

Oak Tree Dental Practice

Oak Tree Dental Practice

Inspection Report

Oak Tree Dental Practice
303 Brighton Road
South Croydon
Surrey
CR2 6EQ
Tel: 02086804645
Website: NA

Date of inspection visit: 25 August 2015
Date of publication: 07/01/2016

Overall summary

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection on 25 August 2015 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

Oak Tree Dental Practice is located in the London Borough of Croydon. The premises consist of one treatment room and one dedicated decontamination room. There are also toilet facilities, waiting area, a reception area and a staff room.

The practice provides NHS and private dental services and treats both adults and children. The practice offers a range of dental services including routine examinations and treatment, veneers, crowns and bridges and oral hygiene.

The practice staffing consisted of one dentist (who was also the manager and provider), one dental nurse and one administrator.

The practice is open; Monday to Wednesday 9:00am to 5:00pm and Friday 9:00am to 1:00pm. The practice books patients in on Tuesday only for treatments.

The owner is the principal dentist, manager and the provider of the service.

The principal dentist is also the registered manager. A registered manager is a person who is registered with the Care Quality Commission (CQC) to manage the service. 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.

Summary of findings

The inspection took place over one day and was carried out by a CQC inspector and a dental specialist advisor.

We received five CQC comment cards completed by patients. Patients had commented positively about the dentist and their experience of being treated at the practice.

Our key findings were:

- The practice recorded and analysed significant events and complaints and shared learning with staff.
- The practice had effective safeguarding processes in place and staff understood their responsibilities regarding child protection and safeguarding vulnerable adults.
- Infection control procedures were in place and the practice followed the related guidance.
- Appropriate medicines and life-saving equipment were readily available.
- The practice ensured staff attended relevant training to maintain the necessary skills and competence to meet patients' needs.
- Patients received clear explanations about their proposed treatment, costs, options and risks and were involved in making decisions.

- The practice was well-led and staff worked as a team.
- Governance systems were effective and there was a range of clinical and non-clinical audits to monitor the quality of services.
- The practice sought feedback from staff and patients about the services they provided
- The appointment system met the needs of patients and waiting times were kept to a minimum.

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

- Review the practices' current Legionella risk assessment giving due regard to guidelines issued by the Department of Health - Health Technical Memorandum 01-05: Decontamination in primary care dental practices and The Health and Social Care Act 2008: 'Code of Practice about the prevention and control of infections and related guidance'.
- Review the practice's waste handling protocols to ensure waste is segregated and disposed of in accordance with relevant regulations giving due regard to guidance issued in the Health Technical Memorandum 07-01 (HTM 07-01).

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 and processes in place to ensure all care and treatment was carried out safely. Significant events, complaints and accidents were recorded appropriately, investigated and analysed and improvement measures implemented.

There was a safeguarding lead and staff understood their responsibilities for identifying and reporting any potential abuse. There were suitable recruitment procedures in place and staff were trained and skilled to meet patient's needs.

The practice had robust infection control procedures and staff had received training in infection prevention and control. Radiation equipment was suitably maintained and only used by trained staff. Local rules were displayed clearly where X-rays were carried out.

There were systems for identifying, investigating and learning from incidents relating to the safety of patients and staff members. We found the equipment used in the practice was maintained and checked for effectiveness.

Are services effective?

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

The practice provided evidence-based care in accordance with relevant, published guidance, for example, from the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. The practice monitored patients' oral health and gave appropriate health promotion advice. Patients were referred to other services in a timely manner if needed.

Staff explained treatment options to ensure that patients could make informed decisions about any treatment. The practice worked with other providers when required and followed up on the outcomes of referrals made to other providers. Staff, (where applicable) were registered with the General Dental Council and were engaged in continuous professional development to meet the training requirements of their registration.

Are services caring?

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

We received feedback from patients through CQC comment cards and in speaking with them on the day of the inspection. We found that they were treated with dignity and respect. We noted a caring attitude amongst the staff towards the patients. We found that dental care records were stored securely and patient confidentiality was well maintained.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

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

The practice was accessible to patients with restricted mobility, with level access and ground floor surgeries if needed.

