

Xeon Smiles UK Limited

Carlton House Dental Care

Inspection Report

69 High Street
Knaresborough
North Yorkshire
HG5 0HB
Tel: 01423 862178
Website:

Date of inspection visit: 22 October 2015
Date of publication: 14/01/2016

Overall summary

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection on 22 October 2015 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

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 not providing well-led care in accordance with the relevant regulations

Background

Carlton House Dental Practice is situated in Knaresborough, North Yorkshire. The practice offers a mix of NHS and private dental treatments. The services include preventative advice, routine restorative dental care and conscious sedation.

The practice has four surgeries, a decontamination room, a dental panoramic x-ray room, a reception area and a waiting area all on the ground floor level.

There are three dentists, two hygienists, five dental nurses, two receptionists and a registered manager.

The practice is open:

Monday 08:30 - 18:30

Tuesday and Friday 08:30 – 17:30

Wednesday 08:30 – 19:00

Thursday 08:30 – 18:00.

The practice manager is the registered manager. A registered manager is a person who is registered with the Care Quality Commission to manage the service. Like registered providers, they are 'registered persons'. 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.

On the day of inspection we received eight CQC comment cards providing feedback and spoke to three patients.

Summary of findings

The patients who provided feedback were positive about the care and treatment they received at the practice. They told us they were involved in all aspects of their care and found the staff to be caring and considerate and they were treated with dignity and respect in a clean and tidy environment.

Our key findings were:

- There was a complaints system in place. Staff recorded complaints and cascaded learning to staff.
- Staff had received safeguarding training, 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.
- Staff had been trained to manage medical emergencies.
- Infection control procedures were in accordance with the published guidelines.
- Patient care and treatment was planned and delivered in line with evidence based guidelines, best practice and current regulations.
- Patients received clear explanations about their proposed treatment, costs, benefits and risks and were involved in making decisions about it.
- Patients were treated with dignity and respect and confidentiality was maintained.
- The appointment system met patients' needs.
- The governance systems were effective.
- The practice sought feedback from staff and patients about the services they provided.

We identified regulations that were not being met and the provider must:

- Ensure the practice's protocols and audits for conscious sedation are reviewed, giving due regard to guidelines published by The Intercollegiate Advisory Committee on Sedation in Dentistry in the document 'Standards for Conscious Sedation in the Provision of Dental Care 2015'.

You can see full details of the regulations not being met at the end of this report.

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

- Update the Local Rules for radiography including the new radiation protection supervisors -RPS details.
- Review the dental panoramic X-ray machine is critically tested and certified.

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 effective systems and processes in place to ensure that all care and treatment was carried out safely. For example, there were systems in place for infection control, clinical waste control, dental radiography and management of medical emergencies. All emergency equipment and medicines were in date apart from the oro-pharyngeal airways, this was brought to the attention of the registered manager and an order was placed immediately.

We saw that staff had received training in infection control. There was a decontamination area and guidance for staff on effective decontamination of dental instruments. 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 appropriately recruited and suitably trained and skilled to meet patients' needs and there were sufficient numbers of staff available at all times. Staff induction processes were in place and had been completed by all staff.

We reviewed the legionella risk assessment dated October 2014, there was evidence of regular water testing being carried out in accordance with the assessment, and additionally a local water authority certificate was available dated November 2014.

Are services effective?

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

Consultations were carried out in line with best practice guidance from the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE).

The practice followed best practice guidelines when delivering dental care. These included guidance from the Faculty of General Dental Practice (FGDP) and NICE. The practice focused strongly on prevention and the dentists were aware of the 'Delivering Better Oral Health' toolkit (DBOH) with regards to fluoride application and oral hygiene advice. Patients' dental care records provided contemporaneous information about their current dental needs and past treatment.

The practice monitored any changes to the patients oral health and made referrals for specialist treatment or investigations where indicated in a timely manner.

Staff were registered with the General Dental Council (GDC) and maintained their registration by completing the required number of hours of continuing professional development (CPD). Staff were supported to meet the requirements of their professional registration.

Are services caring?

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

Comments on the eight completed CQC comment cards we received included statements saying the staff were always ready to help, there were caring and helpful. Patients we spoke with on the day confirmed this.

