

Dental Care Centre

The Smiles Studio

Inspection Report

144 Bournemouth Road
Chandlers Ford
Eastleigh
Hampshire
SO53 3AL
Tel: 02380251133
Website: www.thesmilesstudio.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 1 May 2019
Date of publication: 23/05/2019

Overall summary

We carried out this announced inspection on 1 May 2019 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 CQC inspector who was supported by a specialist dental adviser.

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

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.

Background

The Smiles Studio is in Chandlers Ford and provides NHS and private treatment to adults and children.

There is level access for people who use wheelchairs and those with pushchairs. Car parking spaces, including those for blue badge holders, are available near the practice.

The dental team includes eight dentists, one oral surgeon, one lead dental nurse, five dental nurses, three trainee dental nurses, one dental hygienist, one practice manager, one business manager and three receptionists. The practice has four treatment rooms.

Summary of findings

The practice is owned by a partnership and as a condition of registration must have a person registered with the Care Quality Commission 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 The Smiles Studio is the principal dentist. A registered manager is legally responsible for the delivery of services for which the practice is registered

On the day of inspection, we collected 40 CQC comment cards filled in by patients and spoke with two other patients.

During the inspection we spoke with four dentists, one lead dental nurse, one dental nurse, three trainee dental nurses, two receptionists, one business manager 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 Friday 8.30am to 5pm

Saturday 8.30am to 1pm

Our key findings were:

- The practice appeared clean and well maintained, however improvements could be made to the cleaning file with additional documentation.
- The provider had infection control procedures which reflected published guidance, improvements could be made to workflows and conditions in the decontamination room.
- Staff knew how to deal with emergencies. Appropriate medicines and most life-saving equipment were available, however some face masks were not available as recommended in guidance.
- Improvements could be made by ensuring that staff fully understood 'safer sharps' and implemented guidance.
- Improvements could be made by carrying out an antimicrobial prescribing audit, which would confirm guidelines were being followed and antibiotic stewardship understood by staff.
- Improvements should be made to ensure that all actions from the legionella risk assessment had been completed.

- The practice had systems to help them manage risk to patients and staff.
- Improvements could be made by reviewing the use of rubber dams and ensuring staff use was in line with guidelines.
- The provider had suitable safeguarding processes and staff knew their responsibilities for safeguarding vulnerable adults and children.
- The provider had thorough staff recruitment procedures.
- 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, however improvements could be made by ensuring that treatment room view ports provided sufficient privacy to patients.
- Staff were providing preventive care and supporting patients to ensure better oral health.
- The appointment system took account of patients' needs.
- The provider had effective leadership and culture of continuous improvement. however improvements could be made to the auditing processes with independent verification.
- Improvements could be made to Control of Substances Hazardous to Health (COSHH) Regulations 2002 file to ensure the safe storage and use of materials used.
- Staff felt involved and supported and worked well as a team.
- The provider asked staff and patients for feedback about the services they provided.
- The provider dealt with complaints positively and efficiently.
- The provider had suitable information governance arrangements, however improvements could be made to CCTV signage.

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

- Review the practice's policy for the control and storage of substances hazardous to health identified by the Control of Substances Hazardous to Health Regulations 2002, to ensure risk assessments are undertaken and the products are stored securely.

Summary of findings

- Review the practice's sharps procedures to ensure the practice is in compliance with the Health and Safety (Sharp Instruments in Healthcare) Regulations 2013.
- Review the practice's protocols for the use of rubber dam for root canal treatment taking into account guidelines issued by the British Endodontic Society.
- Review the practice's Legionella risk assessment and implement any recommended actions, taking into

account the guidelines issued by the Department of Health in the Health Technical Memorandum 01-05: Decontamination in primary care dental practices, and having regard to The Health and Social Care Act 2008: 'Code of Practice about the prevention and control of infections and related guidance.'

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 and processes to provide safe care and treatment. They used learning from incidents and complaints to help them improve.

Improvements could be made to Control of Substances Hazardous to Health (COSHH) Regulations 2002 file to ensure the safe storage and use of materials used.

Staff received training in safeguarding people and knew how to recognise the signs of abuse and how to report concerns.

Improvements should be made to ensure that all actions from the legionella risk assessment had been completed.

Staff were qualified for their roles and the practice completed essential recruitment checks.

Premises and equipment were clean and properly maintained. Improvements could be made to the cleaning file with additional documentation.

Improvements could be made by reducing, or removing, the permanent use of temporary extension cables throughout the practice.

