

Dr. Julie Forde

Mint Dental Ambleside

Inspection Report

**Rydal Road
Ambleside
Cumbria
LA22 9AN**

Tel: 01539 434999
Website: N/A

Date of inspection visit: 31 October 2016
Date of publication: 14/12/2016

Overall summary

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection on 31 October 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

This practice provides NHS treatment to patients of all ages.

The dental practice is based in a grade 2 listed building in the centre of Ambleside, Cumbria.

The practice has two treatment rooms, a decontamination room, office, waiting room with separate reception area and ground floor toilet facilities. There is public parking available opposite the practice.

The practice has two dentists, one dental nurse and two trainee dental nurses/ receptionists.

The practice is open Monday-Friday 8:30am-5pm, with the exception of Wednesday when the practice closes at 1pm.

The principal dentist is registered with the Care Quality Commission as an individual. Like registered providers, they are 'registered persons'. Registered persons have legal responsibility for meeting the requirements in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 and associated Regulations about how the practice is run.

We received feedback from ten people during the inspection about the services provided. Patients commented that they found the staff friendly, caring and that all the staff listened to them and took appropriate action. They commented that the dentists were

Summary of findings

knowledgeable and that they were always given good and helpful explanations about dental treatment. Patients commented that the practice was clean and comfortable.

Our key findings were:

- The premises were visibly clean and free from clutter.
- Staff followed current infection control guidelines for decontaminating and sterilising equipment.
- The practice had procedures in place to record and analyse significant events and incidents.
- Staff had received safeguarding training, and knew the process to follow to raise concerns.
- There were sufficient numbers of suitably qualified, skilled staff to meet the needs of patients.
- Staff had been trained to deal with medical emergencies, and emergency medicines and equipment were available.
- Patients' needs were assessed, and care and treatment were delivered, in accordance with current legislation, standards, and guidance.
- Patients received information about their care, proposed treatment, costs, benefits, and risks and were involved in making decisions about it.
- Staff were supported to deliver effective care, and opportunities for training and learning were available.
- Patients were treated with kindness, dignity, and respect, and their confidentiality was maintained.
- The appointment system met the needs of patients, and emergency appointments were available.
- Services were planned and delivered to meet the needs of patients, and reasonable adjustments were made to enable patients to receive their care and treatment.
- The practice gathered the views of patients and took their views into account.
- Staff were supervised, felt involved, and worked as a team.
- Governance arrangements were in place for the smooth running of the practice, and for the delivery of high quality person centred care.

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

- Review X-ray grading procedures to ensure only staff who are appropriately trained review the quality of the X-rays.
- Review the equipment used to transport dirty instruments for decontamination and the frequency of flushing water lines in line with Health Technical Memorandum 01-05 (HTM 01-05).

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 effective systems in place to assess and manage risks to patients. These included maintaining the required standards of infection prevention and control.

Staff completed annual training in how to deal with medical emergencies.

Emergency equipment and medicines were in place and regularly audited.

There were systems in place for identifying, investigating and learning from incidents relating to the safety of patients and staff members.

X-ray equipment was regularly maintained, however we noted that the X-rays were not always quality audited by staff who had completed the appropriate training. The principal dentist assured us that this would be rectified.

The decontamination procedures were effective and the equipment involved in the decontamination process was regularly serviced, validated and checked to ensure it was safe to use. However we did note that the boxes used to transport dirty instruments were not clearly marked and water lines were not being flushed as frequently as outlined in the guidance. The principal dentist assured us that this would be rectified.

There were maintenance contracts in place to ensure all equipment had been serviced regularly, including; the autoclave, fire extinguishers, the air compressor and medical emergency oxygen.

Staff were appropriately recruited and suitably trained and skilled to meet patients' needs and there were sufficient numbers of staff available at all times. Staff induction processes were in place and had been completed.

