

Dr. Henrik Christensen

H C Christensen Dental Practice

Inspection Report

2 West Way
Bournemouth
Dorset
BH9 3EE

Tel: 01202 533175

Website: www.christensendental.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 24/11/2016

Date of publication: 18/01/2017

Overall summary

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection on 24 November 2016 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.

Background

Dr Christensen Dental Practice is a dental practice providing private treatment for both adults and children. The practice is based on an area of the owner's residential accommodation in Bournemouth, a seaside town situated in south Dorset.

The practice has one dental treatment room based on the ground floor which is accessible to wheelchair users, prams and patients with limited mobility. The cleaning, sterilising and packing of dental instruments takes place within a designated area in the dental treatment room.

The practice employs one dentist, one dental nurse and a practice manager who also covers reception duties.

The practice's opening hours are between 9am and 5.30pm Monday to Wednesday, 9am and 7pm Thursday and between 9am and 1pm on Friday.

Summary of findings

There are arrangements in place to ensure patients receive urgent medical assistance when the practice is closed. This is provided by an out-of-hours service delivered by the provider and three other dentists who worked on a rota system.

Dr Henrik Christensen, the practice owner is registered as an individual and is legally responsible for making sure that the practice meets the requirements relating to safety and quality of care, as specified in the regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008.

We obtained the views of three patients on the day of our inspection.

Our key findings were:

- We found that the practice ethos was to provide patient centred dental care in a relaxed and friendly environment.
- Effective leadership was provided by the practice owner.
- Staff had been trained to handle emergencies and appropriate medicines and life-saving equipment were readily available in accordance with current guidelines.
- The practice appeared clean and well maintained.
- There was appropriate equipment for staff to undertake their duties, and equipment was well maintained.
- Infection control procedures were robust and the practice followed published guidance.
- The practice owner acted as the safeguarding lead and there were effective processes in place for safeguarding adults and children living in vulnerable circumstances.
- There was a process in place for the reporting and shared learning when untoward incidents occurred in the practice.

- The dentist provided dental care in accordance with current professional and National Institute for Care Excellence (NICE) guidelines.
- The service was aware of the needs of the local population and took these into account in how the practice was run.
- Patients could access treatment and urgent and emergency care when required.
- Staff received training appropriate to their roles and were supported in their continued professional development (CPD) by the practice owner.
- Staff we spoke with felt well supported by the practice owner and were committed to providing a quality service to their patients.
- Information from 28 completed Care Quality Commission (CQC) comment cards gave us a positive picture of a friendly, caring, professional and high quality service.

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

- Provide an annual statement in relation to infection prevention control required under The Health and Social Care Act 2008: 'Code of Practice about the prevention and control of infections and related guidance
- Review the availability of hearing loops for patients who are hard of hearing.
- Review the storage of products identified under Control of Substances Hazardous to Health (COSHH) 2002 Regulations to ensure they are stored securely.
- Review the storage of patient care records is in accordance with current legislation and guidance.
- Consider the provision of an external name plate providing details of the dentist working at the practice including their General Dental Council (GDC) registration number in accordance with GDC guidance issued in March 2012.

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 robust arrangements for essential areas such as infection control, clinical waste control, management of medical emergencies at the practice and dental radiography (X-rays). We found that all the equipment used in the dental practice was well maintained.

The practice took its responsibilities for patient safety seriously and staff were aware of the importance of identifying, investigating and learning from patient safety incidents.

Staff had received safeguarding training and were aware of their responsibilities regarding safeguarding children and vulnerable adults.

No action



Are services effective?

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

The dental care provided was evidence based and focussed on the needs of the patients. The practice used current national professional guidance including that from the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) to guide their practice.

We saw examples of positive teamwork within the practice and evidence of good communication between the staff. The staff received professional training and development appropriate to their roles and learning needs.

No action



Are services caring?

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

We obtained the views of three patients on the day of our visit. These provided a positive view of the service the practice provided.

All of the patients commented that the quality of care was very good. Patients commented on friendliness and helpfulness of the staff and dentist were good at explaining the treatment that was proposed.

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 service was aware of the needs of the local population and took these into account in how the practice was run.