Patients were able to access treatment quickly in an emergency, and there were arrangements in place for patients to receive alternative emergency treatment when the practice was closed.

The practice had a complaints procedure that explained to patients the process to follow, the timescales involved for investigation and the person responsible for handling the issue. The practice was following this policy and procedure.

Summary of findings

Are services well-led?

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

The practice had clinical governance and risk-management structures in place. Staff described an open and transparent culture where they were comfortable raising and discussing concerns with the principal dentist. The practice had arrangements in place for monitoring and improving the services provided for patients. Regular checks and audits were completed to ensure the practice was safe and patients' needs were being met.

The practice had a full range of policies and procedures to ensure the practice was safe and met patient's needs. Responses to patients' concerns or complaints had been recorded, and showed an open no blame approach.

Oak Tree Dental Practice

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 practice was meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008.

We carried out an announced, comprehensive inspection on 25 August 2015. The inspection took place over one day. The inspection was led by a CQC inspector. They were accompanied by a dental nurse specialist advisor.

We reviewed information received from the provider prior to the inspection.

During our inspection visit, we reviewed policy documents; spoke with two members of staff, including the provider and four patients that were at the practice on the day. We conducted a tour of the practice and looked at the storage

arrangements for emergency medicines and equipment. We observed dental staff carrying out decontamination procedures of dental instruments and also observed staff interacting with patients in the waiting area.

We reviewed five Care Quality Commission (CQC) comment cards completed by patients. They had all commented positively about the dentist and their experience of being treated 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

There was an effective system in place for reporting and learning from incidents. There was a policy for staff to follow for the reporting of these events. The manager told us incidents would be appropriately recorded and investigated. Actions taken at the time and any lessons that could be learnt to prevent a recurrence would be noted and discussed with staff. Where necessary a staff meeting would be convened to discuss learning points which would improve the quality of care.

Staff understood the process for accident and incident reporting including the Reporting of Injuries, Diseases and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations 2013 (RIDDOR). The manager explained to us the processes for reporting incidents within the practice. They confirmed there had been no accidents that had required notification under the RIDDOR guidance.

Reliable safety systems and processes (including safeguarding)

The dentist was the named practice lead for child and adult safeguarding. The safeguarding lead was able to describe the types of behaviour a child might display that would alert them to possible signs of abuse or neglect.

The practice had a safeguarding policy which referred to national guidance. All staff had completed safeguarding training and the staff we spoke with were able to describe what might be signs of abuse or neglect and how they would raise concerns with the safeguarding lead. There had been no safeguarding issues reported by the practice to the local safeguarding team.

Staff were aware of the procedures for whistleblowing if they had concerns about another member of staff's performance. They told us they were confident about raising such issues with the practice manager in the first instance.

The practice had carried out a range of risk assessments and implemented policies and protocols with a view to keeping staff and patients safe. For example, a practice-wide risk assessment had been carried out which

covered topics such as fire safety, sharps safety and the safe use of X-ray equipment. The practice manager could demonstrate that they followed up any issues identified during audits as a method for minimising risks.

We asked how the practice treated the use of instruments which were used during root canal treatment. The dentist we spoke with explained that these instruments were single use only. They explained that root canal treatment and other treatment, where appropriate, was carried out using a rubber dam which was in line with guidance from the British Endodontic Society. (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).

Medical emergencies

The practice had most of the arrangements in place to deal with medical emergencies at the practice. The practice had an automated external defibrillator (AED). (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). The practice held emergency medicines in line with guidance issued by the British National Formulary for dealing with common medical emergencies in a dental practice. Oxygen and other related items, such as manual breathing aids and portable suction, were available in line with the Resuscitation Council UK guidelines. The emergency medicines were all in date.

Staff received annual training in using the emergency equipment, the last training was completed in March 2015.

Staff recruitment

The practice staffing consisted of one dentist (who was also the manager and provider), one dental nurse and one administrator.

The practice had a small team and had not recruited any new members of staff for over 15 years.