There was evidence to demonstrate that staff had attended training in safeguarding patients and understood their responsibilities in relation to identifying and reporting any potential abuse.

No action



Are services effective?

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

The practice followed current guidelines when delivering dental care and treatment to patients. Patients' medical history was recorded at their initial visit and updated at subsequent visits. Patients received an assessment of their dental health. Clinicians obtained consent from patients before treatment was provided; and treatment focused on the patients' individual needs.

Staff provided oral health advice to patients and monitored changes in their oral health. Patients were referred to other services, where necessary, in a timely manner.

No action



Summary of findings

Staff were encouraged to complete training relevant to their roles and this was monitored by the registered provider. The clinical staff were up to date with their continuing professional development (CPD).

Qualified staff were registered with their professional body, the General Dental Council, and were supported in meeting the requirements of their professional regulator. Staff received ongoing training in a variety of subjects to assist them in carrying out their roles.

Are services caring?

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

Staff understood the importance of emotional support when delivering care to patients who were nervous of dental treatment. Patient feedback on CQC comment cards confirmed that staff were understanding and made them feel at ease.

We observed privacy and confidentiality were maintained for patients in reception and over the telephone. Policies and procedures in relation to data protection and security and confidentiality were in place and staff were aware of these.

No action



Are services responsive to people's needs?

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

The practice had an efficient appointment system in place to respond to patients' needs. There were appointment slots for urgent or emergency appointments each day. Patients could request appointments by telephone or in person. The practice opening hours and the 'out of hours' appointment information was provided at the entrance to the practice, in the practice leaflet, and on the practice website.

There was a procedure in place for responding to patients' complaints. This involved acknowledging, investigating and responding to individual complaints or concerns.

No action



Are services well-led?

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

There were a range of policies and procedures in use at the practice which were easily accessible to staff.

Environmental risks were assessed and well managed.

The practice held regular practice meetings, and these gave everybody an opportunity to openly share information and discuss any concerns or issues. Staff felt well supported and found the principal dentist approachable,

The provider used a variety of means to monitor quality and safety at the practice and to ensure continuous improvement in the practice, for example, learning from complaints and patient feedback.

The practice had a system to monitor and continually improve the quality of the service through a programme of clinical and non-clinical audits.

No action



Mint Dental Ambleside

Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

We carried out this inspection under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as part of our regulatory functions. This inspection was planned to check whether the registered provider was meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008.

The inspection took place on the 31 October 2016 and was led by a CQC inspector assisted by a dental specialist adviser.

Prior to the inspection we asked the practice to send us some information which we reviewed. This included details of complaints they had received in the last 12 months, their latest statement of purpose, and staff details, including their qualifications and professional body registration number where appropriate. We also reviewed information we held about the practice.

During the inspection we spoke to dentists, dental nurses and the receptionist and we toured the practice and reviewed emergency medicines and equipment.

We reviewed policies, protocols and other documents and observed procedures. We also reviewed CQC comment cards which we had sent prior to the inspection for patients to complete about the services provided 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

We reviewed the significant events which had taken place within the last 12 months and these had been well documented, investigated and reflected upon by the dental practice. We saw evidence of learning from significant events.

The principal dentist told us they received recent alerts from the Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA). (The MHRA is the UK's regulator of medicines, medical devices and blood components for transfusion, responsible for ensuring their safety, quality and effectiveness).

Staff had a good understanding of the Reporting of Injuries, Diseases, and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations 2013 and were aware of how and what to report. The provider had procedures in place to record and investigate accidents, and we saw examples of these in the accident book.

Staff had an understanding of their responsibilities under the Duty of Candour. Duty of Candour means relevant people are told when a notifiable safety incident occurs and in accordance with the statutory duty are given an apology and informed of any actions taken as a result.

Reliable safety systems and processes (including safeguarding)

The practice had up to date safeguarding policies and guidance for staff to refer to including the contact details for the relevant safeguarding professionals. Staff were aware of their responsibility and had completed training to safeguard patients from abuse.