We observed patients being treated with respect and dignity during interactions at the reception desk and over the telephone.

Summary of findings

Are services responsive to people's needs?

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

Patients could access routine treatment and urgent care when required. The practice offered daily access for patients experiencing dental pain which enabled them to receive treatment quickly.

The practice had good disability access with all surgeries having adequate space to accommodate a wheelchair; there was also a separate disability toilet with an alarm in place.

The practice had a complaints process which was available to patients who wished to make a complaint. Staff recorded complaints and cascaded learning to staff. They also had patient advice leaflets available on reception, comment cards and feedback forms.

Are services well-led?

We found that this practice was not providing well-led care in accordance with the relevant regulations. We have told the registered provider to take action (see full details of this action in the Requirement Notices at the end of this report).

There was a clearly defined management structure in place. The registered manager was responsible for the day to day running of the practice and also delegated tasks to the lead nurse.

Staff reported that the registered manager was approachable; they felt supported in their roles and were freely able to raise any issues or concerns with them at any time. The culture within the practice was seen by staff as open and transparent.

The practice regularly undertook patient satisfaction surveys and were also undertaking the NHS Family and Friends Test.

The practice held regular staff meetings which were minuted, gave everybody an opportunity to openly share information and discuss any concerns or issues which had not already been addressed during their daily interactions.

The practice undertook various audits to monitor its performance and help improve the services offered. The audits included infection control and X-rays.

On the day of the inspection we noted that no audits for sedation had been completed within which the need for staff to have up to date Immediate life support training and a policy in place for sedation would have been highlighted.

Carlton House Dental Care

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 their obligations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008.

The inspection was carried out on 22 October 2015 and was led by a CQC Inspector who had access to remote advice from a specialist advisor.

We informed NHS England area team and the local Healthwatch that we were inspecting the practice; however we did not receive any information of concern from them.

The methods that were used to collect information at the inspection included interviewing staff, observations and reviewing documents.

During the inspection we spoke with one dentist, two dental nurses and the registered manager. We saw policies, procedures and other records relating to the management of the service. We reviewed eight CQC comment cards that had been completed.

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 policies and procedures in place to investigate, respond to and learn from significant events and complaints. Staff were aware of the reporting procedures in place and encouraged to raise safety issues to the attention of colleagues and the registered provider.

Staff understood the process for accident and incident reporting including their responsibilities under the Reporting of Injuries and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations 2013 (RIDDOR). The registered manager told us that any accident or incidents would be discussed at practice meetings or whenever they arose. We saw that the practice had an accident book which had two entries recorded in the last 12 months; each incident had been followed up in accordance with the practice's policy and reviewed at a staff meeting to prevent further incidents.

The registered manager told us that they received alerts by email from the Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA), the UK's regulator of medicines, medical devices and blood components for transfusion, responsible for ensuring their safety, quality and effectiveness. Relevant alerts were discussed with staff, actioned and stored for future reference.

Reliable safety systems and processes (including safeguarding)

We reviewed the practice's policy and procedures in place for child protection and safeguarding vulnerable adults using the service. They included the contact details for the local authority safeguarding team, social services and other relevant agencies. The registered manager was the lead for safeguarding. This role included providing support and advice to staff and overseeing the safeguarding procedures within the practice.

We saw that all staff had received safeguarding training in vulnerable adults and children. In respect of safeguarding children, all staff were trained to level two and staff could easily access the safeguarding policy. The dentist demonstrated an 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.

The dentist told us that they routinely used a rubber dam when providing root canal treatment to patients. A rubber

dam is a small rectangular sheet of latex (or other similar material if a patient is latex sensitive) used to isolate the tooth operating field to increase the efficacy of the treatment and protect the patient.

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

Medical emergencies

The practice had procedures in place for staff to follow in the event of a medical emergency and all staff had received training in basic life support including the use of an Automated External Defibrillator (An AED is a portable electronic device that analyses life threatening irregularities of the heart including ventricular fibrillation and is able to deliver an electrical shock to attempt to restore a normal heart rhythm).

The practice kept medicines and equipment for use in a medical emergency, on the day of the inspection we found that the oropharyngeal airways were out of date. This was brought to the attention of the registered manager and an order was placed immediately for next day delivery. These were in line with the 'Resuscitation Council UK' and British National Formulary guidelines. All staff knew where these items were kept.

