

The Implant Experts Ltd

The Implant Experts

Inspection Report

3 Ashford Road
Maidstone
ME14 5BJ
Tel: 01622 751553
Website: www.theimplantexperts.com

Date of inspection visit: 16 January 2017
Date of publication: 21/03/2017

Overall summary

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection on 16 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.

The Dental Implants Experts is a private dental practice in Maidstone, Kent which specialises in the surgical and restorative management of dental implants. The premises are located on the ground and first floor and

consist of three dental treatment rooms, a large reception and waiting area and a separate decontamination room. There is also a private room available as an option for patients to relax in after lengthy treatment procedures before leaving the practice

The staff at the practice consist of a principal dentist (who is also a specialist in oral surgery), a practice manager, a business manager, three associate dentists (one of whom is a specialist in periodontics), a dental hygienist, three dental nurses and a receptionist.

The principal dentist 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.

Our key findings were:

- There was an induction programme for staff to follow which ensured they were skilled and competent in delivering safe and effective care and support to patients.
- The practice ensured staff maintained the necessary skills and competence to support the needs of patients.

Summary of findings

- There were effective systems in place to reduce the risk and spread of infection. We found the treatment rooms and equipment were visibly clean.
- There were systems in place to check equipment had been serviced regularly, including the dental air compressor, autoclaves, fire extinguishers and the X-ray equipment.
- We observed the practice to be focussed around the needs of individual patients. The practice carried out a detailed clinical suitability assessment and treatment planning process for before commencing treatment.
- The practice kept up to date with current guidelines when considering the care and treatment needs of patients.
- The practice placed an emphasis on the promotion of oral and general health and the prevention of dental disease. Appropriate information and advice was available according to patients' individual needs.
- Staff had been trained to handle emergencies and appropriate medicines and life-saving equipment were readily available.
- Patients received comprehensive assessments of their treatment needs. They were given clear explanations about their proposed treatment, and its 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 the needs of patients and waiting times were kept to a minimum.
- Staff demonstrated knowledge of the practice whistleblowing policy and were confident they would raise a concern about another staff member's performance if it was necessary.
- At our visit we observed staff were kind, caring, very welcoming and worked well as a team.
- Conscious sedation was delivered safely in accordance with current guidelines.
- There was an effective system in place to act on feedback received from patients and staff.
- We reviewed 15 Care Quality Commission (CQC) comment cards that had been completed by patients prior to our inspection. Patients told us they received a very high standard of care in a very welcoming and hygienic environment from staff who worked well as a team and were very caring and professional. Patients also commented that they were able to have detailed discussions about treatment options and staff were always happy to take time to answer any questions.
- The practice is a centre for learning and support for local clinicians involved in the restoration of dental implants. This demonstrates a strong commitment to learning and development in order to provide a high standard of care and support to patients.

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

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

The practice had systems in place for the management of infection control, clinical waste segregation and disposal, management of medical emergencies and dental radiography. We found the equipment used in the practice was well maintained and in line with current guidelines. There were systems in place for identifying, investigating and learning from incidents relating to the safety of patients and staff members. The staffing levels were suitable for the provision of care and treatment.

No action



Are services effective?

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

The practice provided evidence based dental care which was focussed on the needs of the patients. We saw examples of effective collaborative team working. The staff were up-to-date with current guidance and received professional development appropriate to their role and learning needs. Staff, who were registered with the General Dental Council (GDC), had frequent continuing professional development (CPD) training and were meeting the requirements of their professional registration.

No action



Are services caring?

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

Patients commented they had very positive experiences of dental care provided at the practice. Patients told us they received a very high standard of care in a very welcoming and hygienic environment from staff who worked well as a team and were very caring and professional. Patients also commented that they were able to have detailed discussions about treatment options and staff were always happy to take time to answer any questions. On the day of our inspection we observed staff to be caring, friendly and very welcoming. Staff spoke with enthusiasm about their work and were proud of what they did. Staff demonstrated to us they cared about their patients and understood their individual needs well.

No action



Are services responsive to people's needs?

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

The practice provided friendly and personalised dental care. Patients could access routine treatment and urgent or emergency care when required. There was an effective system in place to acknowledge, investigate and respond to complaints made by patients.

No action



Summary of findings

Are services well-led?