The clinicians were assisted at all times by a dental nurse.

We observed that the dental care and treatment of patients was planned and delivered in a way that ensured patients' safety and welfare. Patients completed a medical history form at their first visit and this was reviewed by the clinician prior to the commencement of dental treatment, and at subsequent visits. The dental care records we looked at were well structured and contained sufficient detail to demonstrate what treatment had been prescribed and completed, and what was due to be carried out. The records were stored securely.

The practice had a whistleblowing policy which all staff had access to. Staff told us they felt confident they could raise concerns.

Medical emergencies

The practice had clear guidance about how to respond to medical emergencies. This was in line with the Resuscitation Council UK guidelines and the British National Formulary (BNF). The practice maintained emergency resuscitation equipment, medical emergency oxygen and emergency medicines to support patients. This included a wide range of airways and face masks for both adults and children.

We saw weekly records of checks for emergency equipment and emergency medicines were in place. Staff had attended their annual training in emergency resuscitation and basic life support as a team within the last 12 months.

One member of staff had received first aid training and the first aid boxes were easily accessible in the practice.

The practice had a defibrillator (AED) to support staff in a medical emergency. (An AED is a portable electronic device that analyses life threatening irregularities of the heart and delivers an electrical shock to attempt to restore a normal heart rhythm).

Staff recruitment

The practice had a comprehensive policy and set of procedures in place for the safe recruitment of staff. They included seeking references, immunisation status and checking qualifications and professional registration. The practice's policy was to carry out Disclosure and Barring service (DBS) checks for all newly appointed staff. These checks 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. Records confirmed these checks were in place.

We looked at the recruitment files of the newest members of staff and found they contained appropriate documentation. There was an induction programme for new staff to ensure they were knowledgeable about practice policies and procedure such as health and safety requirements, practice risk assessments and patient confidentiality. The recruitment and employment records were stored securely to prevent unauthorised access.

Are services safe?

We saw the dentists were covered by personal indemnity insurance (this is an insurance professionals are required to have in place to cover their working practice) The principal dentist had indemnity cover for all other clinical members of staff.

Monitoring health & safety and responding to risks

The practice had systems, processes and policies in place to manage and monitor risks to patients, staff and visitors to the practice. These included regular checks of the building, the environment, infection prevention and control, sharps disposal, emergency medicines and equipment.

The provider had a control of substances hazardous (COSHH) to health risk assessment and associated procedures in place. Staff maintained records of products used at the practice and retained manufacturer's product safety details to inform staff what action to take in the event of, for example, spillage, accidental swallowing, or contact with the skin. Measures were identified to reduce risks associated with these products, for example, the use of personal protective equipment for staff and patients, the secure storage of chemicals, and the display of safety signs.

The provider also ensured that 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 identified. People who are likely to come into contact with blood products, and are at increased risk of injuries from sharp instruments, should receive the Hepatitis B vaccination to minimise the risks of acquiring blood borne infections.

We saw that a fire risk assessment had been carried out. The provider had arrangements in place to mitigate the risks associated with fire, for example, one of the staff undertook a lead role for fire safety, safety signage was displayed, fire-fighting equipment was available, and fire drills were carried out regularly. Staff were familiar with the evacuation procedures in the event of a fire.

Infection control

We saw systems were in place for cleaning, sterilising and storing dental instruments. We did note however the boxes to transport 'dirty instruments' were not clearly identified. We also saw that water lines were not been flushed as frequently as outlined in the 'Health Technical

Memorandum 01-05 (HTM 01-05): Decontamination in primary care dental practices' published by the Department of Health. The principal dentist assured us that this would be rectified.

The decontamination equipment was regularly serviced, validated and checked to ensure it was safe to use.

