

Gensmile Dental Care Limited

Bond Street Dental Partners

Inspection Report

12/12a Bond Street
Redruth
Cornwall
TR15 2QB
Tel: 01209 217203
Website: bondstreetdental.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 14 June 2018
Date of publication: 24/07/2018

Overall summary

We carried out this announced inspection on 14 June 2018 under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as part of our regulatory functions. We planned the inspection to check whether the registered provider was meeting the legal requirements in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 and associated regulations. The inspection was led by a CQC inspector who was supported by a specialist dental adviser.

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

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

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

Our findings were:

Are services safe?

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

Are services effective?

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

Are services caring?

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

Are services responsive?

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

Are services well-led?

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

Background

Bond Street Dental Partners is in Redruth and provides private treatment to adults.

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

The dental team includes seven dentists, three dental nurses, three trainee dental nurses, one receptionist and a practice manager. The practice has four treatment rooms.

Summary of findings

The practice is owned by a company and as a condition of registration must have a person registered with the Care Quality Commission as the registered manager. Registered managers have legal responsibility for meeting the requirements in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 and associated regulations about how the practice is run. The registered manager at Bond Street Dental Partners was the practice manager.

On the day of inspection we collected 18 CQC comment cards filled in by patients. This gave us a positive view of the practice.

During the inspection we spoke with four dentists, the dental nurses/trainee dental nurses on duty and one locum dental nurse, the receptionist, one of the company directors and the practice manager. We looked at practice policies and procedures and other records about how the service is managed.

The practice is open: Monday to Friday 8:30am – 5pm.

Our key findings were:

- The practice leadership was encouraging a culture of continuous improvement.
- Staff knew how to deal with emergencies. Appropriate medicines and life-saving equipment were available.
- The practice had systems in place to help them manage risk, although some improvements could be made.
- The practice staff had suitable safeguarding processes and staff knew their responsibilities for safeguarding adults and children.
- The clinical staff provided patients' care and treatment in line with current guidelines.
- Staff treated patients with dignity and respect and took care to protect their privacy and personal information.
- The appointment system met patients' needs.
- A number of new staff appointments meant there was an enthusiastic staff team who worked well together.
- The practice asked patients for feedback about the services they provided.
- The practice staff dealt with complaints positively and efficiently.
- The practice staff had suitable information governance arrangements.

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

- Review the practice's protocols for referral of patients and ensure urgent referrals are monitored suitably.
- Review the practice's sharps procedures and ensure the practice is in compliance with the Health and Safety (Sharp Instruments in Healthcare) Regulations 2013.
- Review the practice's infection control procedures and protocols to take into account guidelines issued by the Department of Health - Health Technical Memorandum 01-05: Decontamination in primary care dental practices and have regard to The Health and Social Care Act 2008: 'Code of Practice about the prevention and control of infections and related guidance.' In particular with reference to development of a written water line management schedule, adherence to the schedule for labelling of decontaminated laboratory work and pest avoidance management.

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

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

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

Staff knew how to recognise the signs of abuse and how to report safeguarding concerns.

Staff were qualified for their roles.

The practice followed national guidance for cleaning, sterilising and storing dental instruments. Some improvements could be made to ensure current infection control guidance is followed.

The practice had suitable arrangements for dealing with medical and other emergencies.

The practice's sharps instruments policy would benefit from review and further staff training.

No action



Are services effective?

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

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

Improvements could be made to ensure the protocol for when patients needed to be referred to other dental or health care professionals is adhered to.

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

No action



Are services caring?

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

We received feedback about the practice from 18 people. Patients were positive about all aspects of the service the practice provided. They told us staff were polite and showed compassion toward their patients.

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

We saw that staff protected patients' privacy and were aware of the importance of confidentiality. Patients said staff treated them with dignity and respect.

No action



Summary of findings

Are services responsive to people's needs?

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

The practice's appointment system was efficient and met patients' needs. Patients could get an appointment quickly if in pain.

Staff considered patients' different needs. This included providing facilities for disabled patients and families with children. The practice had made reasonable adjustments for patients with disabilities. The premises did not have an accessible toilet suitable for wheelchair users. This information was signposted to potential patients on the practice website.

