

Thamesview Dental Surgery

Thamesview Dental Surgery

Inspection Report

1st Floor New Health Center
1 Banstable Avenue Barking
Essex
IG11 0LG
Tel: 02085940041
Website: N/A

Date of inspection visit: 03 February 2016
Date of publication: 11/03/2016

Overall summary

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection on 03 February 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

Thamesview Dental Surgery is located in the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham and provides NHS and private dental treatment to both adults and children. The premises are on the first floor of a health center and consist of three treatment rooms, a reception area and a dedicated decontamination room. The premises are wheelchair accessible and have facilities for wheelchair users. The practice is open Monday to Friday 9:30am – 5:00pm.

The staff consists of two principal dentists, one associate dentist, one dental nurse, three trainee dental nurses and a receptionist.

The principal dentist is the registered manager. A registered manager is a person who is registered with the Care Quality Commission to manage the service. 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 reviewed 17 CQC comment cards completed by patients in the two weeks prior to our inspection. Patients were positive about the service. They were complimentary about the professional, friendly and caring attitude of the staff.

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

Our key findings were:

Summary of findings

- Patients' needs were assessed and care was planned in line with current guidance such as from the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE).
- Patients were involved in their care and treatment planning so they could make informed decisions.
- There were effective processes in place to reduce and minimise the risk and spread of infection.
- The practice had effective safeguarding processes in place and staff understood their responsibilities for safeguarding adults and child protection
- Equipment, such as the air compressor, autoclave (steriliser), fire extinguishers, and X-ray equipment had all been checked for effectiveness and had been regularly serviced.
- Patients were treated with dignity and respect and confidentiality was maintained.
- The appointment system met the needs of patients and waiting times were kept to a minimum.
- Patients indicated that they found the team to be efficient, professional, caring and reassuring.

- Risk assessments and audits were carried out but it was not clear how the findings were used to drive improvement.
- There were some pre-employment checks, such as references and identity checks, that had not been carried out for new members of staff

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

- Review its audit protocols to document learning points that are shared with all relevant staff and ensure that the resulting improvements can be demonstrated as part of the audit process.
- Review the practice's system for the recording, investigating and reviewing incidents with a view to preventing further occurrences and, ensuring that improvements are made as a result
- Review its responsibilities as regards to the Control of Substance Hazardous to Health (COSHH) Regulations 2002 and, ensure all documentation is up to date.
- Reviews requirements under the Reporting of Injuries, Diseases and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations 2013 (RIDDOR).
- Review recruitment procedures to ensure accurate, complete and detailed records are maintained securely for all staff.

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 in place for the management of infection control, clinical waste segregation and disposal, management of medical emergencies and dental radiography. We found the equipment used in the practice was maintained and in line with current guidelines. Processes were in place for reporting of accidents and incidents. Dental instruments were decontaminated suitably. Medicines and equipment were available in the event of an emergency and stored safely. X-rays were taken in accordance with relevant regulations.

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 Faculty of General Dental Practice (FGDP), National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) Department of Health (DH) and the General Dental Council (GDC). The practice monitored patients' oral health and gave appropriate health promotion advice. Staff explained treatment options to ensure that patients could make informed decisions about any treatment. The practice worked well with other providers and followed up on the outcomes of referrals made to other providers. We saw examples of effective collaborative team working.

Are services caring?

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

We reviewed 17 CQC comments cards completed by patients in the two weeks prior to our inspection. Patients were positive about the care they received from the practice. Patients commented they felt fully involved in making decisions about their treatment, were made comfortable and reassured. We also reviewed 17 comment cards from the NHS friend and family test and patients were positive in their feedback about the service.

We noted that patients were treated with respect and dignity during interactions at the reception desk and over the telephone

Are services responsive to people's needs?

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

The needs of people with disabilities had been considered and there was wheelchair access to the practice. The practice used feedback from patients to help to develop the service. Patients had access to information about the service. There was a practice leaflet with relevant information for patients and also a patient information noticeboard.

The practice provided friendly and personalised dental care. Patients had good access to appointments, including emergency appointments, which were available on the same day.

Are services well-led?

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

The staff we spoke with described an open and transparent culture which encouraged candour. Staff said that they felt comfortable about raising concerns with the principal dentist. They felt they were listened to and responded to when they did so. Leadership structures were clear and there were processes in place for dissemination of information and feedback to staff.

Summary of findings

The practice had suitable clinical governance and risk management structures in place. Staff meetings were held frequently and minutes taken of the meetings. Staff told us they enjoyed working at the practice and felt part of a team. Opportunities existed for staff for their professional development. Staff we spoke with were confident in their work and felt well-supported.