Patients could access treatment and urgent and emergency care when required. The practice provided patients with access to telephone interpreter services when required.

The practice had one ground floor treatment room and level access into the building for patients with mobility difficulties and families with prams and pushchairs.

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.

Effective leadership was provided by the practice owner. The staff had an open approach to their work and shared a commitment to continually improving the service they provided.

There was a no blame culture in the practice. The practice had robust clinical governance and risk management structures in place.

We saw evidence of systems to identify staff learning needs which were underpinned by an appraisal system and a programme of clinical audit. Staff working at the practice were supported to maintain their continuing professional development as required by the General Dental Council.

Staff told us that they felt well supported and could raise any concerns with the practice owner. All the staff we met said that they were happy in their work and the practice was a good place to work.

No action



H C Christensen Dental Practice

Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

We carried out an announced, comprehensive inspection on 24 November 2016. Our inspection was carried out by a lead inspector and a dental specialist adviser.

During our inspection visit, we reviewed policy documents and staff training and recruitment records. We obtained the views of two members of staff.

We conducted a tour of the practice and looked at the storage arrangements for emergency medicines and equipment. We were shown the decontamination procedures for dental instruments and the systems that supported the patient dental care records. We obtained the views of three patients on the day of our inspection.

Patients gave positive feedback about their experience at the practice.

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

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

These questions therefore formed the framework for the areas we looked at during the inspection.

Are services safe?

Our findings

Reporting, learning and improvement from incidents

The practice owner demonstrated a good awareness of RIDDOR 2013 (reporting of injuries, diseases and dangerous occurrences regulations). The practice had an incident reporting system in place when something went wrong; this system also included the reporting of minor injuries to patients and staff.

Records showed that no such accidents occurred during 2015-16 and were managed in accordance with the practice's accident reporting policy. The practice received national patient safety alerts such as those issued by the Medicines and Healthcare Regulatory Authority (MHRA). Where relevant, these alerts were shared with all members of staff at the regular staff meetings.

Reliable safety systems and processes (including safeguarding)

We spoke to a dental nurse about the prevention of needle stick injuries. They explained that the treatment of sharps and sharps waste was in accordance with the current EU directive with respect to safe sharp guidelines, thus helping to protect staff from blood borne diseases. The practice used a system whereby needles were not manually re-sheathed using the hands following administration of a local anaesthetic to a patient. The practice used a special safety syringe for the administration of dental local anaesthetics to prevent needle stick injuries from occurring. The dentist was also responsible for the disposal of used sharps and needles. A practice protocol was in place should a needle stick injury occur. The systems and processes we observed were in line with the current EU Directive on the use of safer sharps.

We asked the dental nurse how they treated the use of instruments used during root canal treatment. They explained that these instruments were single patient use only. The practice followed appropriate guidance issued by the British Endodontic Society in relation to the use of the rubber dam. They explained that root canal treatment was carried out where practically possible using a rubber dam. A rubber dam is a thin, rectangular sheet, usually latex rubber, used in dentistry to isolate the operative site from the rest of the mouth and protect the airway. Rubber dams should be used when endodontic treatment is being provided.

The practice owner was the safeguarding lead and was the point of referral should members of staff encounter a child or adult safeguarding issue. A policy and protocol was in place for staff to refer to in relation to children and adults who may be the victim of abuse or neglect. Training records showed that staff had received appropriate safeguarding training for both vulnerable adults and children. Information was available in the practice that contained telephone numbers of whom to contact outside of the practice if there was a need, such as the local authority responsible for investigations. The practice reported that there had been no safeguarding incidents that required further investigation by appropriate authorities.

Medical emergencies

The practice had arrangements in place to deal with medical emergencies at the practice. The practice had an automated external defibrillator (AED), a portable electronic device that analyses life threatening irregularities of the heart and is able to deliver an electrical shock to attempt to restore a normal heart rhythm. Staff had received training in how to use this equipment.

The practice had in place emergency medicines as set out in the British National Formulary guidance for dealing with common medical emergencies in a dental practice. The practice had access to medical oxygen along with other related items such as manual breathing aids and portable suction in line with the Resuscitation Council UK guidelines. The emergency medicines and oxygen we saw were all in date and stored in a central location known to all staff.

