

Station Road Dental Partnership

Station Road Dental Surgery

Inspection report

107 Station Road
Birchington
CT7 9RE
Tel: 01843842153

Date of inspection visit: 02 August 2023
Date of publication: 08/09/2023

Overall summary

We carried out this announced comprehensive inspection on 02 August 2023 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 practice 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 advisor.

To get to the heart of patients' experiences of care and treatment, we always ask the following 5 questions:

- Is it safe?
- Is it effective?
- Is it caring?
- Is it responsive to people's needs?
- Is it well-led?

These questions form the framework for the areas we look at during the inspection.

Our findings were:

- The dental clinic appeared clean and well-maintained.
- The practice had infection control procedures which reflected published guidance.
- Staff knew how to deal with medical emergencies. Appropriate medicines and life-saving equipment were available.
- The practice had systems to manage risks for patients, staff, equipment and the premises.
- Safeguarding processes were in place and staff knew their responsibilities for safeguarding vulnerable adults and children.
- The practice had staff recruitment procedures which did not reflect current legislation.
- Clinical staff provided patients' care and treatment in line with current guidelines.
- Patients were treated with dignity and respect. Staff took care to protect patients' privacy and personal information.

Summary of findings

- Staff provided preventive care and supported patients to ensure better oral health.
- The appointment system worked efficiently to respond to patients' needs.
- The frequency of appointments was agreed between the dentist and the patient, giving due regard to National Institute of Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidelines.
- There was effective leadership and a culture of continuous improvement.
- Staff felt involved, supported and worked as a team.
- Staff and patients were asked for feedback about the services provided.
- Complaints were dealt with positively and efficiently.
- The practice had information governance arrangements.

Background

Station Road Dental Practice is in Broadstairs, Kent and provides NHS and private dental care and treatment for adults and children.

There is step free access to the practice for people who use wheelchairs and those with pushchairs. Car parking spaces, including dedicated parking for disabled people, are available near the practice. The practice has made reasonable adjustments to support patients with access requirements.

The dental team includes 3 dentists, a foundation dentist, 2 qualified dental nurses, 2 trainee dental nurses, a dental hygienist, a practice manager and 2 receptionists. The practice has 3 treatment rooms.

During the inspection we spoke with 2 dentists, 2 dental nurses, a receptionist and the practice manager. We looked at practice policies, procedures and other records to assess how the service is managed.

The practice is open:

- Monday to Friday 9am to 5pm

The practice is closed between 1pm and 2pm for lunch.

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.

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

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

- Implement audits for prescribing of antibiotic medicines taking into account the guidance provided by the College of General Dentistry.

Improve the practice protocols regarding auditing patient dental care records to check that necessary information is recorded.

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?	No action ✓
Are services effective?	No action ✓
Are services caring?	No action ✓
Are services responsive to people's needs?	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)

The practice had safeguarding processes and staff knew their responsibilities for safeguarding vulnerable adults and children. We noted one member of the clinical team had completed level 1 training where level 2 is required.

The practice had infection control procedures which reflected published guidance.

The practice had procedures to reduce the risk of Legionella, or other bacteria, developing in water systems, in line with a risk assessment.

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

The practice appeared clean and there was an effective schedule in place to ensure it was kept clean.

The practice had a recruitment policy and procedure to help them employ suitable staff, including for agency or locum staff. We noted that all the required information required under current legislation was not available.

- We did not see a full employment history for 4 members of staff.
- We did not see identification for 4 members of staff.
- There was no disclosure and barring service check (DBS) for two members of the clinical team.
- We did not see satisfactory evidence of conduct in previous employment for 7 members of staff.
- We did not see evidence for 2 members of staff Hepatitis B vaccinations.
- One member of staff did not have the level of cover for Hepatitis B recorded and no risk assessment in place.

The practice ensured equipment was safe to use, maintained and serviced according to manufacturers' instructions. The practice ensured the facilities were maintained in accordance with regulations.

A fire safety risk assessment was carried out in line with the legal requirements. The management of fire safety was effective.

The practice had arrangements to ensure the safety of the X-ray equipment and the required radiation protection information was available.

Risks to patients

The practice had implemented systems to assess, monitor and manage risks to patient and staff safety. This included sharps safety, sepsis awareness and lone working.

Emergency equipment and medicines were available and checked in accordance with national guidance.

Staff knew how to respond to a medical emergency and had completed training in emergency resuscitation and basic life support every year. We noted 2 members of staff had not completed training for medical emergencies.

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

Information to deliver safe care and treatment

Patient care records were complete, legible, kept securely and complied with General Data Protection Regulation requirements.

Are services safe?

The practice had systems for referring patients with suspected oral cancer under the national two-week wait arrangements.

Safe and appropriate use of medicines

The practice had systems for appropriate and safe handling of medicines. Antimicrobial prescribing audits were carried out.

Track record on safety, and lessons learned and improvements

The practice had systems to review and investigate incidents and accidents. The practice had a system for receiving and acting on safety alerts.

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.

Helping patients to live healthier lives

The practice provided preventive care and supported patients to ensure better oral health.

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

Consent to care and treatment

Staff obtained patients' consent to care and treatment in line with legislation and guidance. They understood their responsibilities under the Mental Capacity Act 2005.

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 patient care records in line with recognised guidance.

Staff conveyed an understanding of supporting more vulnerable members of society such as patients living with dementia or adults and children with a learning disability.