An infection control lead was in place and they ensured there was a comprehensive infection control policy and set of procedures to help keep patients safe. These included hand hygiene, manual cleaning, managing waste products and decontamination guidance. We observed waste was separated into safe containers for disposal by a registered waste carrier and appropriate documentation retained.

We also saw the infection prevention control audit completed in 2016, which had risk assessed the dental practice and highlighted action to be taken if required.

We looked around the premises during the inspection and found the treatment rooms and the decontamination room was visibly clean and hygienic. They were free from clutter and had sealed floors and work surfaces that could be cleaned with ease to promote good standards of infection prevention and control.

Staff cleaned the treatment areas and surfaces between each patient and at the end of the morning and afternoon sessions to help maintain infection control standards.

We saw all sharps bins were being used correctly and located appropriately. The practice operated a "safer sharps" policy to reduce the risk of injury to staff and patients. Safer syringes had been purchased and where possible sharp items were single use only.

The practice had completed a Legionella risk assessment. The practice met the Legionella safety guidelines and completed monthly water temperature checks. (Legionella is a germ found in the environment which can contaminate water systems in buildings). The practice had taken appropriate action to ensure the safety of the staff and patients.

The segregation and disposal of dental waste was in accordance with current guidelines laid down by the Department of Health in the Health Technical Memorandum 07-01 Safe management of healthcare waste. The practice had arrangements for all types of

Are services safe?

dental waste to be removed from the premises by a contractor. Spillage kits were available for contaminated spillages. We observed that clinical waste awaiting collection was stored securely.

Equipment and medicines

Equipment checks were regularly carried out in line with the manufacturer's recommendations.

We saw evidence of servicing certificates for equipment such as the autoclave (a device for sterilising dental and medical instruments), compressor and X-ray equipment. We also saw certificates of electrical and gas safety.

We saw evidence a fire risk assessment was completed and the fire safety equipment was checked annually. Fire alarms and emergency lighting were tested regularly and a recent staff fire drill had taken place.

Radiography (X-rays)

The practice had a Radiation Protection Adviser (RPA) and Radiation Protection Supervisor (RPS). X-ray equipment

was located in all treatment rooms. The practice's radiation protection file was maintained in line with the Ionising Radiation Regulations 1999 and Ionising Radiation (Medical Exposure) Regulations 2000 (IRMER). It was detailed and up to date with an inventory of all X-ray equipment and maintenance records. We found there were suitable arrangements in place to ensure the safety of the equipment.

X-rays were taken in accordance with the Faculty of General Dental Practice (FGDP) Good Practice Guidelines. The justification for taking X-rays was recorded in dental care records to evidence the potential benefit and/or risks of the exposure had been considered. The patients dental records indicated each radiograph was quality assured and the findings reported on as per FGDP guidance. X-rays were stored within the patient's dental care record. However we noted that the X-rays were not always quality audited by staff who had completed the appropriate training. The principal dentist assured us that this would be rectified.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Monitoring and improving outcomes for patients

A thorough examination was carried out to assess the dental hard and soft tissues including an oral cancer screen. Dental professionals also used the basic periodontal examination (BPE) to check patients' gums. This is a simple screening tool that indicates how healthy the patient's gums and bone surrounding the teeth are.

The dentists used NICE guidance to determine a suitable recall interval for the patients. This takes into account the likelihood of the patient experiencing dental decay, gum disease or oral cancer. This was documented and also discussed with the patient.

We saw patient record audits were undertaken by the practice and any necessary actions dealt with.

We received feedback via CQC comment cards; we also reviewed patient surveys the practice had undertaken. Comments received reflected that patients were very satisfied with the staff, explanations, and the quality of the dentistry and outcomes.

Health promotion & prevention

Dentists were working in accordance with guidance issued in the Public Health England June 2014 publication 'Delivering better oral health: an evidence-based toolkit for prevention' when providing preventive oral health care and advice to patients. 'Delivering better oral health' is an evidence based toolkit to support dental teams in improving their patient's oral and general health.