The practice held training sessions each year for the whole team so that they could maintain their competence in dealing with medical emergencies. Staff we spoke with demonstrated they knew how to respond if a person suddenly became unwell.

Staff recruitment

The dentist and dental nurses had current registration with the General Dental Council, the dental professionals' regulatory body. The practice had a recruitment policy that detailed the checks required to be undertaken before a person started work. For example, proof of identity, a full employment history, evidence of relevant qualifications, adequate medical indemnity cover, immunisation status and references.

Are services safe?

We looked at one staff recruitment file and records confirmed they had been recruited in accordance with the practice's recruitment policy.

The systems and processes we saw were in line with the information required by regulations. Staff recruitment records were stored securely to protect the confidentiality of staff personal information.

We saw that all staff had received appropriate checks from the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS). These are 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 may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable.

Monitoring health & safety and responding to risks

The practice had arrangements in place to monitor health and safety and deal with foreseeable emergencies. The practice maintained a comprehensive system of policies and risk assessments which included radiation, fire safety, general health and safety and those pertaining to all the equipment used in the practice; however cleaning products were stored in an area of the practice that could be accessible to unauthorised members of the public.

The practice had in place a well maintained Control of Substances Hazardous to Health (COSHH) file. This file contained details of the way substances and materials used in dentistry should be handled and the precautions taken to prevent harm to staff and patients.

Infection control

There were effective systems in place to reduce the risk and spread of infection within the practice. Decontamination of dental instruments was undertaken in a designated area in the dental treatment room. Decontamination procedures were always undertaken either during the lunch time period or the end of the day when no patients were present.

The practice had in place a robust infection control policy that was regularly reviewed. It was demonstrated through direct observation of the cleaning process and a review of practice protocols that HTM 01 05 (national guidance for infection prevention and control in dental practices) Essential Quality Requirements for infection control was being met. It was observed that audit of infection control processes carried out in April 2016 confirmed compliance with HTM 01 05 guidelines.

We saw that the dental treatment room, waiting area, reception and toilet were visibly clean, tidy and clutter free. Clear zoning demarking clean from dirty areas was apparent in the treatment room. Hand washing facilities were available including liquid soap and paper towel dispensers in each of the treatment rooms. Hand washing protocols were also displayed appropriately and bare below the elbow working was observed.

The drawers of the treatment room were inspected and these were clean, ordered and free from clutter. The treatment room had the appropriate routine personal protective equipment available for staff use, this included protective gloves and visors.

The dental nurse we spoke with described to us the end-to-end process of infection control procedures at the practice. They explained the decontamination of the general treatment room environment following the treatment of a patient. They demonstrated how the working surfaces, dental unit and dental chair were decontaminated. This included the treatment of the dental water lines.

The dental water lines were maintained to prevent the growth and spread of Legionella bacteria (Legionella is a term for particular bacteria which can contaminate water systems in buildings); they described the method they used which was in line with current HTM 01 05 guidelines. We saw that a Legionella risk assessment had been carried out at the practice by a competent person in May 2015. The recommended procedures contained in the report were carried out and logged appropriately. These measures ensured that patients and staff were protected from the risk of infection due to Legionella.

The dental nurse we spoke with demonstrated the process from taking the dirty instruments through to clean and ready for use again. The process of cleaning, inspection, sterilisation, packaging and storage of instruments followed a well-defined system of zoning from dirty through to clean.

The practice used the manual scrubbing method for the initial cleaning process, following inspection with an illuminated magnifier; the instruments were placed in an autoclave (a device for sterilising dental and medical

Are services safe?

instruments). When the instruments had been sterilised, they were pouched and stored until required. All pouches were dated with an expiry date in accordance with current guidelines.

We were shown the systems in place to ensure that the autoclave used in the decontamination process was working effectively. It was observed that the data sheets used to record the essential daily and weekly validation checks of the sterilisation cycles were complete and up to date.