Improvements could be made by reviewing the use of rubber dams and ensuring staff use was in line with guidelines.

Improvements could be made by ensuring that staff fully understood 'safer sharps' and implemented guidance.

Improvements could be made to the cone beam computed tomography machine by implementing a quality assurance process in line with guidelines.

The practice followed national guidance for cleaning, sterilising and storing dental instruments, however improvements could be made to workflows and conditions in the decontamination room.

The practice had suitable arrangements for dealing with medical and other emergencies, however some items such as face masks and airways were not available as recommended in guidance.

Improvements could be made by carrying out an antimicrobial prescribing audit, which would confirm guidelines were being followed and antibiotic stewardship understood by staff.

No action



Are services effective?

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

No action



Summary of findings

The dentists assessed patients' needs and provided care and treatment in line with recognised guidance. Patients described the treatment they received as always a great service, excellent and professional. The dentists discussed treatment with patients so they could give informed consent and recorded this in their records.

The practice had clear arrangements when patients needed to be referred to other dental or health care professionals.

The provider supported staff to complete training relevant to their roles and had systems to help them monitor this.

The staff were involved in quality improvement initiatives such as good practice as part of its approach in providing high quality care.

Are services caring?

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

We received feedback about the practice from 42 people. Patients were positive about all aspects of the service the practice provided. They told us staff were good, helpful and informative.

They said that they were given professional, helpful and accurate explanations about dental treatment, and said their dentist listened to them. Patients commented that they made them feel at ease, especially when they were anxious about visiting the dentist.

We saw that staff protected patients' privacy and were aware of the importance of confidentiality, however improvements could be made by ensuring that treatment room view ports provided sufficient privacy to patients. Patients said staff treated them with dignity and respect.

The practice had suitable information governance arrangements, however improvements could be made to CCTV signage.

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's appointment system took account of patients' needs. Patients could get an appointment quickly if in pain.

Staff considered patients' different needs. This included providing facilities for patients with a disability and families with children. The practice had access to telephone interpreter services and had arrangements to help patients with sight or hearing loss.

The practice took patients views seriously. They valued compliments from patients and responded to concerns and complaints quickly and constructively.

No action



Are services well-led?

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

No action



Summary of findings

The practice had arrangements to ensure the smooth running of the service. These included systems for the practice team to discuss the quality and safety of the care and treatment provided. There was a clearly defined management structure and staff felt supported and appreciated.

The practice team kept complete patient dental care records which were, clearly written or typed and stored securely.

The provider monitored clinical and non-clinical areas of their work to help them improve and learn, however improvements could be made to the auditing processes with independent verification. This included asking for and listening to the views of patients and staff.

Are services safe?

Our findings

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

The practice had clear systems to keep patients safe.

Staff knew their responsibilities if they had concerns about the safety of children, young people and adults who were vulnerable due to their circumstances. The practice had safeguarding policies and procedures to provide staff with information about identifying, reporting and dealing with suspected abuse. We saw evidence that staff 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 practice had a system to highlight vulnerable patients on records e.g. children with child protection plans, adults where there were safeguarding concerns, people with a learning disability or a mental health condition, or who require other support such as with mobility or communication.

The practice had a whistleblowing policy. Staff felt confident they could raise concerns without fear of recrimination.

The dentists mostly used dental dams in line with guidance from the British Endodontic Society when providing root canal treatment but not in all cases. In instances where the rubber dam was not used, such as for example refusal by the patient, and where other methods were used to protect the airway, this was not well documented in the dental care record and a risk assessment completed. We spoke to the practice manager who with the provider made immediate arrangements to review use of rubber dams and ensure that staff were correctly using rubber dams and making appropriate note in dental care records.

The provider had a business continuity plan describing how they would deal with events that could disrupt the normal running of the practice.

The practice had 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 all staff recruitment records. These showed the practice followed their recruitment procedure.

We noted that clinical staff were qualified and registered with the General Dental Council (GDC) and had professional indemnity cover.

The practice ensured that facilities and equipment were safe and that equipment was maintained according to manufacturers' instructions, including electrical and gas appliances, however improvements could be made by reducing, or removing, the permanent use of temporary extension cables throughout the practice.

Records showed that fire detection equipment, such as smoke detectors and emergency lighting, were regularly tested and firefighting equipment, such as fire extinguishers, were regularly serviced.

The practice had suitable arrangements to ensure the safety of the X-ray equipment and had the required information in their radiation protection file.