There was a recruitment policy in place and we saw that the practice would carry out relevant checks to ensure that the person being recruited was suitable and competent for the role. This would include the checking of qualifications, proof of identity, registration with the General Dental Council (where relevant) and checks with the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS).

Monitoring health & safety and responding to risks

Are services safe?

There were arrangements in place to deal with foreseeable emergencies. We saw that there was a health and safety policy in place. The practice had been assessed for risk of fire and there were documents showing that fire extinguishers had been recently serviced.

There were arrangements in place to meet the Control of Substances Hazardous to Health 2002 (COSHH) regulations. There was a system in place to record all COSHH products where risks to patients, staff and visitors associated with hazardous substances were identified. Actions were described to minimise any risks. Staff were aware of the COSHH records and the strategies in place to minimise the risks associated with these products. During our observations around the practice we saw COSHH products were securely stored.

The practice responded promptly to Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA) advice. MHRA alerts, and alerts from other agencies, were received by email at the practice and cascaded to staff where appropriate.

Infection control

There were effective systems in place to reduce the risk and spread of infection within the practice. It was demonstrated through direct observation of the cleaning process and a review of protocols that the practice was following most of the guidance on decontamination and infection control issued by the Department of Health, namely 'Health Technical Memorandum 01-05 - Decontamination in primary care dental practices (HTM 01-05)'.

We observed that the dental treatment rooms, waiting areas, reception and toilet were clean, tidy and clutter free. Hand washing facilities including liquid soap and paper towels were available in the treatment room and toilet. Hand washing protocols were displayed appropriately in various areas of the practice.

The manager and the dental nurse were jointly the infection control leads and they described 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 a good system for decontaminating the working surfaces, dental unit and dental chair.

The practice had a decontamination room for instrument processing. Protocols were displayed on the wall to remind staff about the correct processes to follow at each stage of the decontamination process. Staff demonstrated the process to us; 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 system designed to minimise the risks of infection.

When instruments had been sterilized they were pouched and stored appropriately until required. All pouches were dated with an expiry date in accordance with current guidelines. We saw some pouched instruments that were out of date. The manager removed these items from the drawers immediately and reprocessed them.

The dental nurse showed us that systems were in place to ensure that the autoclaves were working effectively. These included the automatic control test and steam penetration tests for the autoclave. It was observed that the data sheets used to record the essential daily validation were always complete and up to date.

The drawers and cupboards of the treatment room were inspected. We found some instruments were not correctly stored. The manager and the dental nurse removed these instantly and reprocessed all the items. The treatment room had the appropriate routine personal protective equipment such as gloves, aprons and eye protection available for staff and patient use.

The dental water lines were maintained to prevent the growth and spread of Legionella bacteria. (Legionella is a bacterium found in the environment which can contaminate water systems in buildings). The method described by the dental nurses was in line with current HTM 01-05 guidelines. The practice had not commissioned a Legionella risk assessment. The manager told us they would arrange this as soon as possible. These measures ensured that patients and staff were protected from the risk of infection associated with Legionella.

The segregation and storage of dental waste could be improved to ensure it was in line with current guidelines. For example, we observed that clinical waste bags were stored with nonclinical waste and clinical waste was not stored securely outside the building. The dental nurse and the manager carried out an immediate review and contacted the local council to order a clinical waste bin.

Are services safe?

Equipment and medicines

We found that the equipment used at the practice was regularly serviced and well maintained. For example, we saw documents showing that the air compressor, fire equipment and X-ray equipment had all been inspected and serviced within the last year. Portable appliance testing (PAT) had been completed in accordance with good practice guidance. PAT is the name of a process during which electrical appliances are routinely checked for safety.

The expiry dates of medicines, oxygen and equipment were monitored daily and monthly and a check sheet was signed by staff; this enabled the staff to replace out-of-date drugs and equipment promptly. We noted there were no regular checks for the AED.

We noted prescription pads were stored securely.