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

The dental practice had effective risk management structures in place. Staff told us the practice principal was always approachable and the culture within the practice was open and transparent. All staff were aware of the practice ethos and philosophy. They told us they felt well supported and able to raise any concerns where necessary. Staff told us they enjoyed working at the practice and felt part of a team.

No action



The Implant Experts

Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

The inspection was carried out on 16 January 2017 by a CQC inspector and a dental specialist advisor. We reviewed information received from the provider prior to the inspection. On the day of our inspection we looked at practice's policies and protocols, clinical patient records and other records relating to the management of the service. We spoke with the principal dentist, the practice manager, the business manager, an associate dentist, a dental hygienist, two dental nurses and the receptionist. We reviewed 15 Care Quality Commission (CQC) comment cards that had been completed by patients prior to our inspection.

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?

This informed our view of the care provided and the management of the practice.

Are services safe?

Our findings

Reporting, learning and improvement from incidents

There was a system in place to learn from and make improvements following any accidents, incidents or significant events.

Staff understood the process for accident and incident reporting including the Reporting of Injuries, Diseases and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations 2013 (RIDDOR). We found incidents were reported, investigated and measures put in place where necessary to prevent recurrence.

Staff were aware of their responsibilities under the Duty of Candour. [Duty of candour is a requirement under The Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014 on a registered person who must act in an open and transparent way with relevant persons in relation to care and treatment provided to service users in carrying on a regulated activity].

Patients were told when they were affected by something that went wrong, given an apology and informed of any actions taken as a result.

Reliable safety systems and processes (including safeguarding)

The practice had policies and procedures in place for child protection and safeguarding adults. This included contact details for the local authority's safeguarding team, social services and other agencies including the Care Quality Commission. Staff demonstrated to us their knowledge of how to recognise the signs of abuse and neglect. There was a documented reporting process available for staff to use if anyone made a disclosure to them. This included and identified the practice's safeguarding lead.

Staff demonstrated knowledge of the whistleblowing policy and were confident they would raise a concern about another staff member's performance if it was necessary.

A risk management process had been undertaken for the safe use of sharps (needles and sharp instruments). Only the dentists were permitted to re-sheath needles where necessary in order to minimise the risk of inoculation injuries to staff.

Medical emergencies

The practice had suitable emergency resuscitation equipment in accordance with guidance issued by the Resuscitation Council UK. This included face masks for both adults and children. Oxygen and medicines for use in an emergency were available.

Records completed showed regular checks were done to ensure the equipment and emergency medicine was safe to use. Records showed staff regularly completed training in emergency resuscitation and basic life support including the use of the automatic external defibrillator (AED). 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. Staff we spoke with demonstrated they knew how to respond if a person suddenly became unwell.

Staff recruitment

There were effective recruitment and selection procedures in place. We reviewed the employment files for three staff members. Appropriate checks had been made before staff commenced employment including evidence of their professional registration with the General Dental Council (where required) and checks with the Disclosure and Barring Service had been carried out. The Disclosure and Barring Service carries out checks to identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they might have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable.

Monitoring health & safety and responding to risks

There were arrangements in place to deal with foreseeable emergencies. We found the practice had been assessed for risk of fire, and fire extinguishers had been serviced in July 2016. There was a health and safety risk management process in place which enabled them to assess, mitigate and monitor risks to patients, staff and visitors to the practice. There was a business continuity plan in place.

There were effective arrangements in place to meet the Control of Substances Hazardous to Health 2002 (COSHH) regulations. We looked at the COSHH file and found that risks (to patients, staff and visitors) associated with substances hazardous to health had been identified and actions taken to minimise them.

Infection control

There were effective systems in place to reduce the risk and spread of infection. There was a written infection control

Are services safe?

policy which included minimising the risk of blood-borne virus transmission which included Hepatitis B. The policy also described processes for the possibility of sharps' injuries, decontamination of dental instruments, hand hygiene, segregation and disposal of clinical waste. The practice had followed the guidance on decontamination and infection control issued by the Department of Health, namely 'Health Technical Memorandum 01-05 -Decontamination in primary care dental practices (HTM 01-05)'. This document and the practice policy and procedures on infection prevention and control were accessible to staff.

We examined the facilities for cleaning and decontaminating dental instruments. The practice had a designated decontamination room in accordance with HTM 01-05 guidance. A dental nurse showed us how instruments were decontaminated. They wore appropriate personal protective equipment (including heavy duty gloves and a mask) while instruments were decontaminated in an automatic washer disinfectant and inspected with an illuminated magnifier prior to being placed in an autoclave (sterilising machine).