The segregation and storage of clinical waste was in line with current guidelines laid down by the Department of Health. We observed that sharps containers, clinical waste bags and municipal waste were properly maintained in accordance with current guidelines. We did note that one of the sharps bins was stored on the floor of the treatment room, this could pose a health and safety risk to patients and staff. The practice owner assured us that a more suitable site would be found for the sharps bin during surgery hours. The practice used an appropriate contractor to remove clinical waste from the practice. This was stored in a separate locked location adjacent to the practice prior to collection by the waste contractor. Waste consignment notices were available for inspection.

We saw that general environmental cleaning was carried out according to a cleaning plan developed by the practice. We did note that the cupboard containing cleaning materials and equipment was not locked and could be accessed by unauthorised persons. The practice owner assured us that a lock would be fitted as soon as practically possible.

We found the practice had not produced an annual statement in relation to infection prevention control required under The Health and Social Care Act 2008: Code of Practice about the prevention and control of infections and related guidance.

Equipment and medicines

Equipment checks were regularly carried out in line with the manufacturer's recommendations. For example, the autoclave had been serviced and calibrated in April 2016. The practice's X-ray machines had been serviced and calibrated as specified under current national regulations in January 2015 and were due to be tested again in January 2018.

Portable appliance testing (PAT) had been carried out in October 2016 and was due to be carried out again in October 2017.

The batch numbers and expiry dates for local anaesthetics were recorded in patient dental care records. These medicines were stored securely.

The practice also dispensed their own medicines as part of a patient's dental treatment for certain dental procedures. These medicines were a range of antibiotics, the dispensing procedures were in accordance with current secondary dispensing guidelines and medicines were stored according to manufacturer's instructions. The practice had in place a stock control system to account for the medicines issued to prevent inappropriate prescribing or loss of medicines.

We observed that the practice had equipment to deal with minor first aid problems such as minor eye problems and body fluid and mercury spillage.

Radiography (X-rays)

We were shown a well-maintained radiation protection file in line with the Ionising Radiation Regulations 1999 and Ionising Radiation Medical Exposure Regulations 2000 (IRMER). This file contained the names of the Radiation Protection Advisor and the Radiation Protection Supervisor and the necessary documentation pertaining to the maintenance of the X-ray equipment. Included in the file were the three yearly maintenance logs and a copy of the local rules. The local rules must contain the name of the appointed Radiation Protection Advisor, the identification and description of each controlled area and a summary of the arrangements for restriction access. Additionally, they must summarise the working instructions, any contingency arrangements and the dose investigation level.

We were shown records that demonstrated that radiological audits had been carried out on annual basis. Dental care records we saw where X-rays had been taken showed that dental X-rays were justified, reported on and quality assured. These findings showed that the practice was acting in accordance with national radiological guidelines and patients and staff were protected from unnecessary exposure to radiation. We saw training records that showed staff where appropriate had received training for core radiological knowledge under IRMER 2000 Regulations.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Monitoring and improving outcomes for patients

The dentist carried out consultations, assessments and treatment in line with recognised general professional guidelines. They described to us how they carried out their assessment of patients for routine care.

The assessment began with the patient completing a medical history questionnaire disclosing any health conditions, medicines being taken and any allergies suffered. We saw evidence that the medical history was updated at subsequent visits. This was followed by an examination covering the condition of a patient's teeth, gums and soft tissues and the signs of mouth cancer. Patients were then made aware of the condition of their oral health and whether it had changed since the last appointment. Following the clinical assessment, the diagnosis was then discussed with the patient and treatment options explained in detail.

Where relevant, preventative dental information was given in order to improve the outcome for the patient. This included dietary advice and general oral hygiene instruction such as tooth brushing techniques or recommended tooth care products. The patient dental care record was updated with the proposed treatment after discussing options with the patient. A treatment plan was then given to each patient and this included the cost involved. Patients were monitored through follow-up appointments and these were scheduled in line with their individual requirements.

Dental care records that were shown to us by the dentist demonstrated that the findings of the assessment and details of the treatment carried out were recorded appropriately. We saw details of the condition of the gums using the basic periodontal examination (BPE) scores and soft tissues lining the mouth. The BPE tool is a simple and rapid screening tool used by the dentist to indicate the level of treatment need in relation to a patient's gums. These were carried out where appropriate during a dental health assessment.

Health promotion & prevention

The practice was focused on the prevention of dental disease and the maintenance of good oral health.