Radiography (X-rays)

The practice had in place a Radiation Protection Adviser (RPA) and a Radiation Protection Supervisor (RPS) in accordance with the Ionising Radiation Regulations 1999 and Ionising Radiation Medical Exposure Regulations 2000 (IRMER). A radiation protection file, in line with these regulations, was present. This file included the critical examination pack for the X-ray set, the three-yearly maintenance log and a copy of the local rules. The procedures and equipment had been assessed by an external RPA in July 2015. The maintenance log was within the current recommended interval of three years. The local rules were displayed next to the X-ray equipment.

A copy of the most recent radiological audit was available for inspection. This demonstrated that radiographs were graded and quality assured.

We saw evidence that relevant training had been completed in March 2014.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Monitoring and improving outcomes for patients

The practice carried out consultations, assessments and treatment in line with recognised general professional guidelines and General Dental Council (GDC) guidelines. The dentist we spoke with described how they carried out patient assessments using a typical patient journey scenario. The practice used a pathway approach to the assessment of the patient. The assessment begins with the patient completing a medical history questionnaire disclosing any health conditions, medicines being taken and any allergies suffered. The assessment also included details of their dental and social history. Following an examination of a patient's teeth, gums and soft tissues the diagnosis was then discussed with the patient and treatment options explained in detail.

The dental care record was updated with the proposed treatment after discussing options with the patient. Patients were monitored through follow-up appointments and these were scheduled in line with their individual requirements.

Health promotion & prevention

The practice promoted the maintenance of good oral health through the use of health promotion and disease prevention strategies. Staff told us they discussed oral health with their patients, for example, effective tooth brushing or dietary advice and they were aware of the Delivering Better Oral Health Toolkit when considering care and advice for patients. (This is an evidence based toolkit used by dental teams for the prevention of dental disease in a primary and secondary care setting). Where relevant the dentist identified patients' smoking status and recorded this in their notes. This prompted them to provide advice or consider how smoking status might be impacting on their oral health. They also carried out examinations to check for the early signs of oral cancer.

We observed that there were a small range of health promotion materials displayed in the waiting area. The manager told us they were in the process of updating these. The information could be used to support patient's understanding of how to prevent gum disease and how to maintain their teeth in good condition.

Staffing

Staff told us they received appropriate professional development and training. We reviewed staff files and saw that this was the case. The training covered all of the mandatory requirements for registration issued by the General Dental Council. This included responding to emergencies, safeguarding and infection control.

The practice held regular supervision and review meetings. This provided staff with an opportunity to discuss their current performance as well as their career aspirations. The manager told us that appraisals were completed annually and we noted this was last done in June 2015.

Working with other services

The practice had suitable arrangements in place for working with other health professionals to ensure quality of care for their patients. The dentist used a system of onward referral to other providers, for example, for orthodontic treatment. The practice kept a file with referral forms for local secondary providers. The dentist and receptionist ensured that referral letters were sent out on the same day that the dentist made the recommendation.

The dentist told us a referral letter would include all the necessary details from the patients' record including medical history. All letters were filed into patient's notes. When the patient had received their treatment they were discharged back to the practice for further follow-up and monitoring.

Consent to care and treatment

The practice ensured valid consent was obtained for all care and treatment. Patients told us the dentist discussed treatment options, including risks and benefits, as well as costs. Patients dental care records confirmed that treatment options, and their risks and benefits were discussed with them.

Formal written consent was obtained using standard treatment plan forms. Patients were asked to read and sign these before starting a course of treatment.

The dentists and dental nurse were aware of the Mental Capacity Act (2005). They could explain the meaning of the term mental capacity and described to us their responsibilities to act in patients' best interests, if patients lacked some decision-making abilities. The Mental

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Capacity Act 2005 (MCA) provides a legal framework for health and care professionals to act and make 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 received five CQC comment cards and spoke to four patients during our visit. All described a positive view of the service the practice provided. Patients commented that the team were caring, polite and efficient and the practice always appeared clean and tidy. They were happy with the quality of treatment provided.

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. All the staff we spoke with were mindful about treating patients in a respectful and caring way. They were aware of the importance of protecting patients' privacy and dignity.