We saw that the practice kept logs which indicated that the emergency equipment, emergency oxygen and AED were checked weekly. Emergency medicines were also checked regularly. This helped ensure that the equipment was fit for use and the medication was within the manufacturer's expiry dates. We checked the emergency medicines and found that they were of the recommended type and were all in date and the oxygen cylinder had been serviced in November 2014.

Staff recruitment

The practice had a recruitment policy which included a process to be followed when employing new staff. This included obtaining proof of their identity, checking their skills and qualifications, registration with relevant professional bodies and taking up references. We reviewed four personnel files which confirmed that the processes had been followed.

Are services safe?

We saw that all staff had been checked by the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS). The DBS 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 noted that all relevant staff had personal indemnity insurance (insurance professionals are required to have in place to cover their working practice); In addition, there was employer's liability insurance which covered employees working at the practice.

Monitoring health & safety and responding to risks

The practice had undertaken a number of risk assessments to cover the health and safety concerns that may arise in providing dental services generally and those that were particular to the practice. The practice had a Health and Safety policy which included guidance on fire safety, manual handling and dealing with clinical waste. We saw that this policy was currently being reviewed to comply with the new registered provider's policy.

The practice had maintained a 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. We saw that the lead nurse had reviewed the COSHH folder annually and updated any information about new materials the practice used.

The registered manager showed us that there had been a fire risk assessment in September 2014. All fire extinguishers had been checked in January 2015. There was evidence that a fire drill had been undertaken in October 2015 and training for two fire marshals had completed in June 2015. These and other measures were taken to reduce the likelihood of risks of harm to staff and patients.

Infection control

The practice had a decontamination room that was set out according to the Department of Health's guidance, Health Technical Memorandum 01-05 (HTM 01-05), decontamination in primary care dental practices. All clinical staff were aware of the work flow in the decontamination area from the 'dirty' to the 'clean' zones.

The room had an extractor fan to aid good air flow to reduce the risk of cross contamination. There was a separate hand washing sink for staff, in addition to two separate sinks for decontamination work. The procedure for cleaning, disinfecting and sterilising the instruments was clearly displayed on the wall to guide staff. We observed staff wearing appropriate personal protective equipment when working in the decontamination area this included disposable gloves, aprons and protective eye wear.

We found that instruments were being cleaned and sterilised in line with published guidance (HTM01-05). The dental nurses we spoke with were knowledgeable about the decontamination process and demonstrated that they followed the correct procedures. For example, instruments were examined under illuminated magnification and sterilised in an autoclave. Sterilised instruments were correctly packaged, sealed, stored and dated with an expiry date. For safety, instruments were transported between the surgeries and the decontamination area in lidded and sealed boxes.

We saw records which showed that the equipment used for cleaning and sterilising had been maintained and serviced in line with the manufacturer's instructions. Appropriate records were kept of the decontamination cycles of the autoclaves to ensure that they were functioning properly.

We saw from staff records that all staff had received infection control training at different intervals over the last year covering a range of topics including hand washing techniques.

There were adequate supplies of liquid soap, paper hand towels in the decontamination area and surgeries and a poster describing appropriate hand washing techniques was displayed above all the hand washing sinks. Paper hand towels and liquid soap was also available in the toilets.

We saw that all sharps bins were being used correctly and located appropriately in all surgeries. Clinical waste was stored securely for collection inside the practice in a designated, locked area. The registered manager had a contract with an authorised contractor for the collection and safe disposal of clinical waste and this was about to change to be in line with the rest of the organisation.

The staff files we reviewed showed that all clinical staff had received inoculations against Hepatitis B. It is

Are services safe?

recommended that people who are likely to come into contact with blood products or are at increased risk of needle-stick injuries should receive these vaccinations to minimise risks of acquiring blood borne infections.

We reviewed the last legionella risk assessment report dated October 2014. Legionella is a term for particular bacteria which can contaminate water systems in buildings. There was evidence that all water tests were regularly completed by the lead nurse.

Equipment and medicines

Staff told us that 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) was undertaken annually and had been completed in June 2015.

We saw that the fire extinguishers had been checked annually to ensure that they were suitable for use if required. We saw that the fire extinguishers had been checked in January 2015.