We saw instruments were placed in pouches after sterilisation and dated to indicate when they should be reprocessed if left unused. We found daily and weekly tests were performed to check the washer-disinfectant and steriliser were working efficiently and a log was kept of the results. We saw evidence the parameters (temperature and pressure) were regularly checked to ensure equipment was working efficiently in between service checks.

We observed how waste items were disposed of and stored. The practice had an on-going contract with a clinical waste contractor. We saw the different types of waste were appropriately segregated and stored at the practice. This included clinical waste and safe disposal of sharps.

Staff confirmed to us their knowledge and understanding of single use items and how they should be used and disposed of which was in line with guidance.

We looked at the treatment rooms where patients were examined and treated. The rooms and equipment were visibly clean. Separate hand wash sinks were available with

good supplies of liquid soap and alcohol gel. Patients were given a protective bib and safety glasses to wear each time they attended for treatment. There were good supplies of protective equipment for patients and staff members.

Records showed a risk assessment process for Legionella had been carried out in December 2016 and was regularly reviewed. This process ensured the risks of Legionella bacteria developing in water systems within the premises had been identified and preventive measures taken to minimise risk of patients and staff developing Legionnaires' disease. (Legionella is a bacterium found in the environment which can contaminate water systems in buildings).

There was a good supply of environmental cleaning equipment which was stored appropriately. The practice had a cleaning schedule in place that covered all areas of the premises and detailed what and where equipment should be used. This took into account national guidance on colour coding equipment to prevent the risk of infection spreading. Cleaning standards were regularly monitored to ensure a high standard was maintained.

Equipment and medicines

There were systems in place to check equipment had been serviced regularly, including the dental air compressor, autoclaves, fire extinguishers, oxygen and the X-ray equipment. We were shown the servicing certificates.

An effective system was in place for the prescribing, administration and stock control of the medicines used in clinical practice such as antibiotics and local anaesthetics. These medicines were stored safely for the protection of patients.

Regular Portable Appliance Testing (PAT) is required to confirm that portable electric items used at the practice are safe to use. Documents we reviewed confirmed this was last undertaken in April 2016.

The practice carried out intra-venous sedation for patients who were very anxious and required complex dental treatment. We found that the provider had put into place robust governance systems to underpin the provision of conscious sedation. The systems and processes we observed were in accordance with guidelines recently published by the Royal College of Surgeons and Royal College of Anaesthetists.

Are services safe?

The governance systems supporting sedation included pre and post sedation treatment checks, emergency equipment requirements, medicines management, sedation equipment checks, personnel present, patient's checks including consent, monitoring of the patient during treatment, discharge and post-operative instructions and staff training.

We found that patients were appropriately assessed for sedation. We saw clinical records that showed that all patients undergoing sedation had important checks made prior to sedation this included a detailed medical history, blood pressure and an assessment of health using the American Society of Anaesthesiologists classification system in accordance with current guidelines. The records demonstrated that important checks were recorded including pulse, blood pressure, breathing rates and the oxygen saturation of the blood. This was carried out using specialised equipment including a pulse oximeter which measures the patient's heart rate and oxygen saturation of the blood. Blood pressure was measured using a separate blood pressure monitor.

We saw evidence that conscious sedation was undertaken and monitored by appropriately qualified anaesthetists external to the practice. The measures in place ensured that patients were being treated safely and in line with current standards of clinical practise.

Radiography (X-rays)

We checked the practice's radiation protection records as X-rays were taken and developed at the practice. We also looked at X-ray equipment and talked with staff about its use. We found there were arrangements in place to ensure the safety of the equipment. We saw local rules relating to each X-ray machine were available.

We found procedures and equipment had been assessed by an independent expert within the recommended timescales. The practice had a radiation protection adviser and had appointed a radiation protection supervisor.

In order to keep up to date with radiography and radiation protection and to ensure the practice is in compliance with its legal obligations under Ionising Radiation (Medical Exposure) Regulation (IRMER) 2000, the General Dental Council recommends that dentists undertake a minimum of five hours continuing professional development (CPD) training During each five year CPD cycle. We saw evidence that the dentists were up to date with this training.