There were systems in place to ensure that patients' confidential information was protected. Dental care records were stored securely. Staff understood the

importance of data protection and confidentiality and had received training in information governance. The dental nurse told us that people could request to have confidential discussions in an empty room, if necessary.

Involvement in decisions about care and treatment

The practice displayed information in the waiting area which gave details of NHS and private dental charges or fees. On the day of our inspection we observed the receptionist took time to explain appointments and NHS charges to patients in detail.

Staff told us that they took time to explain the treatment options available. They spent time answering patients' questions and gave patients a copy of their treatment plan.

The patient feedback we received via discussions and comment cards confirmed that patients felt appropriately involved in the planning of their treatment and were satisfied with the descriptions given by staff. They told us that treatment options were well explained; the dentist listened and understood their concerns, and respected their choices regarding treatment.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting patients' needs

The practice had a system in place to schedule enough time to assess and meet patients' needs. The dentist could decide on the length of time needed for their patient's consultation and treatment. They scheduled additional time for patients depending on their knowledge of the patient's needs, including scheduling additional time for patients who were known to be anxious or nervous.

Staff told us they had enough time to treat patients and that patients could generally book an appointment in good time to see the dentist. The feedback we received from patients confirmed that they could get an appointment within a reasonable time frame and that they had adequate time scheduled with the dentist to assess their needs and receive treatment.

Tackling inequity and promoting equality

The practice had recognised the needs of different groups in the planning of its service. Staff told us they treated everybody equally and welcomed patients from a range of different backgrounds, cultures and religions.

The dentist spoke Tamil as an additional language and told us they had access to a telephone translation service, although they had not had to use this so far.

The practice premises ensured that it was wheelchair accessible. For example, the corridors were wide enough to allow for wheelchair access.

Access to the service

The practice was open Monday to Wednesday 9:00am to 5:00pm and Friday 9:00am to 1:00pm. The manager told us they would fit patients in at other times when required. The practice leaflet included the opening hours and policy on booking and cancelling appointments.

Patients commented that they could get an appointment in good time and did not have any concerns about accessing the dentist if they were in pain.

We asked the manager about access to the service in an emergency or outside of normal opening hours. They told us the answer phone message and the practice leaflet gave details on how to access out of hours emergency treatment. They also displayed the information about local emergency dental services on the wall in the waiting area.

Concerns & complaints

There was a complaints policy which described how the practice handled formal and informal complaints from patients. Information about how to make a complaint was displayed in the reception area. There had been no complaints recorded in the last 12 months.

Are services well-led?

Our findings

Governance arrangements

The practice had good governance arrangements and enough staff to manage the service. They had implemented, suitable arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks through the use of scheduled risk assessments and audits. There were relevant policies and procedures in place. We noted some of these did need updating. Staff were aware of these policies and procedures and acted in line with them. There were regular practice meetings and notes were recorded in a meeting book. For example, we saw notes where issues such as MCA 2005 and infection control had been discussed. This facilitated an environment where improvement and continuous learning were supported.

Leadership, openness and transparency

The staff we spoke with described a transparent culture which encouraged candour, openness and honesty. Staff told us they were comfortable about raising concerns with the management staff. They felt they were listened to and responded to when they did so. They were aware that they could escalate concerns to external agencies, such as the Care Quality Commission (CQC), if necessary.

We spoke with the provider who was the principal dentist who told us they aimed to provide high-quality care. They were committed to both maintaining and continuously improving the quality of the care provided.

The staff we spoke with told us they enjoyed their work. There was a system of staff appraisals to support staff in carrying out their roles to meet the standards.

Learning and improvement

Staff were supported to pursue development opportunities. We saw evidence that staff were working towards completing the required number of CPD hours to maintain their professional development in line with requirements set by the General Dental Council (GDC).

The practice had a programme of clinical audit in place. These included audits for infection control, clinical record keeping and X-ray quality. The audits showed a good standard of work.

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

The practice gathered feedback from patients through the use of the 'Friends and Family Test' and all of the people responding said that they would be 'extremely likely' or 'likely' to recommend the practice to someone else.

Staff described an open culture where feedback between staff was encouraged in order to improve the quality of the care.