Thamesview Dental Surgery

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 03 February 2016. The inspection was carried out by a CQC inspector and a dental specialist advisor. Prior to the inspection we reviewed information submitted by the provider.

During our inspection visit, we reviewed policy documents and staff records. We spoke with five members of staff, which included the principal dentist, two associate dentists, two dental nurses and the receptionist. We conducted a tour of the practice and looked at the storage

arrangements for emergency medicines and equipment. We reviewed the practice's decontamination procedures of dental instruments and also observed staff interacting with patients in the waiting area.

We reviewed 17 CQC comment cards completed by patients in the two-week period prior to our inspection visit.

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

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

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

Are services safe?

Our findings

Reporting, learning and improvement from incidents

The practice had an incidents and accident reporting procedure. All staff we spoke with were aware of reporting procedures including recording them in the accident book. There were four reported incidents within the last 12 months. Records show that these incidents were reported in line with current guidance. However, improvements could be made to ensure that the reported incidents were investigated and the learning shared with staff.

There was a policy in place for Reporting of Injuries, Diseases and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations 2013 (RIDDOR). However, staff we spoke with were uncertain of these requirements. There were no RIDDOR incidents within the last 12 months. The practice had carried out risk assessment around the safe use, handling and Control of Substances Hazardous to Health, 2002 Regulations (COSHH). The practice had a COSHH folder but there was no record of when it was last updated and the risk assessments were limited.

Reliable safety systems and processes (including safeguarding)

The practice had a comprehensive set of policies and procedures in place for safeguarding adults and child protection which was updated in January 2016. The policy contained details of the local authority safeguarding teams, whom to contact in the event of any concerns and the team's contact details. The policy also reflected the General Dental Council (GDC) guidance on child protection and vulnerable adults. The principal dentist was the safeguarding lead. Staff gave us examples of the type of incidents and concerns that would be reported and outlined the protocol that would be followed in the practice. There were no reported safeguarding incidents in the last 12 months.

We saw evidence that all staff had completed child protection and safeguarding adults training to an appropriate level. Staff completed safeguarding training as a team in January 2016.

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, we saw records of risk assessment for fire, autoclave, eye injury, sharp injuries, manual handling, slip, trips and falls.

The practice responded promptly to Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA) alerts. The principal dentist showed us examples of the alerts which they received and disseminated to other members of staff. The practice recorded whether any actions were taken once the alerts were reviewed and this was stored in a file.

Medical emergencies

The practice had suitable emergency resuscitation equipment in accordance with guidance issued by the Resuscitation Council UK. Medical oxygen and other related items, such as manual breathing aids and an automated external defibrillator (AED) were available in line with the Resuscitation Council UK guidelines. (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). A spacer device and portable suction were not available at the practice on the day of our inspection. We discussed this with the principal dentist who showed us confirmation that these items had been ordered.

Records completed showed regular checks were done to ensure the equipment and emergency medicine were safe to use. All staff were aware of where medical equipment was kept and knew how to respond if a person suddenly became unwell. We saw evidence that all members of staff completed training in emergency resuscitation and basic life support in January 2016.

Staff recruitment

We reviewed the employment files for five staff members. The files contained some of the evidence required to satisfy the requirements of relevant legislation including immunisation and evidence of professional registration with the General Dental Council (where required). The practice carried out Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks for all members of staff. (The Disclosure and Barring Service carries out checks to identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable).

Are services safe?

We saw evidence that references were obtained for the associate dentist but not for the trainee dental nurses. There were no records of photographic evidence of the employee's identification and eligibility to work in the United Kingdom where required. The principal dentist told us that these checks had been carried out but had not been recorded. We discussed this with the principal dentist who sent us confirmation following the inspection to show that these checks were carried out. The principal dentist sent us an updated recruitment policy which will be followed to ensure that all the necessary checks are carried out and documented in future.

Monitoring health & safety and responding to risks

There were arrangements in place to deal with foreseeable emergencies and the practice had a fire safety policy in place. Fire safety signs were clearly displayed, and staff were aware of how to respond in the event of a fire. The practice is located in a health center and the fire drills are carried out with other members of the healthcare team.

The practice had carried out a risk assessment of the business and there was a comprehensive business continuity plan in place. The business continuity plan detailed the practice procedures for unexpected incidents and emergencies. This included loss of telephone service, electricity, gas or water supply. The plan contained information on how to contact patients and staff members in the event of unexpected incidents and emergencies.