We saw evidence the dentists justified, graded and reported on the radiographs they took. We looked at the information collected regarding the quality of x-ray images taken. This did not form a full audit with summary, action plan, learning points and a date to re-audit. We discussed this with staff who assured us audits would be conducted six monthly in line with current guidance.

Effective staffing

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

Newly appointed staff had a structured induction and clinical staff completed 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 caring?

Our findings

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

Kindness, respect and compassion

Staff were aware of their responsibility to respect people's diversity and human rights.

On the day of inspection, we spoke with 1 patient. We looked at other methods the practice used to collect feedback from patients and reviewed feedback from a further 10 patients.

- 3 patients had commented how happy they were to be seen the same day for emergency treatment.
- 5 patients commented the staff were helpful, friendly and put them at ease.
- 1 patient said they had painless treatments and their fear of dentists had been cured.
- 3 patients had commented they had easy to digest explanations of the options available to them.

Patients said staff were compassionate and understanding when they were in pain, distress or discomfort.

Privacy and dignity

Staff were aware of the importance of privacy and confidentiality.

Staff password protected patients' electronic care records and backed these up to secure storage. They stored paper records securely.

Involving people in decisions about care and treatment

Staff helped patients to be involved in decisions about their care and gave patients clear information to help them make informed choices about their treatment.

The practice's website and information leaflet provided patients with information about the range of treatments available at the practice.

The dentist/s explained the methods they used to help patients understand their treatment options. These included for example, photographs, study models, videos and X-ray images.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

Our findings

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

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice organised and delivered services to meet patients' needs and preferences.

Staff were clear about the importance of providing emotional support to patients when delivering care.

The practice had made some reasonable adjustments, for patients with access requirements. However, this could be improved. Staff had not carried out a disability access audit. Staff told us they would carry out an audit as soon as possible.

Timely access to services

The practice displayed its opening hours and provided information on their website and patient information leaflet.

Patients could access care and treatment from the practice within an acceptable timescale for their needs. The practice had an appointment system to respond to patients' needs. The frequency of appointments was agreed between the dentist and the patient, giving due regard to NICE guidelines. Patients had enough time during their appointment and did not feel rushed.

The practice's website, information leaflet and answerphone provided telephone numbers for patients needing emergency dental treatment during the working day and when the practice was not open. Patients were directed to the local out of hours service.

Patients who needed an urgent appointment were offered one in a timely manner. When the practice was unable to offer an urgent appointment, they worked with partner organisations to support urgent access for patients. Patients with the most urgent needs had their care and treatment prioritised.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

The practice responded to concerns and complaints appropriately. Staff discussed outcomes to share learning and improve the service.

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.

Leadership capacity and capability

The practice staff demonstrated a transparent and open culture in relation to people's safety.

There was strong leadership with emphasis on peoples' safety and continually striving to improve.

Systems and processes were embedded, and staff worked together in such a way that the inspection did not highlight any significant issues or omissions.

The information and evidence presented during the inspection process was clear and well documented.

We saw the practice had effective processes to support and develop staff with additional roles and responsibilities.

Culture

Staff could show how they ensured high-quality sustainable services and demonstrated improvements over time.

Staff stated they felt respected, supported and valued. They were proud to work in the practice.

Staff discussed their training needs during annual appraisal. They also discussed learning needs, general wellbeing and aims for future professional development.

The practice had arrangements to ensure staff training was up-to-date and reviewed at the required intervals.

Governance and management

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

The practice had a governance system which included policies, protocols and procedures that were accessible to all members of staff and were reviewed on a regular basis.

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

Appropriate and accurate information

Staff acted on appropriate and accurate information.

The practice had information governance arrangements and staff were aware of the importance of protecting patients' personal information.

Engagement with patients, the public, staff and external partners

Staff gathered feedback from patients, the public and external partners and demonstrated a commitment to acting on feedback.

Feedback from staff was obtained through meetings, surveys, and informal discussions. Staff were encouraged to offer suggestions for improvements to the service and said these were listened to and acted on where appropriate.

Continuous improvement and innovation

Are services well-led?

The practice had some systems and processes for learning, quality assurance, continuous improvement. However, these needed improvement. These included audits of infection prevention and control. Staff kept records of the results of these audits and the resulting action plans and improvements. We noted there were no audits for patient records, disability access, antimicrobial prescribing and X-ray image quality. Data had been collected but not report had been made, action plan for improvement or learning points had been documented.

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>Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014</p> <p>Regulation 17 Good governance</p> <p>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.</p> <p>How the Regulation was not being met</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The registered person had systems or processes in place that operating ineffectively in that they failed to enable the registered person had maintained securely such records as are necessary to be kept in relation to persons employed in the carrying on of the regulated activity or activities. In particular:• We did not see full employment history for 4 members of staff.• We did not see identification for 4 members of staff.• There was no disclosure and barring service check (DBS) for two members of the clinical team.• We did not see references for 7 members of staff.• We did not see documents for 2 members of staff Hepatitis B vaccinations.• One member of staff did not have the level of cover for Hepatitis B recorded.• one member of staff did not have current indemnity information available.• One member of clinical staff had completed level 1 safeguarding where level 2 is required.• Two members of staff had not completed training for medical emergencies. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The registered person had systems or processes in place that operating ineffectively in that they failed to

This section is primarily information for the provider

Requirement notices

enable the registered person to evaluate and improve their practice in respect of the processing of the information obtained throughout the governance process. In particular:

- Audits had not been completed for the quality of X-ray images, disability access, patient records and antimicrobial prescribing.