Dental care records we reviewed showed the practice was justifying, reporting on and grading X-rays taken.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Monitoring and improving outcomes for people using best practice

We observed the practice to be focussed around the needs of individual patients. The practice carried out a detailed assessment and planning process for patients before commencing treatment. This included an initial appointment to assess clinical suitability for and expectations from treatment where appropriate information was gathered through further examination and record taking (photographs, X-rays, study models). In cases where a patient was not suitable for dental implant treatment or if any remedial work was required, this was fully discussed with the patient and reported back to the referring dentist.

Following this, a detailed treatment plan was produced and discussed with each patient. Records we reviewed demonstrated this included discussions of options, risks, benefits and costs.

Records showed a comprehensive examination of a patient's soft tissues (including lips, tongue and palate) had been carried out and the dentists had recorded details of the condition of patients' gums using the basic periodontal examination (BPE) scores as well as more detailed pocket depth measurements. (The BPE is a simple and rapid screening tool that is used to indicate the level of examination needed and to provide basic guidance on treatment need). In addition they recorded the justification, findings and quality assurance of X-ray images taken.

The practice kept up to date with current guidelines and research in order to develop and improve their system of clinical risk management.

Health promotion & prevention

The practice placed an emphasis on oral disease prevention and the maintenance of good oral health as part of their overall philosophy. A range of information leaflets were available containing information for patients such as smoking cessation advice and maintaining good oral health.

Staff we spoke with told us patients were given advice appropriate to their individual needs such as smoking cessation or dietary advice. This was also recorded in the dental care records we reviewed.

Staffing

There was a comprehensive induction and training programme for staff to follow which ensured they were skilled and competent in delivering safe and effective care and support to patients.

Staff had undertaken training to ensure they were kept up to date with the core training and registration requirements issued by the General Dental Council. This included areas such as responding to medical emergencies and infection control and prevention.

All practice staff are current members of The Association of Dental Implantology (ADI). This is 'a registered charity dedicated to providing the profession with continuing implant education and the public with a greater understanding of the benefits of dental implants.' The practice principal is a past president of the ADI.

There was an appraisal system in place which was used to identify training and development needs.

Working with other services

The practice had an effective system in place for accepting referrals from general dental practitioners and other services.

Each patient's referring dentist was notified when a patient accepted or declined treatment or if they were referred to other specialists. The practice kept referring dentists informed throughout a course of treatment to facilitate effective follow-up and monitoring.

Any suspected oral cancer lesions would be referred immediately by NHS email or phone call and then followed up by letter.

Consent to care and treatment

The practice ensured informed consent from patients was obtained for all care and treatment. Staff confirmed individual treatment options, risks and benefits were discussed with each patient who then received a detailed treatment plan and estimate of costs. We asked the dentists to show us some dental care records which reflected this. Patients were given time to consider and make informed decisions about which option they wanted. This was reflected in the comments we received from patients.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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 for themselves. Staff demonstrated a good understanding of the MCA and how this applied in considering whether or not patients had the capacity to consent to dental treatment.

Staff members we spoke with were clear about involving children in decision making and ensuring their wishes were respected regarding treatment. They were familiar with the concept of Gillick competence regarding the care and treatment of children under 16. Gillick competence principles help clinicians to identify children aged under 16 who have the legal capacity to consent to examination and treatment.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Respect, dignity, compassion & empathy

Staff explained how they ensured information about patients using the service was kept confidential. Patients' electronic dental care records were password protected and paper records were stored securely. Staff members demonstrated their knowledge of data protection and how to maintain patient confidentiality. Staff told us patients were able to have confidential discussions about their care and treatment in the treatment rooms or in a relaxing, non-clinical room if a patient preferred this.

Patients told us through CQC comment cards they received a very high standard of care in a very welcoming and hygienic environment from staff who worked well as a team and were very caring and professional. Patients also commented that they were able to have detailed

discussions about treatment options and staff were always happy to take time to answer any questions. On the day of our inspection, we observed staff being polite, friendly and welcoming to patients.

Involvement in decisions about care and treatment

The dentists told us they used a number of different methods including clinical photographs, tooth models and display charts to demonstrate what different treatment options involved so that patients fully understood. A comprehensive treatment plan was developed following examination of and discussion with each patient.