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

No action



Are services well-led?

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

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

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

The practice monitored clinical and non-clinical areas of their work to help them improve and learn. This included asking for and listening to the views of patients and staff.

No action



Are services safe?

Our findings

Safety systems and processes (including staff recruitment, Equipment & premises and Radiography (X-rays))

The practice had systems to keep patients safe.

Staff knew their responsibilities if they had concerns about the safety of children, young people and adults who were vulnerable due to their circumstances. The practice had safeguarding policies and procedures to provide staff with information about identifying, reporting and dealing with suspected abuse. We saw evidence that staff received safeguarding training, although the organisation was experiencing current difficulties in sourcing training for non-GDC registered staff. We discussed this with the management team, who told us they were actively looking into alternative training provision, including in-house training. We spoke with staff and they knew about the signs and symptoms of abuse and neglect and how to report concerns.

The practice had a whistleblowing policy. Staff we spoke with told us they felt confident they could raise concerns without fear of recrimination.

The dentists used rubber dams in line with guidance from the British Endodontic Society when providing root canal treatment. However, in instances where the rubber dam was not used, such as for example refusal by the patient, and where other methods were not used to protect the airway, the dentists told us they did not complete risk assessments in patients' record. We raised this with the management team, who told us this would be raised as a learning point with the dentists.

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

The practice had a staff recruitment policy and procedure to help them employ suitable staff and also had checks in place for agency and locum staff. These reflected the relevant legislation. We looked at two staff recruitment records. These showed the practice followed their recruitment procedure. However, recording of references received was inconsistent. We raised this with the management team who told us they would ensure all future references received verbally would be documented.

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

The practice ensured that facilities and equipment were safe and that equipment was maintained according to manufacturers' instructions, including electrical and gas appliances.

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

The practice had arrangements to ensure the safety of the X-ray equipment. However, we noted that three yearly performance checks on the X-ray units had not been completed. We raised this with the management team, who took immediate action during the inspection to book the units in for performance testing.

We saw evidence that the dentists justified, graded and reported on the radiographs they took. The practice carried out radiography audits every year following current guidance and legislation.

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

Risks to patients

There were systems to assess, monitor and manage risks to patient safety.

The practice's health and safety policies, procedures and risk assessments were reviewed regularly to help manage potential risk. The practice had current employer's liability insurance.

We looked at the practice's arrangements for safe dental care and treatment. We spoke with the dentists who described a range of dental needle systems in use at the practice. During the inspection the organisation sharps use policy could not be found. Risk assessments for the differing types of sharps needle systems in use at the practice had not been completed. We discussed this with the management team. Improvements could be made to revise the practice sharps policy, discuss the contents with the dental team and made arrangements, where necessary, to risk assess where the policy is not followed.

Are services safe?

The provider had a system in place to ensure clinical staff had received appropriate vaccinations, including the vaccination to protect them against the Hepatitis B virus, and that the effectiveness of the vaccination was checked.

Staff knew how to respond to a medical emergency and completed training in emergency resuscitation and basic life support (BLS) every year.

Emergency medicines were available as described in recognised guidance. Staff kept records of their checks to make sure these were available, within their expiry date, and in working order. We noted that some emergency equipment intended for use in airway management was missing. We raised this with the management team, who took immediate action to order the necessary equipment for guaranteed next day delivery.

A dental nurse worked with the dentists when they treated patients in line with GDC Standards for the Dental Team.

The provider had suitable risk assessments to minimise the risk that can be caused from substances that are hazardous to health.

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

The practice had infection prevention and control policy and procedures. However, improvements could be made as there was no written schedule for dental chair water line management. Staff completed infection prevention and control training and received updates as required.

The practice had suitable arrangements for transporting, cleaning, checking, sterilising and storing instruments in line with guidance in The Health Technical Memorandum 01-05: Decontamination in primary care dental practices (HTM01-05) published by the Department of Health and Social Care. The records showed equipment used by staff for cleaning and sterilising instruments were validated, maintained and used in line with the manufacturers' guidance.

