection visit: 24 June 2021
Date of publication: 16/07/2021

Overall summary

We carried out this announced focussed inspection 24 June 2021 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 asked the following three questions:

- Is it safe?
- Is it effective?
- 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.

Summary of findings

Are services well-led?

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

Background

Ashfield House Dental Practice is in a rural location to the west of Wem in Shropshire and provides 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, including dedicated parking for people with disabilities, are available at the practice.

The dental team includes one dentist, and one dental nurse who is also the receptionist and practice manager. The practice has one treatment room, which is located on the ground floor.

The practice is owned by a company and as a condition of registration must have a person registered with the CQC 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 Ashfield House Dental Practice is the principal dentist.

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

The practice is open:

Monday to Friday 8am to 5pm

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.
- The provider had implemented standard operating procedures in line with national guidance on COVID-19. At the time of this inspection FFP3 masks were not available for aerosol generating procedures.
- 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.
- Improvements could be made to the monitoring of hot and cold-water temperatures in line with the Legionella risk assessment.
- 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.
- Information held at the practice relating to the Control of Substances Hazardous to Health Regulations 2002 could be improved.
- Staff provided preventive care and supported patients to ensure better oral health.
- Improvements could be made to the record keeping at the practice.
- Staff felt involved and supported and worked as a team.

Summary of findings

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

- Take action to ensure that all clinical staff have adequate FFP3 masks when completing aerosol generating procedures to protect themselves and patients from the risk of COVID-19 being spread within the practice.
- Improve the practice's processes for the control and storage of substances hazardous to health identified by the Control of Substances Hazardous to Health Regulations 2002, to ensure risk assessments are undertaken and the products are stored securely.
- Take action to ensure the clinicians take into account the guidance provided by the Faculty of General Dental Practice when completing dental care records and auditing antimicrobial prescribing.
- Take action to implement any recommendations in the practice's Legionella risk assessment, taking into account the guidelines issued by the Department of Health in the Health Technical Memorandum 01-05: Decontamination in primary care dental practices, and having regard to The Health and Social Care Act 2008: 'Code of Practice about the prevention and control of infections and related guidance.' In particular ensure that hot water taps produce water at a temperature above 55 degrees centigrade and cold-water taps produce water at a temperature below 20 degrees centigrade. Weekly records should be kept to demonstrate this.

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 well-led?	No action	✓

Are services safe?

Our findings

We found that 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 that 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. There was a designated lead person for safeguarding alerts within the practice. They had completed safeguarding training to the required level.

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 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. 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 and had the necessary training certificates in their file.

The provider had implemented standard operating procedures in line with national guidance on COVID-19. Screening and triaging were undertaken prior to patients attending the premises and immediately upon arrival to identify COVID-19 positive individuals and those who may have been exposed to the virus. However, we saw the provider was not using FFP3 masks or an equivalent when completing aerosol generating procedures. Following this inspection, the provider informed us they had ordered new FFP3 masks which were due for delivery on 5 July 2021. Arrangements had been made to get them fit tested at a local dental practice once they arrived. They had decided not to complete any aerosol generating procedures until the FFP3 masks had been obtained and fit tested.

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.

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 hot and cold-water testing and dental unit water line management were maintained. The risk assessment had been completed by an external company in March 2016 and was kept under review internally on an annual basis. We saw the water temperature at three hot water taps was not reaching 55 degrees centigrade as identified in the Legionella guidance. The provider told us there were thermostatic valves on each of these taps and that they would be adjusted to increase the water temperature to the required level. The provider informed us on the 4 July 2021 the thermostatic valves had been adjusted to achieve temperatures above 55 degrees centigrade.

We saw effective cleaning schedules to ensure the practice was kept clean. During the inspection we saw the practice was visibly clean.

Are services safe?

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

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

The provider had a Speak-Up policy. Staff felt confident they could raise concerns without fear of recrimination.

The dentist used dental dam in line with guidance from the British Endodontic Society when providing root canal treatment. In instances where dental dam was not used, such as 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 agency and locum staff. These reflected the relevant legislation. We looked at both staff recruitment records. These showed the provider followed their recruitment procedure.

We observed that 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 appliances. We noted the five-year fixed wire electrical check was out of date. Following this inspection, the provider informed us they had arranged for this to be completed by an electrician.

A fire risk assessment was carried out in line with the legal requirements. We saw there were fire extinguishers and fire detection systems throughout the building and fire exits were kept clear.

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

We saw evidence the dentist justified, graded and reported on the radiographs they took. The provider carried out radiography audits every six months following current guidance and legislation. The provider had registered with the Health and Safety Executive in line with changes to legislation relating to radiography. Local rules for the X-ray unit were available in line with the current regulations.

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

A Covid-19 risk assessment had been completed. We observed staff were wearing personal protective equipment and a social distancing regime was in place.