We saw maintenance records for equipment such as autoclaves, ultrasonic baths and X-ray equipment which showed that they were serviced in accordance with the manufacturers' guidance. The regular maintenance ensured that the equipment remained fit for purpose. The dental panoramic X-ray machine did not have a critical examination certificate, this was brought to the attention of the registered manager during the inspection and the machine was taken out of service until the test and certificate could be acquired.

Anaesthetics were stored appropriately and a log of batch numbers and expiry dates was in place. Other than emergency medicines the practice held sedation

medicines including midazolam and a small selection of antibiotics were kept in practice for private patients. These were kept in a locked cupboard and a log of all drugs was kept to account for each medicine and the amount prescribed.

Radiography (X-rays)

The X-ray equipment was located in each of the surgeries. X-rays were carried out safely and in line with the rules relevant to the practice and type and model of equipment being used. There was also a separate room for dental panoramic radiographs to be taken.

We reviewed the practice's radiation protection file. This contained a copy of the local rules which stated how the X-ray machine needed to be operated safely. The local rules were also displayed in each of the surgeries and the dental panoramic x-ray room. The file also contained the name and contact details of the Radiation Protection Advisor; however this was now out of date as a new company had taken over the advisor role. This was brought to the attention of the registered manager and changes were made during the inspection.

We saw that all the staff were up to date with their continuing professional development training in respect of dental radiography. The practice also had a maintenance log which showed that the X-ray machines had been serviced regularly. The registered manager told us that they undertook annual quality audits of the X-rays taken. We saw the results of the September 2015 audit and the results were in accordance with the National Radiological Protection Board (NRPB). Action plans were in place to continuously improve the procedure and reduce future risks.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Monitoring and improving outcomes for patients

New patients to the practice were asked to complete a medical history form which included their health conditions, current medication and allergies prior to their consultation and examination of their oral health with the dentist. The practice recorded the medical history information within the patients' dental care records for future reference. In addition, the dentist told us that they discussed patients' lifestyle and behaviour such as smoking and drinking and where appropriate offered them health promotion advice, this was recorded in the patients' dental care records.

The dental care records we reviewed with the registered manager showed that at all subsequent appointments patients were always asked to review and update a medical history form. This ensured the dentist was aware of the patient's present medical condition before offering or undertaking any treatment. The dental care records showed that dental examination appointments included checks for gum disease and oral cancer had taken place.

There was evidence that patient records had been regularly audited to ensure that they complied with the guidance provided by the Faculty of General Dental Practice. The last audit was undertaken in August 2015 where an action plan was in place to address the issues that arose. This was revisited with the clinical advisor who implemented a review to confirm changes had been made.

The patient care records we reviewed showed that they were in accordance with the guidance provided by the Faculty of General Dental Practice. For example, evidence of a discussion of treatment needs with the patient was routinely recorded. The practice recorded that medical histories had been up dated prior to treatment. Soft tissue examinations, a diagnosis and a basic periodontal examination (BPE) – a simple and rapid screening tool used by dentists to indicate the level of treatment need in relation to a patient's gums, had also been recorded.

The dentists told us that they always discussed the diagnosis with their patients and, where appropriate, offered them any options available for treatment and

explained the costs. By reviewing the dental care records we found these discussions were always recorded and signed treatment plans were scanned into the patient care records.

Patients' oral health was monitored through follow-up appointments and these were scheduled in line with the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) recommendations. We saw from the records that the dentist was following the NICE guidelines on recalling patients for check-ups.

Patients requiring specialist treatments that were not available at the practice such as orthodontics or oral surgery were referred to other dental specialists. Their oral health was then monitored after the patient had been referred back to the practice. This helped ensure patients had the necessary post-procedure care and satisfactory outcomes.

Health promotion & prevention

The patient reception/waiting area contained a range of information that explained the services offered at the practice and the NHS and private fees for treatment. Staff told us that they offered patients information about effective dental hygiene and oral care in the surgeries and had a hygienist to help support this.

The registered manager advised us that they offered patients oral health advice and provided treatment in accordance with the Department of Health's policy, the 'Delivering Better Oral Health' toolkit, this included fluoride applications. Fluoride treatments are a recognised form of preventative measures to help protect patients' teeth from decay.