We saw evidence that the dentists justified, graded and reported on the radiographs they took. The practice carried out radiography audits every year following current guidance and legislation, however improvements could be made by the use of independent verification and completion of quality assurance processes.

Clinical staff completed continuing professional development (CPD) in respect of dental radiography.

The practice had a cone beam computed tomography machine. Staff had received training and appropriate safeguards were in place for patients and staff, however there was no monthly phantom tests. Phantom tests are part of a regular quality assurance guideline. We spoke with the practice manager who made immediate arrangements to implement a system

Risks to patients

There were 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 practice had current employer's liability insurance.

We looked at the practice's arrangements for safe dental care and treatment. The staff mostly followed relevant safety regulation when using needles and other sharp dental items. We spoke with staff members who told us that they did not always use 'safer sharps' equipment and

Are services safe?

procedures were not well understood. we spoke with the practice manager who made immediate arrangements to review the use of 'safer sharps' and ensure staff implemented guidance. 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 the vaccination to protect them against the Hepatitis B virus, and that the effectiveness of the vaccination was checked.

Staff knew how to respond to a medical emergency and completed training in emergency resuscitation and basic life support (BLS) every year. Immediate Life Support training for sedation was also completed.

Emergency equipment and medicines were mostly available as described in recognised guidance. Staff kept records of their checks of these to make sure these were available, within their expiry date, and in working order. Some items such as face masks and airways were not available as recommended in guidance. The practice manager made immediate arrangements to rectify the shortfalls.

A dental nurse worked with the dentists when they treated patients in line with GDC Standards for the Dental Team. A risk assessment was in place for when the dental hygienist/hygiene therapist worked without chairside support.

We reviewed the Control of Substances Hazardous to Health (COSHH) Regulations 2002 file and saw that some material safety data sheets were out of date when newer versions were available. The use of the most recent material safety data sheets improves the accuracy of a materials risk assessment and storage requirements. The practice manager told us that up to date material safety data sheets would be obtained and risk assessed.

The practice occasionally used locum and/or agency staff. We noted that these staff received an induction to ensure that they were familiar with the practice's procedures.

The practice 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.

We found that the temperature in the decontamination room was high, and that electric cables ran close to sinks, noise levels due to a compressor were high. We spoke with the practice manager who told us they would review these issues.

The practice had suitable 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 practice had systems in place to ensure that any work was disinfected prior to being sent to a dental laboratory and before treatment was completed.

The practice had procedures to reduce the possibility of Legionella or other bacteria developing in the water systems, in line with a risk assessment, however there was no evidence to confirm that all recommendations had been actioned. The practice manager told us that a new report would shortly be commissioned to ensure that the recommendations were completed. There were records of water testing and dental unit water line management were in place.

We saw cleaning schedules for the premises. The practice was visibly clean when we inspected. However improvements could be made to the cleaning file with additional documentation. We spoke with the practice manager who agreed and made immediate arrangements to improve the files contents.

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

The practice had recently had an infection prevention and control audit. There were no other infection prevention and control audits available. The latest audit showed the practice was meeting the required standards. We spoke with the practice manager who told us that a second audit would shortly be carried out and that it would be subject to independent verification and ensure quality assurance.

Information to deliver safe care and treatment

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

Are services safe?

We discussed with the dentist how information to deliver safe care and treatment was handled and recorded. We looked at a sample of dental care records to confirm our findings and noted that individual records were written 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 (GDPR) requirements.

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

Safe and appropriate use of medicines

The provider had reliable systems for appropriate and safe handling of medicines.

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

The practice stored and kept records of NHS prescriptions as described in current guidance.

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

We could not be shown an antimicrobial prescribing audit, which would confirm guidelines were being followed and antibiotic stewardship understood by staff. The practice manager made arrangements for an audit to take place, with independent verification to ensure quality assurance.

Track record on safety and Lessons learned and improvements

There were comprehensive risk assessments in relation to safety issues. The practice monitored and reviewed incidents. This helped it to understand risks and gave a clear, accurate and current picture that led to safety improvements.

In the previous 12 months there had been one safety incident. The incident was investigated, documented and discussed with the rest of the dental practice team to prevent such occurrences happening again in the future.

There were adequate systems for reviewing and investigating when things went wrong. The practice learned and shared lessons identified themes and acted to improve safety in the practice.

There was a system for receiving and acting on safety alerts. The practice 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

Effective needs assessment, care and treatment

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

The practice offered dental implants. These were placed by the principal dentist who had undergone appropriate post-graduate training in this advanced field. The provision of dental implants was in accordance with national guidance.