Infection control

There were effective systems in place to reduce the risk and spread of infection. There was a written infection control policy which included minimising the risk of blood-borne virus transmission and the possibility of sharps injuries, decontamination of dental instruments and hand hygiene. The practice had followed 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)'. This document and the practice policy and procedures on infection prevention and control were accessible to staff. An infection control audit had been carried out in November 2015.

We examined the facilities for cleaning and decontaminating dental instruments. The practice had a dedicated decontamination room. A dental nurse showed us how instruments were decontaminated. They wore

appropriate personal protective equipment (including heavy duty gloves and a mask) while instruments were decontaminated and rinsed prior to being placed in an autoclave (sterilising machine).

We saw instruments were placed in pouches following sterilisation and dated to indicate when they should be reprocessed if left unused. We found daily, weekly and monthly tests were performed to check the steriliser was working efficiently and a log was kept of the results. We saw evidence the parameters (temperature and pressure) were regularly checked to ensure equipment was working efficiently in between service checks.

We observed how waste items were disposed of and stored. The practice had an on-going contract with a clinical waste contractor. We saw the differing types of waste were appropriately segregated and stored at the practice. This included clinical waste and safe disposal of sharps. Staff confirmed to us their knowledge and understanding of single use items and how they should be used and disposed of which was in line with guidance.

The treatment rooms where patients were examined and treated and equipment appeared visibly clean. Hand washing posters were displayed next to each dedicated hand wash sink to ensure effective decontamination of hands. Patients were given a protective bib and safety glasses to wear when they were receiving treatment. There were good supplies of protective equipment for patients and staff members.

Records showed a risk assessment process for Legionella was carried out in January 2012. We discussed this with the provider who told us that a Legionella risk assessment had been booked for 29 February 2016 and we saw evidence of this. This process ensured the risks of Legionella bacteria developing in water systems within the premises had been identified and preventive measures taken to minimise risk of patients and staff developing Legionnaires' disease. (Legionella is a bacterium found in the environment which can contaminate water systems in buildings).

The practice had a cleaning schedule in place for the surgeries and the provider told us that the environmental cleaning policy would be updated to cover the domestic cleaning arrangements.

Equipment and medicines

Are services safe?

There were appropriate service arrangements in place to ensure equipment was well maintained. There were service contracts in place for the maintenance of equipment such as the autoclave and X-ray equipment. The autoclave was serviced in June 2015 and a pressure vessel check had been undertaken in June 2015. The practice had portable appliances and had carried out portable appliance tests (PAT) in January 2016. We saw records which showed that the emergency lighting and fire extinguishers were checked in March 2015.

Radiography (X-rays)

The practice had a well maintained radiation protection file. We checked the provider's radiation protection records

as X-rays were taken and developed at the practice. We also looked at X-ray equipment and talked with staff about its use. We found there were arrangements in place to ensure the safety of the equipment including the local rules. The radiation protection file contained the maintenance history of X-ray equipment along with the critical examination and acceptance test reports.

We found procedures and equipment had been assessed by an independent expert within the recommended timescales. The practice had a radiation protection adviser and had appointed a radiation protection supervisor.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Monitoring and improving outcomes for patients

Patients' needs were assessed and care and treatment was delivered in line with current guidance. This included following the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) and Faculty of General Dental Practice (FGDP) guidance and Delivering Better Oral Health toolkit. 'Delivering better oral health' is an evidence based toolkit used by dental teams for the prevention of dental disease in a primary and secondary care setting. The dentists told us they regularly assessed each patient's gum health and took X-rays at appropriate intervals.

During the course of our inspection we checked dental care records to confirm our findings. We saw evidence of assessments to establish individual patient needs. The assessment included completing a medical history, outlining medical conditions and allergies and a social history. An assessment of the periodontal tissue was taken and recorded using the basic periodontal examination (BPE) tool. [The BPE tool is a simple and rapid screening tool used by dentists to indicate the level of treatment need in relation to a patient's gums]. Dentists were also recording when oral health advice was given.

Health promotion & prevention

Appropriate information was given to patients for health promotion. There were a range of leaflets available in the treatment rooms relating to health promotion including toothbrushing, caring for children's teeth, erosion and caring for dentures.

Staff we spoke with told us patients were given advice appropriate to their individual needs such as dietary advice and smoking cessation. Dental care records we checked confirmed this; for example we saw that dentists had discussions with patients about gum disease and smoking.