Staffing

We saw that all relevant staff were currently registered with their professional bodies. Staff were encouraged to maintain their continuing professional development (CPD) to update and enhance their skill levels. Completing a prescribed number of hours of CPD training is a compulsory requirement of registration for a general dental professional.

Staff training was being monitored and recorded by the practice manager. Records we reviewed showed that all staff had received training in basic life support, infection control and safeguarding children and vulnerable adults.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Staff told us that they had annual appraisals at which training requirements were discussed. They also said the lead nurse was very practiced at finding courses for all staff to help with their CPD requirements.

Staff told us that they had a good availability to staff to help cover period of absence, for example because of sickness or holidays.

Working with other services

The dentists explained that they would refer patients to other dental specialists when necessary, for example patients for minor oral surgery and orthodontic treatment when required.

The referrals were based on the patient's clinical need. In addition, the practice followed a two week referral process to refer patients when oral cancer was suspected. The dentist said they had a good line of communication with local services to help efficient and effective treatment for patients.

Consent to care and treatment

Staff demonstrated an awareness and its relevance to their role of the Mental Capacity Act (MCA) 2005 (MCA provides a legal framework for acting and making decisions on behalf of adults who may lack the capacity to make particular

decisions for themselves). The dentist demonstrated how they would obtain consent from patients who they thought would experience difficulty in providing consent. This was consistent with the provisions of the MCA.

Staff ensured patients gave their consent before treatment began. The registered manager and dentist informed us that verbal consent was always given prior to any treatment. In addition, the advantages and disadvantages of the treatment options and the appropriate fees were discussed before treatment commenced. Patients were given time to consider and make informed decisions about which option they preferred. Staff were aware that consent could be removed at any time.

Patients with complicated or detailed treatment requirements had a longer consultation to highlight all options, risks and cost associated with their treatment. A copy of this was stored within their patient care records.

The practice also provided sedation services, in house for its patients. Each patient was asked if any other form of anxiety control could be used before consideration of sedation. On the day of the inspection the lead nurse and dentist talked us through the consent process and paperwork for their sedation patients but no policy or audit had been implemented for their sedation procedures. This was brought to the attention of the registered manager on the day and they assured us this would be done as soon as possible.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Respect, dignity, compassion & empathy

The practice had procedures in place for respecting patients' privacy, dignity and providing compassionate care and treatment. If a patient needed to speak to a receptionist confidentially they would speak to them in the surgery or in a private room.

Staff understood the need to maintain patients' confidentiality. The registered manager was the lead for information governance with the responsibility to ensure patient confidentiality was maintained and patient information was stored securely. We saw that patient records were held securely and passwords were automatically prompted to be changed every four weeks.

We received eight CQC comment cards providing feedback and spoke to three patients. The patients who provided

feedback were positive about the care and treatment they received at the practice. They told us they were involved in all aspects of their care and found the staff to be pleasant and efficient and caring and they were treated with dignity and respect.

Involvement in decisions about care and treatment

Comments made by patients who completed the CQC comment cards confirmed that they were involved in their care and treatment.

When treating children the dentist told us that to gain their trust and consent they explained the reasons for the treatment and what to expect, they would also involve their parents or carer. For patients with disabilities or in need of extra support staff told us that they would be given as much time as was needed to provide the treatment required.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting patients' needs

Information displayed in the reception/waiting area described the range of services offered to patients and opening times.

The dentist told us that they offered patient information leaflets on oral care and treatments in the surgery to aid the patients' understanding if required or requested.

The practice was open:

Monday 08:30-18:30

Tuesday and Friday 08:30 – 17:30

Wednesday 08:30 – 19:00

Thursday 08:30 – 18:00

For patients in need of urgent dental care during normal working hours, the practice offered same day appointments, for example those patients in pain. We saw that there were slots available for emergency patients every day but if they were full an option for patients to sit and wait was provided. Patients commented that it was easy to make appointments both generally and if they needed an emergency appointment.

Tackling inequity and promoting equality

All four surgeries were located on the ground floor of the building. There was step free access to the practice from the street and automatic doors were in place to help access for patients.

We saw that staff had received equality and diversity training and staff told us that patients were offered treatment on the basis of clinical need and they did not discriminate when offering their services.