The practice had access to both an extra-oral and intra-oral cameras to enhance the delivery of care, and patient communication.

The staff were involved in quality improvement initiatives including peer review as part of their approach in providing high quality care. They were also a member of a 'good practice' certification scheme.

Helping patients to live healthier lives

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

The dentists prescribed high concentration fluoride toothpaste if a patient's risk of tooth decay indicated this would help them. They used fluoride varnish for children and adults based on an assessment of the risk of tooth decay.

The dentists/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 health promotion leaflets to help patients with their oral health.

The practice was aware of national oral health campaigns and local schemes in supporting patients to live healthier lives. For example, local stop smoking services. They directed patients to these schemes when necessary.

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

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

Consent to care and treatment

The practice 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 dentists gave patients information about treatment options and the risks and benefits of these so they could make informed decisions. 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 may 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. The 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.

We saw the practice audited patients' dental care records to check that the dentists/clinicians recorded the necessary information, however improvements could be made by the use of independent verification and completion of quality assurance processes.

The practice carried out conscious sedation for patients who were nervous. This included people who were very nervous of dental treatment and those who needed

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

complex or lengthy treatment. The practice had systems to help them do this safely. These were in accordance with guidelines published by the Royal College of Surgeons and Royal College of Anaesthetists in 2015.

The practice's systems included checks before and after treatment, emergency equipment requirements, medicines management, sedation equipment checks, and staff availability and training. They also included patient checks and information such as consent, monitoring during treatment, discharge and post-operative instructions.

The staff assessed patients appropriately for sedation. The dental care records showed that patients having sedation had important checks carried out first. These included a detailed medical history, blood pressure checks and an assessment of health using the American Society of Anaesthesiologists classification system in accordance with current guidelines.

The records showed that staff recorded important checks at regular intervals. These included pulse, blood pressure, breathing rates and the oxygen saturation of the blood

The operator-sedationist was supported by a trained second individual. The name of this individual was recorded in the patients' dental care record.

Effective staffing

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

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

Staff discussed their training needs at annual appraisals. We saw evidence of completed appraisals and how the practice addressed the training requirements of staff.

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 if they needed treatment the practice did not provide.

The practice had systems to identify, manage, follow up and where required refer patients for specialist care when presenting with dental infections.

The practice also had systems for referring patients with suspected oral cancer under the national two week wait arrangements. This was initiated by NICE in 2005 to help make sure patients were seen quickly by a specialist.

The practice monitored all referrals to make sure they were dealt with promptly.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Kindness, respect and compassion

Staff treated patients with kindness, respect and compassion.

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

Patients commented positively that staff were informative, excellent and good. We saw that staff treated patients respectfully, appropriately and professionally; and were friendly towards patients at the reception desk and over the telephone.

Patients said staff were compassionate and understanding. Patients could choose whether they saw a male or female dentist.

Patients told us staff were kind and helpful when they were in pain, distress or discomfort.

Information folders were available for patients to read.

Privacy and dignity

The practice respected and promoted patients' privacy and dignity, however improvements could be made by ensuring that treatment room view ports provided sufficient privacy to patients.

Staff were aware of the importance of privacy and confidentiality. The layout of reception and waiting areas provided privacy when reception staff were dealing with patients. If a patient asked for more privacy, staff would take them into another room. The reception computer screens were not visible to patients and staff did not leave patients' personal information where other patients might see it.

The practice used a CCTV system inside the public areas of the practice, However we could not find internal warning signs in line with guidance. The practice manager told us they would make immediate arrangements for appropriate signage.

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 were aware of the

Accessible Information Standards a requirement to make sure that patients and their carers can access and understand the information they are given:

- Interpretation services were available for patients who did not use English as a first language. Patients were also told about multi-lingual staff that might be able to support them.
- Staff communicated with patients in a way that they could understand and communication aids and easy read materials were available.
- Staff helped patients and their carers find further information and access community and advocacy services. They helped them ask questions about their care and treatment.

The practice gave patients clear information to help them make informed choices about their treatment. Patients confirmed that staff listened to them, did not rush them and discussed options for treatment with them. A dentist described the conversations they had with patients to satisfy themselves they understood their treatment options.

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

The dentists described to us the methods they used to help patients understand treatment options discussed. These included models, X-ray images and an intra-oral camera. The intra-oral cameras enabled photographs to be taken of the tooth being examined or treated and shown to the patient/relative to help them better understand the diagnosis and treatment.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The practice organised and delivered services to meet patients' needs. It took account of patient needs and preferences.