The dentist explained that children and adults at high risk of tooth decay were identified and were offered fluoride

varnish applications to keep their teeth in a healthy condition. They also placed fissure sealants (special plastic coatings on the biting surfaces of permanent back teeth in children who were particularly vulnerable to dental decay).

Dental care records we observed demonstrated that the dentist had given oral health advice to patients. The practice also sold a range of dental hygiene products to maintain healthy teeth and gums; these were available in the reception area.

Staffing

We observed a friendly atmosphere at the practice. All clinical staff had current registration with their professional body, the General Dental Council.

The GDC numbers of registered staff was seen on the practice website and practice leaflet.

We noted that the external name plate which detailed names of the dentist working at the practice did not include their General Dental Council (GDC) registration number in accordance with GDC guidance from March 2012.

All of the patients we asked told us they felt there was enough staff working at the practice. Staff told us there were enough staff. Staff we spoke with told us they felt supported by the dentist and practice manager. They told us they felt they had acquired the necessary skills to carry out their role and were encouraged to progress.

The practice employed a dentist, a dental nurse and a practice manager who also carried out reception duties. There was a structured induction programme in place for new members of staff.

Working with other services

The dentist explained how they worked with other services and could refer patients to a range of specialists in primary and secondary services if the treatment required was not provided by the practice. The practice used referral criteria and referral forms developed by other primary and secondary care providers such as oral surgery and orthodontic providers. We saw an example of a referral to a periodontal (gum) specialist. The referral was very detailed, appropriate and fit for purpose. The practice maintained a referral tracking system to ensure that patients were seen by the right person at the right time.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Consent to care and treatment

The dentist explained how they implemented the principles of informed consent; they had a very clear understanding of consent issues. The dentist explained how individual treatment options, risks, benefits and costs were discussed with each patient and then documented in a written treatment plan. They stressed the importance of communication skills when explaining care and treatment to patients to help ensure they had an understanding of their treatment options.

The dentist went on to explain how they would obtain consent from a patient who suffered with any mental impairment that may mean that they might be unable to

fully understand the implications of their treatment. If there was any doubt about their ability to understand or consent to the treatment, then treatment would be postponed. They added they would involve relatives and carers if appropriate to ensure that the best interests of the patient were served as part of the process. This followed the guidelines of the Mental Capacity Act 2005. Staff were familiar with the concept of Gillick competence in respect of the care and treatment of children under 16. Gillick competence is used to help assess whether a child has the maturity to make their own decisions and to understand the implications of those decisions.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Respect, dignity, compassion & empathy

The treatment room was situated away from the main waiting area and we saw that doors were closed always when patients were with the dentist.

Conversations between patients and dentist could not be heard from outside the treatment rooms which protected patients' privacy. Patients' paper clinical records were stored in an area of the practice that could be accessible to unauthorised members of the public. We pointed this out to the practice owner who assured us that storage of records would be made more secure as soon as practically possible.

Practice computer screens were not overlooked which ensured patients' confidential information could not be viewed at reception. Staff were aware of the importance of providing patients with privacy and maintaining confidentiality.

We obtained the views of 28 patients prior to the day of our visit and three patients on the day of our visit. These provided a wholly positive view of the service the practice provided. All of the patients commented that the dentist was good at treating them with care and concern. Patients commented that treatment was explained clearly and the staff were caring and put them at ease. They also said that the reception staff were helpful and efficient. During the inspection, we observed staff in the reception area, they were polite and helpful towards patients and the general atmosphere was welcoming and friendly.

Involvement in decisions about care and treatment

The practice provided clear treatment plans to their patients that detailed possible treatment options and indicative costs. The dentist paid particular attention to patient involvement when drawing up individual care plans. We saw evidence in the records we looked at that the dentist recorded the information they had provided to patients about their treatment and the options open to them.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting patients' needs

During our inspection we looked at examples of information available to patients. We saw that the practice waiting area displayed a variety of information. These explained opening hours, emergency 'out of hours' contact details and arrangements and how to make a complaint. The practice website also contained useful information to patients such as how to provide feedback to the practice, details of out of hours' arrangements and the costs of treatment. We observed that the appointment diary was not overbooked and that this provided capacity each day for patients with dental pain to be fitted into urgent slots with the dentist.