We looked at the practice's 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, and that the effectiveness of the vaccination was checked.

Are services safe?

Following this inspection, we were informed all staff had completed sepsis awareness training on 29 June 2021. This helped ensure staff made triage appointments effectively to manage patients who present with 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.

Staff knew how to respond to a medical emergency and had completed training in emergency resuscitation and basic life support every year. Emergency equipment and medicines were available as described in recognised guidance. 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 when they treated patients in line with General Dental Council Standards for the Dental Team.

The provider had data information sheets related to substances that are hazardous to health. We noted that products did not have attendant risk assessments. We were informed after the inspection that work to complete the necessary risk assessments has been started.

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 the dentist to confirm our findings and observed that individual records were hand-written. Improvements could be made to dental care records. The records we saw were brief in places and details of treatments, options and potential outcomes could be expanded on. There were areas where dental care records were not in line with guidelines on record keeping issued by the Faculty of General Dental Practice (FGDP). Following the inspection, the provider informed us they were reviewing their dental care records in light of the FGDP guidance.

Medical histories were placed directly into the dental care records and were checked by the dentist at each visit.

Patient referrals to other service providers contained specific information which allowed appropriate and timely referrals in line with practice protocols and current guidance.

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 systems for appropriate and safe handling of medicines.

There was a stock control system of medicines which were held on site. This ensured that medicines did not pass their expiry date and enough medicines were available if required.

The dentist were aware of current guidance with regards to prescribing medicines.

We saw that antimicrobial prescribing audits were not being completed this was not in line with Faculty of General Dental Practice (FGDP) guidelines. The provider assured us they would review this.

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 risks which led to effective risk management systems in the practice as well as safety improvements.

Are services safe?

In the previous 12 months there had been no safety incidents. The practice had systems and processes to record, investigate and analyse any safety incidents that occurred. If relevant these were discussed with the rest of the dental practice team to prevent such occurrences happening again.

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. The practice reviewed regular Coronavirus (COVID-19) advisory information and alerts. Information was provided to staff and displayed for patients to enable staff to act on any suspected cases. Patients and visitors were requested to carry out hand hygiene and wear a mask on entering the premises.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

We found that 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 practitioner up to date with current evidence-based practice. We saw that dentist 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 dentist where applicable, discussed smoking, alcohol consumption and diet with patients during appointments.

Staff were aware of and involved with national oral health campaigns and local schemes which supported patients to live healthier lives, for example, local stop smoking services. They directed patients to these schemes when appropriate.

The dentist described 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 recording detailed charts of the patient's gum condition.

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.

The practice's consent policy 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. The team were aware of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 and understood their responsibilities under the act when treating adults who might not be able to make informed decisions. Information relating to best interest decisions needed to be expanded. We discussed this with the provider who assured us this would be addressed.

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 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.

Effective staffing

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

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.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

The dentist confirmed they referred patients to a range of specialists in primary and secondary care for treatment the practice did not provide.

Staff made referrals through an electronic referral and tracking system, and they ensured they were responded to promptly.

Are services well-led?

Our findings

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

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

Leadership capacity and capability

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

The provider 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.

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. The COVID-19 pandemic had reduced numbers of patients seen at the practice. However, the provider had taken steps to ensure the maximum number of patients who could receive an appointment, received one. Provided this could be done safely and giving due consideration to the restrictions imposed by COVID-19.

Culture

The practice had a culture of high-quality sustainable care.

The practice staff consisted of two people, consequently communication systems were simplified, and minutes of meetings were not always kept.

Staff stated they felt respected, supported and valued. They were proud to work in the practice. They had systems to identify and act on behaviour and performance that was not consistent with the vision and values of the practice. These included a range of human resources policies and procedures.

The staff focused on the needs of patients, the ground floor treatment room and level entry made accessing treatment for patients with mobility issues easy.

We saw the provider had systems in place to deal with staff poor performance with a range of human resources procedures and protocols.

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, and they had confidence that these would be addressed.

Governance and management

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

The provider had overall responsibilities for the management and clinical leadership and oversaw 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 on a regular basis.

We saw there were clear and effective processes for managing risks, issues and performance.

Are services well-led?

Staff acted on appropriate and accurate information.

Quality and operational information, for example surveys and audits were used to ensure and improve performance. Performance information was combined with the views of patients.

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

The practice involved patients, the public, staff and external partners to support high-quality sustainable services.

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.

COVID-19 had disrupted the usual methods of receiving written feedback from patients. However, with a well-established patient group the practice had relied on verbal feedback in recent times.

Continuous improvement and innovation

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

The provider had quality assurance processes to encourage learning and continuous improvement. These included audits of radiographs, patient feedback and infection prevention and control.

The provider showed a commitment to learning and improvement and valued the contributions made to the team by individual members of staff. There were systems in place to support staff in training and meeting the requirements of their continuing professional development.

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