Access to the service

Patients could access the service in a timely way by making their appointment either in person or over the telephone. When treatment was urgent, patients would be seen on the same day. For patients in need of urgent care out of the practice's normal working hours, they were directed to the NHS 111 service and for private patients a local rota was in place to provide care.

The practice also had staggered lunch hours so patients could access its services at all times during the day.

Concerns & complaints

The practice had a policy and processes to deal with complaints. The policy clearly set out how complaints and concerns would be investigated and responded to. This was in accordance with the Local Authority Social Services and National Health Service Complaints (England) Regulations 2009. The practice had received two complaints in the last year and there was evidence these had been processed in accordance to the policy and in a timely manner; they had been raised at staff meeting to discuss if any changes could be put in place to prevent further complaints.

The staff were aware of the complaints process and told us that they would refer all complaints to the registered manager to deal with.

Are services well-led?

Our findings

Governance arrangements

The practice had governance arrangements in place such as various policies and procedures for monitoring and improving the services provided for patients. For example, there was a recruitment policy, safety policy and an infection control policy. Staff were aware of their roles and responsibilities within the practice.

There was evidence that patient dental care records had been regularly audited to ensure that they complied with the guidance provided by the Faculty of General Dental Practice. The last audit was undertaken in August 2015 where an action plan was in place to address the issues that arose.

The registered manager told us that they undertook annual quality audits of the X-rays taken. We saw the results of the September 2015 audit and the results were in accordance with the National Radiological Protection Board (NRPB). Action plans were in place to continuously improve the procedure and reduce future risks.

Leadership, openness and transparency

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 where relevant and it was evident that the practice worked as a team. All staff were aware of whom to raise any issues with and told us that the registered manager was responsive to their concerns and would act appropriately. We were told that there was a no blame culture at the practice and that the delivery of high quality care was part of the practice ethos.

The registered manager was aware of their responsibility to comply with the duty of candour and told us that they preferred to address any concerns or issues immediately should they arise.

Learning and improvement

The practice maintained records of staff training which showed that all staff were up to date with their training. We

saw that staff had personal files and showed that training was accessed through a variety of sources including formal courses and informal in house training. Staff stated that they were given sufficient training to undertake their roles and given the opportunity for additional training.

The practice undertook various audits to monitor its performance and help improve the services offered. The audits included infection control and X-rays. The X-ray audit findings were within the guidelines of the Faculty of General Dental Practice (FGDP) – part of the Royal College of Surgeons that aims to promote excellent standards in primary dental care.

On the day of the inspection we noted that no audits or policies in place for sedation and there was a need to review the practice's protocols for conscious sedation, giving due regard to guidelines published by; The Intercollegiate Advisory Committee on Sedation in Dentistry in the document 'Standards for Conscious Sedation in the Provision of Dental Care 2015. This was brought to the attention of the registered manager to review all aspect of the sedation process and find any learning outcomes to continue to develop safe systems of work.

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

The registered manager explained that the practice had a good longstanding relationship with its patients. The practice was participating in the continuous NHS Friends and Family Test (FFT). The FFT is a feedback tool that supports the fundamental principle that people who use NHS services should have the opportunity to provide feedback on their experience. The latest results showed that patients were extremely likely to recommend the practice to family and friend.

We saw that the practice held regular practice meetings which were minuted and gave everybody an opportunity to openly share information and discuss any concerns or issues which had not already been addressed during their daily interactions.

This section is primarily information for the provider

Requirement notices

Action we have told the provider to take

The table below shows the legal requirements that were not being met. The provider must send CQC a report that says what action they are going to take to meet these requirements.

Regulated activity	Regulation
Diagnostic and screening procedures Surgical procedures Treatment of disease, disorder or injury	<p>Regulation 17 HSCA (RA) Regulations 2014 Good governance</p> <p>The registered provider failed to assess, monitor and improve the quality and safety of the services provided in the carrying on of the regulated activity.</p> <p>The registered provider failed to maintain accurate, complete and contemporaneous record in respect of each service user, including a record of the care and treatment provided to the service user and of decisions taken in relation to the care and treatment provided (including justification and results of diagnostic tests).</p> <p>Regulation 17 (1)(2)(a)</p>