Staff were clear on the importance of emotional support needed by patients when delivering care.

Patients described high levels of satisfaction with the responsive service provided by the practice.

The practice had made reasonable adjustments for patients with disabilities. These included steps free access, accessible toilet with hand rails and a call bell.

A disability access audit had been completed and an action plan formulated to continually improve access for patients.

Staff described an example of a patient who found it unsettling to wait in the waiting room before an appointment. The team kept this in mind to make sure the dentist could see them as soon as possible after they arrived.

Staff telephoned some patients on the morning of their appointment to make sure they could get to the practice.

Timely access to services

Patients could access care and treatment from the practice within an acceptable timescale for their needs.

The practice displayed its opening hours in the premises, and included it in their information leaflet and on their website.

The practice had an appointment system to respond to patients' needs. Patients who requested an urgent

appointment were seen the same day. Patients had enough time during their appointment and did not feel rushed. Appointments ran smoothly on the day of the inspection and patients were not kept waiting.

The staff took part in an emergency on-call arrangement with the NHS111 out of hour's service>.

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 confirmed they could make routine and emergency appointments easily and were rarely kept waiting for their appointment.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

The practice took complaints and concerns seriously and responded to them appropriately to improve the quality of care.

The practice had a policy providing guidance to staff on how to handle a complaint. The practice information leaflet explained how to make a complaint.

The practice manager was responsible for dealing with these. Staff would tell the practice manager about any formal or informal comments or concerns straight away so patients received a quick response.

The practice manager aimed to settle complaints in-house and invited patients to speak with them in person to discuss these. Information was available about organisations patients could contact if not satisfied with the way the practice dealt with their concerns.

We looked at comments, compliments and complaints the practice received two complaints in the previous year.

These showed the practice responded to concerns appropriately and discussed outcomes with staff to share learning and improve the service.

Are services well-led?

Our findings

Leadership capacity and capability

We found the principal dentist had the capacity and skills to deliver high-quality, sustainable care, and had the experience, capacity and skills to deliver the practice strategy and address risks to it.

They were knowledgeable about issues and priorities relating to the quality and future of services. They understood the challenges and were addressing them.

Leaders at all levels were visible and approachable. They worked closely with staff and others to make sure they prioritised compassionate and inclusive leadership.

The practice had effective processes to develop leadership capacity and skills, including planning for the future leadership of the practice.

Vision and strategy if applicable

There was a clear vision and set of values.

The strategy was in line with health and social priorities across the region. The practice planned its services to meet the needs of the practice population.

Culture

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

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

The practice focused on the needs of patients.

We saw the provider took effective action to deal with poor performance.

Openness, honesty and transparency were demonstrated when responding to incidents and complaints. The provider was aware of and had systems to ensure compliance with the requirements of the Duty of Candour.

Staff could raise concerns and were encouraged to do so. They had confidence that these would be addressed.

Governance and management

There were clear responsibilities, roles and systems of accountability to support good governance and management.

The principal dentist 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. Staff knew the management arrangements and their roles and responsibilities.

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

There were clear and effective processes for managing risks, issues and performance.

Appropriate and accurate information

The practice acted on appropriate and accurate information.

Quality and operational information was used to ensure and improve performance. Performance information was combined with the views of patients.

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

Engagement with patients, the public, staff and external partners

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

The practice used patient surveys to obtain and patients' views about the service. We saw examples of suggestions from patients/staff the practice had acted on by introducing a bike rack.

Patients were encouraged to complete the NHS Friends and Family Test (FFT) and NHS choices. These are national programmes to allow patients to provide feedback on NHS services they have used.

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

Continuous improvement and innovation

There were systems and processes for learning, continuous improvement and innovation.

Are services well-led?

The practice had quality assurance processes to encourage learning and continuous improvement. These included audits of dental care records, radiographs and infection prevention and control. They had clear records of the results of these audits and the resulting action plans and improvements, however improvements could be made by the use of independent verification and completion of quality assurance processes.

The principal dentist showed a commitment to learning and improvement and valued the contributions made to the team by individual members of staff. This approach was to be commended.

The staff team had annual appraisals with a process underway. They discussed learning needs, general wellbeing and aims for future professional development. We saw evidence of completed appraisals in the staff folders.

Staff completed 'highly recommended' training as per General Dental Council professional standards. This included undertaking medical emergencies and basic life support training annually. The provider supported and encouraged staff to complete CPD.