The practice had in place systems to ensure that any dental laboratory work was disinfected prior to being sent to a dental laboratory and before the dental laboratory work was fitted in a patient's mouth. We noted that one laboratory item awaiting collection had not been labelled as disinfected. We raised this with the management team

who investigated and assured us it had been disinfected. They told us this would be raised in the next staff meeting to ensure the labelling protocol was consistently adhered to.

The practice had procedures to reduce the possibility of Legionella or other bacteria developing in the water systems, in line with a risk assessment. All recommendations had been actioned and records of water testing and dental unit water line management were in place.

We saw cleaning schedules for the premises. The practice was clean when we inspected and patients confirmed that this was usual.

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

The practice carried out infection prevention and control audits twice a year. The latest audit showed the practice was meeting the required standards.

We noted that on a very warm day that staff often opened a door in the ground floor dental instrument decontamination room to the back yard. The back yard was untidy with a number of cardboard boxes awaiting collection. This presented a potential pest risk for the practice via the decontamination room. We raised this with the management team who told us the boxes were due for collection later in the day and that the yard would be cleaned up at the end of the inspection to reduce the pest risk.

Information to deliver safe care and treatment

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

We discussed with the management team and dentists how information to deliver safe care and treatment was handled and recorded. We looked at a sample of dental care records to confirm our findings and noted that individual records were written and managed in a way that kept patients safe. Dental care records we saw were accurate, complete, and legible and were kept securely and complied with General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) protection requirements.

Safe and appropriate use of medicines

Are services safe?

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

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

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

An antimicrobial prescribing audit had been completed in the last 12 months. This audit demonstrated the dentists were following current guidelines.

Track record on safety

The practice monitored and reviewed incidents. This helped it to understand risks and gave a clear, accurate and current picture that led to safety improvements.

There was a system for receiving and acting on safety alerts. The practice learned from external safety events as well as patient and medicine safety alerts.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Effective needs assessment, care and treatment

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

The practice offered dental implants. These were placed by one of the dentists at the practice who had undergone appropriate post-graduate training in this speciality. The provision of dental implants was in accordance with national guidance.

Helping patients to live healthier lives

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

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

The dentists told us that where applicable they discussed smoking, alcohol consumption and diet with patients during appointments. The practice had a selection of dental products for sale and provided health promotion leaflets to help patients with their oral health. However, the dentists were not signposting patients to local schemes available in supporting patients to stop smoking services or directing patients to these schemes when necessary. We raised this with the management team, who noted this for future staff team meeting discussion.

The dentists described to us the procedures they used to improve the outcome of periodontal treatment. This involved preventative advice, taking plaque and gum bleeding scores and detailed charts of the patient's gum condition. Patients with more severe gum disease were recalled at more frequent intervals to review their compliance and to reinforce home care preventative advice.

Consent to care and treatment

The practice obtained consent to care and treatment in line with legislation and guidance.

The practice team understood the importance of obtaining and recording patients' consent to treatment. The dentists told us they gave patients information about treatment options and the risks and benefits of these so they could make informed decisions. Patients confirmed their dentist listened to them and gave them clear information about their treatment.

The practice's consent policy included information about the Mental Capacity Act 2005. The team understood their responsibilities under the act when treating adults who may not be able to make informed decisions. The policy also referred to Gillick competence, by which a child under the age of 16 years of age can consent for themselves. The staff were aware of the need to consider this when treating young people under 16 years of age.

Staff described how they involved patients' relatives or carers when appropriate and made sure they had enough time to explain treatment options clearly.

Monitoring care and treatment

The practice kept detailed dental care records containing information about the patients' current dental needs, past treatment and medical histories. The dentists assessed patients' treatment needs in line with recognised guidance.

We saw that the practice audited patients' dental care records to check that the dentists recorded the necessary information.

Effective staffing

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

Staff told us they discussed training needs at annual appraisals. Staff confirmed that annual appraisals took place.

Co-ordinating care and treatment

Dentists confirmed they referred patients to a range of specialists in primary and secondary care if they needed treatment the practice did not provide.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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

Improvements could be made as the practice did not have a protocol to follow to ensure all referrals were monitored to make sure they were dealt with promptly.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Kindness, respect and compassion

Staff treated patients with kindness, respect and compassion.