Staff told us the dentists took time to explain care and treatment to individual patients clearly and were always happy to answer any questions. Patient feedback also confirmed that the dentists took their time to explain dental treatment and options in a way the patient understood and were happy to answer any questions.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

Staff reported (and we saw from the appointment book) the practice scheduled enough time to assess and undertake patients' care and treatment needs. Staff told us they did not feel under pressure to complete procedures and always had enough time available to prepare for each patient. Patients told us through feedback that they always felt the dentists had enough time to listen to their concerns and answer questions.

There were systems in place to ensure the equipment and materials needed were in stock or received well in advance of the patient's appointment. This included checks for laboratory work such as implants, crowns and dentures which ensured delays in treatment were avoided.

Tackling inequity and promoting equality

We asked staff to explain how they communicated with people who had different communication needs such as those who spoke another language. Staff told us they treated everybody according to their individual needs and welcomed patients from different backgrounds, cultures and religions. Staff told us if they were unable to communicate fully with a patient due to a language barrier they could encourage a relative or friend to attend who could translate or they would contact a translator.

Access to the service

We asked staff how patients were able to access care in an emergency or outside of normal opening hours. They told us an answer phone message detailed how to access out of hours emergency treatment. Staff told us patients requiring emergency care during practice opening hours were seen the same day wherever possible. This was reflected in patients' feedback we reviewed.

The practice had audited their facilities to ensure patients with a disability were supported to access care and treatment and the practice was accessible to people using wheelchairs.

Concerns & complaints

There was a complaints' policy which provided staff with information about handling formal complaints from patients. Staff told us the practice team viewed complaints as a learning opportunity and would discuss as a team in order to highlight any learning points and improve the quality of service provided.

Information for patients about how to make a complaint was available in the practice's waiting room. This included contact details of other agencies to contact if a patient was not satisfied with the outcome of the practice investigation into their complaint.

We looked at the practice's procedure for acknowledging, recording, investigating and responding to complaints, concerns and suggestions made by patients and found there was an effective process in place which ensured a timely response.

Are services well-led?

Our findings

Governance arrangements

The governance arrangements of the practice were developed through a process of continual learning. Strong and effective leadership was provided by the principal dentist/organisation director who worked together with the practice manager sharing responsibility for the day to day running of the practice. They were supported by the practice team and the organisation's business manager. There were clear lines of responsibility and accountability with individual staff members identified as leads in certain areas such as infection control and safeguarding. Staff knew who to report to if they had any issues or concerns.

We reviewed a set of practice policies and procedures which were regularly updated and reviewed by staff.

We found staff to be hard working, very caring towards the patients (and each other), were committed to the work they did and worked well as a team. Many staff had worked at the practice for several years.

Leadership, openness and transparency

Staff reported there was an open and transparent culture at the practice which encouraged candour and honesty. The practice had a whistleblowing policy and staff were aware of their responsibilities under the Duty of Candour. Staff felt confident they could raise issues or concerns at any time with the practice manager or principal dentist without fear of recriminations.

Management lead through learning and improvement

The practice carried out regular audits of infection prevention and control to ensure compliance with government HTM 01-05 standards for decontamination in dental practices. The most recent audit undertaken in December 2016 indicated the facilities and management of decontamination and infection control were managed well.

X-ray audits were carried out regularly, the most recent in September 2016. The results of the audits confirmed the dentists were taking X-ray images which were of the required standards. This, along with using digital X-rays reduced the risk of patients being subjected to further unnecessary X-rays.

Additional audits were undertaken to assess and monitor the quality of services provided. This included a treatment standards audit in February 2016; a record keeping audit in September 2016 and an audit of patient satisfaction which indicated a high standard was being maintained.

The practice is a centre for learning and support for local clinicians involved in the restoration of dental implants; they hosted information sharing and mentoring sessions for dentists as well as a forum for dental hygienists held in conjunction with a periodontist; dental nurses provided 'lunch and learn' sessions in other dental practices; the organisation's business manager is the local representative for the Association of Dental Administrators and Managers and the practice recently facilitated a conference which updated delegates in the core training and registration requirements issued by the General Dental Council. These initiatives demonstrate a strong commitment to learning and development in order to provide a high standard of care and support to patients.

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

The practice regularly sought and acted on feedback from patients. For example, the practice had improved the parking facilities in response to patients' comments.

The practice held regular staff meetings where they discussed a range of topics in order to learn and improve the quality of service provided. Recent topics included fire safety and the role of the treatment coordinator. Staff members told us they found the meetings were a useful opportunity to share ideas.