Perfect Smile (Acorn Dental) Partnership

Laburnum Dental Practice

Inspection report

96 Laburnum Avenue
Wallsend
NE28 8HG
Tel: 01912637150

Date of inspection visit: 23 September 2021
Date of publication: 27/10/2021

Overall summary

We carried out this announced focussed inspection on 23 September 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.

Are services well-led?

We found this practice was not providing well-led care in accordance with the relevant regulations.

Summary of findings

Background

Laburnum Dental Practice is in Wallsend and provides NHS and private dental care and treatment for adults and children.

There is level access to the practice for people who use wheelchairs and those with pushchairs. Car parking spaces are available near the practice.

The dental team includes four dentists, five dental nurses, two dental hygienists, one dental hygiene therapist, one receptionist and a practice manager. The practice has four treatment rooms.

The practice is owned by a partnership 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 Laburnum Dental Practice is one of the partners.

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

The practice is open:

Monday to Thursday from 8am to 6pm

Friday from 8am to 4pm

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 systems to help them manage risks to patients and staff were not effective. These included the risks associated with fire, radiography and Legionella.
- The provider had safeguarding processes and staff knew their responsibilities for safeguarding vulnerable adults and children.
- The provider had staff recruitment procedures which reflected current legislation.
- The clinical staff provided patients' care and treatment in line with current guidelines.
- Staff treated patients with dignity and respect and took care to protect their privacy and personal information.
- Staff provided preventive care and supported patients to ensure better oral health.
- Staff felt involved and supported and worked as a team.
- The provider asked patients for feedback about the services they provided.
- The provider had information governance arrangements.

We identified regulations the provider was not complying with. They must:

- Establish effective systems and processes to ensure good governance in accordance with the fundamental standards of care.

Summary of findings

Full details of the regulation the provider was not meeting are at the end of this report.

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?	**Requirements notice** ✗

Are services safe?

Our findings

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

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

Staff 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.

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.

The provider had arrangements for transporting, cleaning, checking, sterilising and storing instruments in line with HTM 01-05. The records showed equipment used by staff for cleaning and sterilising instruments was validated, maintained and used in line with the manufacturers' guidance. *The provider had suitable numbers of dental instruments available for the clinical staff and measures were in place to ensure they were decontaminated and sterilised appropriately.*

The 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. We discussed the practice's process for post aerosol generating procedures (AGP) down time. We saw the provider had calculated the post AGP down time as 10 minutes for all surgeries. For two of the surgeries the provider had calculated the air changes per hour as less than 10. Current guidance from Public Health England states that for air changes below 10 then the post AGP downtime needs to be increased. This had not been done.

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

A Legionella risk assessment had been carried out in 2018 and again in 2021. We saw there were recommendations in both risk assessments to remove a dead leg in the decontamination room and to replace braided pipes. We asked if this had been done; we were told this had been escalated to the head office to be addressed, however, no action had been taken to address these issues.

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

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

The 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.

Are services safe?

The dentists 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 three 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.

We saw evidence to suggest a fixed wiring electrical inspection had taken place in July 2019. This had stated that additional work was needed to ensure the fixed wiring met current regulations. We asked if this had been actioned and staff told this had been highlighted to the head office. No action had been taken to address the issues identified.

A fire risk assessment was carried out in line with the legal requirements. We saw there were recommendations in this risk assessment to get additional emergency lighting fitted. We saw this issue had been raised with the head office of the provider. No action had been taken to address this issue.

The practice held a folder with detail of how they managed the risks associated with the use of radiation. We noted in one surgery a service carried out in 2017 had identified the X-ray machine should be replaced. This had machine had not been replaced and had only been taken out of use approximately two weeks prior to the inspection. In addition, in another surgery the report stated that the primary beam may be pointed towards an unshielded partition wall. There was no evidence to suggest this had been investigated.

We saw evidence the dentists justified, graded and reported on the radiographs they took. The provider carried out radiography audits every year following current guidance and legislation.

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.

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.

Staff had a good awareness of the risks associated with sepsis. Sepsis prompts for staff and patient information posters were displayed throughout the practice. This helped ensure staff made triage appointments effectively to manage patients who 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.

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.

Are services safe?

A dental nurse worked with the dentists, the dental hygienists and the hygiene therapist when they treated patients in line with General Dental Council Standards for the Dental Team.

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

Information to deliver safe care and treatment

Staff had the information they needed to deliver safe care and treatment to patients.

We discussed with the dentist how information to deliver safe care and treatment was handled and recorded. We looked at dental care records with clinicians to confirm our findings and observed that individual records were typed and managed in a way that kept patients safe. Dental care records we saw were complete, legible, were kept securely and complied with General Data Protection Regulation requirements.

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

We noted NHS prescription pads were stored securely however there was no system in place to identify if a prescription sheet was missing. We discussed improving the security of the prescription pads and improving their logging methods to actively monitor the use of prescriptions.

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

Antimicrobial prescribing audits were carried out annually. The most recent audit indicated the dentists were following current guidelines.

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.

Where there had been a safety incident we saw these were investigated, documented and discussed with the rest of the dental practice team to prevent such occurrences happening again. We noted in the previous three years there had been sharps injuries. These were both from sterile and used sharp instruments. These had been recorded in the accident book. However, we noted there was no evidence of what steps were taken after the sharps injury, such as seeking advice from occupational health.