Preventative measures included providing patients with oral hygiene advice such as tooth brushing technique, fluoride varnish applications and dietary advice. Smoking and alcohol consumption was also checked where applicable

The waiting area contained a variety of health promotion leaflets and posters that explained effective dental hygiene and how to reduce the risk of poor dental health. The medical history form patients completed included questions about smoking and alcohol consumption.

Staffing

New staff confirmed they had completed a period of induction and training which covered areas such as cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) and infection prevention and control.

Staff told us that staff appraisals were undertaken which identified future training needs. We noted the appraisals were a two way process and included a competency and performance assessment.

We saw that staff were encouraged to maintain the continuous professional development (CPD) which was a requirement of their registration with the General Dental Council (GDC). The GDC is the statutory body responsible for regulating dentists, dental therapists, dental hygienists, dental nurses, clinical dental technicians and dental technicians. All clinical staff members were registered with the GDC and registration certificates were available in the practice.

Working with other services

The practice worked with other professionals where this was in the best interest of the patient. For example, referrals were made to hospitals and specialist dental services for further investigations or specialist treatment. Where patients had complex dental needs, such as suspected oral cancer, the practice referred them to other healthcare professionals using their referral process. Information was shared appropriately when patients were referred to other health care providers. Urgent referrals were made in line with current guidelines.

Consent to care and treatment

Patients told us they were given appropriate information to support them to make decisions about the treatment they received. Staff confirmed they ensured patients had sufficient information and the mental capacity to give informed consent. Staff described to us how valid consent was obtained for all care and treatment and the role family members and carers might have in supporting the patient to understand and make decisions.

The dentists told us they ensured patients gave their consent before treatment began and a treatment plan was signed by the patient. They confirmed individual treatment options, risks, benefits and costs were always discussed with each patient. Patients were given time to consider and

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

make choices about which option they preferred. NHS treatment costs were displayed in the waiting room along with information in a variety of formats on dental treatments to assist patients with treatment choices.

The dentists told us they would generally only see children under 16 who were accompanied by a parent or guardian to ensure consent was obtained before treatment was undertaken. Dentists demonstrated an understanding of Gillick competency. (Gillick competency is a term used in

medical law to decide whether a child of 16 years or under is able to consent to their own treatment).

The practice had a consent policy in place and staff had completed training and were aware of their responsibilities under the Mental Capacity Act (2005) (MCA). Mental Capacity Act 2005 – provides a legal framework for acting and making decisions on behalf of adults who lack the capacity to make particular decisions for themselves.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Respect, dignity, compassion & empathy

We looked at CQC comment cards patients had completed prior to the inspection. Patients felt they were always treated with kindness and respect, and staff were friendly, caring, and helpful.

Staff understood the importance of emotional support when delivering care to patients who were nervous of dental treatment.

We observed privacy and confidentiality were maintained for patients who used the service on the day of the inspection. Staff told us they were aware of the importance of providing patients with privacy and how to maintain confidentiality. Patients' dental care records were stored electronically. Computers were password protected and backed up to a secure storage daily.

Treatment rooms were situated away from the main waiting area and we saw that doors were closed at all times

when patients were being seen. An information screen was played in the waiting area and conversations could not be heard from outside the treatment rooms which protected patient privacy.

Staff were confident in data protection and confidentiality principles and had completed information governance training.

Involvement in decisions about care and treatment

The practice provided patients with information to enable them to make informed choices about their dental care and treatment. NHS and private treatment costs were displayed in the waiting area. The practice's website provided patients with information about the range of treatments which were available at the practice.

Staff described to us how they involved patients' relatives or carers when required and ensured there was sufficient time to explain fully the care and treatment they were providing in a way patients understood.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting patients' needs

As part of our inspection we conducted a tour of the practice and we found the facilities were appropriate for the services that were planned and delivered.

The practice provided patients with information about the services they offered in the waiting room and in the practice leaflet.