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

Patients commented positively that staff were polite and showed compassion toward their patients. We saw that staff treated patients respectfully, appropriately and kindly and were friendly towards patients at the reception desk and over the telephone.

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

Patient survey results were available for patients to read.

Privacy and dignity

The practice respected and promoted patients' privacy and dignity.

Staff were aware of the importance of privacy and confidentiality. The layout of reception and waiting areas

provided privacy when reception staff were dealing with patients. Staff told us that if a patient asked for more privacy they would take them into another room. The reception computer screens were not visible to patients and staff did not leave patients' personal information where other patients might see it.

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

Involving people in decisions about care and treatment

Staff helped patients be involved in decisions about their care. Telephone interpretation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language.

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

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

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting people's needs

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

The practice had made reasonable adjustments for patients with disabilities. These included step free access and a hearing loop. The premises did not have an accessible toilet suitable for wheelchair users. This information was signposted to potential patients on the practice website.

Staff told us that they contacted all patients the working day before their appointment to make sure they could get to the practice.

Timely access to services

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

The practice displayed its opening hours in the premises and on their website.

The practice had an efficient appointment system to respond to patients' needs. Staff told us that patients who requested an urgent appointment were seen the same day. Patients told us they had enough time during their appointment and did not feel rushed. Appointments ran smoothly on the day of the inspection and patients were not kept waiting.

The practice website and answerphone provided telephone numbers for patients needing emergency dental treatment during the working day and when the practice was not open. We noticed that a poster on the practice door detailing this information was obscured by privacy glass. We raised this with the management team, who said they would make arrangements to re-site this information so that it was visible. Patients confirmed they could make routine and emergency appointments easily and were rarely kept waiting for their appointment.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

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

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

The practice manager was responsible for dealing with these. Information was available about organisations patients could contact if not satisfied with the way the practice dealt with their concerns.

We looked at comments, compliments and complaints the practice received in the last 12 months. These showed the practice responded to concerns appropriately and discussed outcomes with staff to share learning and improve the service.

Are services well-led?

Our findings

Leadership capacity and capability

The organisation's partners were knowledgeable about issues and priorities relating to the quality and future of services. They understood the challenges and were addressing them.

The practice manager was visible and approachable. They worked closely with staff and others to make sure they prioritised compassionate leadership. We discussed ways of bringing clinical leadership on-site, rather than the current remote leadership model used. The partners, during 2018, had secured employment of dentists with permanent contracts, rather than a previous reliance upon locum staff, which had resulted in a fragmented service and a high number of patient complaints. There were now opportunities to develop clinical leadership at the practice in partnership with the strategic clinical leadership off-site from one of the partners; who is a practicing dentist elsewhere. The current permanent dental team at the practice were enthusiastic and knowledgeable regarding general dentistry. We discussed the merits of introducing specific dentist team meetings at the practice to develop a sense of clinical leadership.

Culture

The management team were improving the culture at the practice by bringing the team together to nurture a common identity for the practice team after a number of new appointments. Staff stated they felt respected, supported and valued. The practice focused on the needs of patients.

The provider was aware of and had systems to ensure compliance with the requirements of the Duty of Candour.

Staff on duty told us they were able to raise concerns and were encouraged to do so. They had confidence that these would be addressed.

Engagement with patients, the public, staff and external partners

The practice used patient surveys and verbal comments to obtain staff and patients' views about the service. Managers told us that patients had commented about the upkeep of the building, both internally and externally. We were told that a number of areas in the practice had been upgraded in recent years, including treatment rooms. The practice had a plan for further upgrade and improvement to the appearance of the premises.

The practice gathered feedback from staff through meetings and informal discussions. Staff were encouraged to offer suggestions for improvements to the service.

Continuous improvement and innovation

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

The practice had quality assurance processes to encourage learning and continuous improvement. These included audits of dental care records, radiographs and infection prevention and control. They had clear records of the results of these audits and the resulting action plans and improvements.

The partners showed a commitment to learning and improvement and valued the contributions made to the team by individual members of staff.

Staff told us they completed training as per General Dental Council professional standards. This included undertaking medical emergencies and basic life support training annually.