The provider had a system for receiving and acting on safety alerts. Staff learned from external safety events as well as patient and medicine safety alerts. We saw they were shared with the team and acted upon if required.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

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

Effective needs assessment, care and treatment

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

Staff had access to an operating microscope to enhance the delivery of care. For example, one of the dentists had an interest in endodontics, (root canal treatment). The dentist used a specialised operating microscope to assist in carrying out root canal treatment.

Helping patients to live healthier lives

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

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

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

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

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

Consent to care and treatment

Staff obtained consent to care and treatment in line with legislation and guidance.

The practice team understood the importance of obtaining and recording patients' consent to treatment. The staff were aware of the need to obtain proof of legal guardianship or Power of Attorney for patients who lacked capacity or for children who are looked after. The dentists gave patients information about treatment options and the risks and benefits of these, so they could make informed decisions. We saw this documented in patients' records. Patients confirmed their dentist listened to them and gave them clear information about their treatment.

The practice's consent policy included information about the Mental Capacity Act 2005. The team understood their responsibilities under the act when treating adults who might not be able to make informed decisions. The policy also referred to Gillick competence, by which a child under the age of 16 years of age may give consent for themselves in certain circumstances. Staff were aware of the need to consider this when treating young people under 16 years of age.

Staff described how they involved patients' relatives or carers when appropriate and made sure they had enough time to explain treatment options clearly.

Monitoring care and treatment

The practice kept detailed dental care records containing information about the patients' current dental needs, past treatment and medical histories. The dentists assessed patients' treatment needs in line with recognised guidance.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

The provider had quality assurance processes to encourage learning and continuous improvement. Staff kept records of the results of these audits, the resulting action plans and improvements.

Effective staffing

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

Staff new to the practice had a structured induction programme. We confirmed clinical staff completed the continuing professional development required for their registration with the General Dental Council.

Co-ordinating care and treatment

Staff worked together and with other health and social care professionals to deliver effective care and treatment.

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

Are services well-led?

Our findings

We found this practice was not providing well-led care in accordance with the relevant regulations. We have told the provider to take action (see full details of this action in the Requirement Notices section at the end of this report). We will be following up on our concerns to ensure they have been put right by the provider.

Culture

Staff discussed their training needs at appraisals. They also discussed learning needs, general wellbeing and aims for future professional development. We saw evidence of completed appraisals in the staff folders.

The staff focused on the needs of patients.

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

Openness, honesty and transparency were demonstrated when responding to incidents. 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

The registered manager had overall responsibility for the management and clinical leadership of the practice. The practice manager was responsible for the day to day running of the service.

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.

Systems and processes were not working effectively to ensure the risks associated with the carrying out of the regulated activities were appropriately managed:

- The risks associated with fire had not been appropriately managed. The recommendation to install additional emergency lighting within the practice had not been actioned. There was evidence an assessment of the electrical fixed wiring had taken place in 2019 and recommendations had been made to make the installation safe. No action had been taken as a result of this.
- The risks associated with Legionella had not been appropriately managed. The recommendations in the Legionella risk assessments had not been actioned. These were to remove the dead leg in the decontamination room and to replace the braided hoses.
- The risks associated with Covid-19 had not entirely been managed. Post aerosol generating procedures (AGP) down time had not been calculated correctly. In two rooms the air changes per hour (ACH) had been calculated as being below 10. In these cases, the post AGP down time needs to be adjusted to reflect the reduced ACH.
- The risks associated with the use of radiation had not been addressed in a timely manner. A report from 2017 had identified an X-ray machine should be replaced. This had not been done and had only been taken out of use two weeks prior to the inspection.
- There was no evidence of actions taken following sharps injuries involving a used sharp instrument.
- There was no active log of NHS prescription pads and they were not stored securely.

Appropriate and accurate information

Staff acted on appropriate and accurate information.

Are services well-led?

Quality and operational information, for example NHS Business Services Authority performance information, surveys, audits, external body reviews was 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

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

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

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

The provider gathered feedback from staff through meetings and informal discussions. Staff were encouraged to offer suggestions for improvements to the service and said these were listened to and acted on.

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 dental care records, radiographs and infection prevention and control. Staff kept records of the results of these audits and the resulting action plans and improvements.

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

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	Regulation 17 HSCA (RA) Regulations 2014 Good governance Systems or processes must be established and operated effectively to ensure compliance with the requirements of the fundamental standards as set out in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014. How the regulation was not being met: The registered person had systems or processes in place that operated ineffectively in that they failed to enable the registered person to assess, monitor and mitigate the risks relating to the health, safety and welfare of service users and others who may be at risk. In particular: • The risks associated with fire and electrical safety had not been appropriately managed. Recommendations made in the fire risk assessment had not been actioned and advisories made by an electrician had not been addressed. • The risks associated with Legionella had not been appropriately managed. Recommendations made in the Legionella risk assessment had not been addressed. These were the removal of a dead leg and removal of braided hoses. • The risks associated with Covid-19 had not entirely been managed. Post aerosol generating procedures (AGP) down time had not been calculated correctly. • The risks associated with the use of radiation had not been addressed in a timely manner. A report from 2017 had identified an X-ray machine should be replaced. This had not been done and had only been taken out of use two weeks prior to the inspection. • There was no evidence of actions taken following sharps injuries involving a used sharp instrument.

This section is primarily information for the provider

Requirement notices

There was additional evidence of poor governance. In particular:

NHS prescription pads were not held securely and there was no log in place to actively monitor their use.

Regulation 17 (1)