We looked at the recorded appointments and found capacity for urgent or emergency appointments. We confirmed that the practice scheduled longer appointments where required if a patient needed more support.

We observed the clinics ran smoothly on the day of the inspection and patients were not kept waiting.

Tackling inequity and promoting equality

The practice had an equality, diversity and human rights policy in place to support staff understanding and meeting the needs of patients. The staff told us they did not have any patients whose first language was not English, however if required an interpreter service would be sought via the telephone language services.

The practice was accessible to people with disabilities and impaired mobility, but the toilet facilities were not accessible to wheelchair users. Parking was available near the premises. The waiting room, reception, toilet facilities and a treatment room were based on the ground floor, and a second treatment room was based on the first floor.

The practice made provision for patients to arrange appointments by telephone or in person, and patients received appointment reminders by email, letter or telephone call. The practice provided extended and flexible appointment time to patients who were vulnerable and in need or extra care and support.

Access to the service

The practice is open Monday-Friday 8:30am-5pm, with the exception of Wednesday when the practice closes at 1pm.

We saw that patients could access treatment and care in a timely way. The practice opening hours, and the 'out of hours' appointment information, were displayed. Emergency appointments were available daily for patients.

Concerns & complaints

The practice had a complaints policy which provided guidance to staff on how to handle a complaint. The policy was detailed in accordance with the Local Authority Social Services and National Health Service Complaints (England) Regulations 2009 and as recommended by the GDC.

Information for patients was available in the waiting areas. This included how to make a complaint, how complaints would be dealt with and the time frames for responses.

Staff told us they raised any patient comments or concerns with the principal dentist immediately to ensure responses were made in a timely manner.

The practice received two complaints in the last twelve months. We saw records that showed the complaints had been effectively managed.

Are services well-led?

Our findings

Governance arrangements

The practice had governance arrangements in place including various policies and procedures for monitoring and improving the services provided for patients. Staff were aware of their roles and responsibilities within the practice. The principal dentist was in charge of the day to day running of the service.

There was an effective management structure in place to ensure that responsibilities of staff were clear. Staff told us that they felt supported and were clear about their roles and responsibilities.

Health and safety and risk management policies were in place and we saw a risk management process to ensure the safety of patients and staff members. For example, we saw risk assessments relating to exposure to hazardous substances and medical emergencies.

Leadership, openness and transparency

The overall leadership was provided by the principal dentist. The ethos of the practice was clearly apparent in all staff as being able to provide the best service possible.

Staff told us they were aware of the need to be open, honest and apologetic to patients if anything was to go wrong; this is in accordance with the Duty of Candour requirements. Duty of Candour is a legal duty to inform and apologise to patients if there have been mistakes in their care that have led to significant harm.

We saw the practice had three monthly full practice meetings. We saw recorded minutes of the meetings, and noted that items discussed included clinical and non-clinical issues.

The provider operated an open door policy. Staff said they could speak to the provider if they had any concerns, and that the provider and all their colleagues were approachable and supportive.

Learning and improvement

The practice had supported staff to access some learning and improvement opportunities. Staff confirmed that they were supported with further development and training to ensure continuous professional development (CPD) as required by the General Dental Council (GDC).

Staff confirmed that learning from complaints, incidents, audits, and feedback was discussed at staff meetings to share learning to inform and improve future practice.

The practice had introduced clinical and non-clinical audits. These included infection prevention and control, X-ray quality and record keeping. The principal dentist provided feedback to staff identifying where improvement actions may be needed.

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

Staff told us that information was shared and they could raise any concerns about the practice if they needed to.

Patients' surveys were conducted by the practice in the last 12 months. The surveys comments had been reviewed and responded to, for instance the practice had provided alternative seating for older patients and more children's books in the waiting area.

The practice also displayed the family and friends NHS survey results for September. They had received 100% for patients recommending the practice to others, which they displayed in the waiting area.