The dentist decided how long a patient's appointment needed to be and took into account any special circumstances such as whether a patient was very nervous, had an impairment and the level of complexity of treatment.

Tackling inequity and promoting equality

The practice had made reasonable adjustments to help prevent inequity for patients that experienced limited mobility or other barriers that may hamper them from accessing services.

The principal dentist spoke four languages. The practice used a translation service, which they arranged if it was clear that a patient had difficulty in understanding information about their treatment.

To improve access for patients who found steps a barrier, the practice had level access throughout and was based on the ground floor. Due to the size of the practice it was not possible to provide a wheelchair accessible toilet.

The practice did not have access to a 'hearing loop' which would assist patients who were hearing aid users.

Access to the service

The practice's opening hours were between 9am and 5.30pm Monday to Wednesday, 9am and 7pm Thursday and between 9am and 1pm on Friday.

Patients told us they were satisfied with the hours the surgery was open.

The practice used an out of hour's service to give advice in case of a dental emergency when the practice was closed. This information was publicised in the practice information booklet kept in the waiting area, website and on the telephone answering machine when the practice was closed.

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 discussed those received in order to improve the quality of service provided.

Information for patients about how to make a complaint was available in the practice's waiting room and practice website. 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. All the patients asked told us they knew how to make a complaint if they had an issue.

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

For example, a complaint would be acknowledged within two working days and a full response would be given in 10 days. We were told the practice had not received any complaints in the previous year.

Are services well-led?

Our findings

Governance arrangements

The governance arrangements of the practice were developed through a process of continual learning and improvement. The governance arrangements for this location consisted of an empowered practice manager and the practice owner who were responsible for the day to day running of the practice.

The practice maintained a system of policies and procedures. All of the staff we spoke with were aware of the policies and how to access them. We noted management policies and procedures were kept under review by the practice owner on a regular basis.

Leadership, openness and transparency

Effective leadership was provided by the practice owner. The practice ethos focussed on providing patient centred dental care in a relaxed and friendly environment. The comment cards we saw reflected this approach.

The staff we spoke with described a transparent culture which encouraged candour, openness and honesty. Staff said they felt comfortable about raising concerns with the practice owner. There was a no blame culture within the practice. They felt they were listened to and responded to when they did raise a concern. We found staff to be hard working, caring and committed to the work they did.

All of the staff we spoke with demonstrated a firm understanding of the principles of clinical governance in dentistry and were happy with the practice facilities. Staff reported that the practice owner was proactive and aimed to resolve problems very quickly. As a result, staff were motivated and enjoyed working at the practice and were proud of the service they provided to patients.

Learning and improvement

We saw evidence of systems to identify staff learning needs which were underpinned by an appraisal system and a programme of clinical audit. For example, we observed that staff received an annual appraisal.

We found there was a programme of clinical audit taking place at the practice. These included infection control and

X-ray quality. The audits demonstrated a comprehensive process where the practice had analysed the results to discuss and identify where improvement actions may be needed.

Staff working at the practice were supported to maintain their continuing professional development as required by the General Dental Council. Staff told us that the practice ethos was that all staff should receive appropriate training and development.

The practice owner encouraged staff to carry out professional development wherever possible. The practice used a variety of ways to ensure staff development including internal training and staff meetings as well as attendance at external courses.

The practice ensured that all staff underwent regular mandatory training in cardio pulmonary resuscitation (CPR), infection control, child protection and adult safeguarding and dental radiography (X-rays).

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

The practice gathered feedback from patients through surveys, compliments and complaints. We saw that there was a robust complaints procedure in place, with details available for patients in the waiting area and the practice website.

Results of the most recent practice survey carried out indicated that 100% of patients, who responded, said they would recommend the practice to a family member or friend.

As a result of patient feedback the practice replaced door handles to make them easier to see for a patient with limited sight.

Staff told us that the dentist was very approachable and they felt they could give their views about how things were done at the practice. Staff told us that they had frequent meetings and described the meetings as good with the opportunity to discuss successes, changes and improvements. For example, changes included offering patients a text reminder and changing the colour of consent forms for patients who were under 18.