Staffing

There was an induction and training programme for staff to follow which ensured they were skilled and competent in delivering safe and effective care and support to patients. All new staff are required to complete the induction programme. We saw records that showed the trainee dental nurses were registered on a training course to gain a qualification which could lead to registration with the General Dental Council (GDC).

All staff had undertaken training to ensure they were up to date with the core training and registration requirements issued by the General Dental Council. We saw evidence of a comprehensive professional development plan for one of the associate dentist. Opportunities existed for staff to pursue continuing professional development (CPD). We reviewed staff training records and saw that staff had attended a range of courses and conferences for their development. Staff we spoke with confirmed that they had access to opportunities for developmental and gave examples of team training. There was a formal appraisal system in place to identify training and development needs.

Working with other services

The practice had arrangements in place for working with other health professionals to ensure quality of care for their patients. Referrals were made to other dental specialists when required including orthodontics, oral surgery and conscious sedation. The dentists referred patients to other practices or specialists if the treatment required was not provided by the practice. We found the practice monitored their referral process to ensure patients had access to treatment they needed within a reasonable amount of time.

Staff told us where a referral was necessary, the care and treatment required was explained to the patient and they were given a choice of other dentists who were experienced in undertaking the type of treatment required. We saw examples of the referral letters. All the details in the referral were correct for example the personal details and the details of the issues. Copies of the referrals had been stored in patients' dental care records appropriately, and where necessary referrals had been followed up.

Consent to care and treatment

The practice ensured valid consent was obtained for care and treatment. Staff confirmed individual treatment options, risks and benefits and costs were discussed with each patient who then received a detailed treatment plan and estimate of costs. Patients would be given time to consider the information given before making a decision. The practice asked patients to sign treatment plans and a copy was kept in the patients dental care records. We

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

checked dental care records which showed treatment plans signed by the patient. The dental care records showed that options, risks and benefits of the treatment were discussed with patients.

The Mental 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. While staff did not have formal training on the MCA they demonstrated an understanding of the principles of the MCA and how this applied in considering whether or not patients had the capacity to consent to dental treatment. This included assessing a patient's capacity to consent and when making decisions in a patient's best interests.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Respect, dignity, compassion & empathy

We received 17 CQC comment cards completed by patients in the two weeks prior to our inspection. Patients were complimentary of the care, treatment and professionalism of the staff and gave a positive view of the service. Patients commented that the team were courteous, friendly and kind. During the inspection we observed staff in the reception area. They were polite, courteous, welcoming and friendly towards patients.

Staff explained how they ensured information about patients using the service was kept confidential. Patients' dental care records were locked in a filing cabinet. Staff told us patients were able to have confidential discussions about their care and treatment in one of the treatment rooms.

The dentist told us that consultations were in private and that staff never interrupted consultations unnecessarily. We observed that this happened with doors being closed so that the conversations could not be overheard whilst patients were being treated. The environment of the surgeries was conducive to maintaining privacy.

Comment cards completed by patients reflected that the dentist and dental nurses had been very mindful of the patients' anxieties when providing care and treatment. They indicated the practice team had been very respectful and responsive to their anxiety which meant they were no longer afraid of attending for dental care and treatment.

Involvement in decisions about care and treatment

The dentist told us they used a number of different methods including tooth models, display charts, pictures, X-rays and leaflets to demonstrate what different treatment options involved so that patients fully understood. A treatment plan was developed following discussion of the options, risk and benefits of the proposed treatment.

Staff told us the dentists took time to explain care and treatment to individual patients clearly and were always happy to answer any questions. Patients told us that treatment was discussed with them in a way that they could understand. Patients we spoke with confirmed that the dentist discussed the options, risks, benefits and cost of the treatment with them.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting patients' needs

We viewed the appointment book and saw that there was enough time scheduled to assess and undertake patients' care and treatment. Staff told us they did not feel under pressure to complete procedures and always had enough time available to prepare for each patient.

There were effective systems in place to ensure the equipment and materials needed were in stock or received well in advance of the patient's appointment. These included checks for laboratory work such as crowns and dentures which ensured delays in treatment were avoided.

Tackling inequity and promoting equality

The practice had an equality and diversity policy. The demographics of the practice was mixed and we asked staff to explain how they communicated with people who had different communication needs such as those who spoke another language. Staff told us they treated everybody equally and welcomed patients from different backgrounds, cultures and religions. They would encourage a relative or friend to attend who could translate or if not they would contact a translator. The practice also had staff who spoke Romanian, Lithuanian, Hindi, Urdu and Punjabi.

The practice carried out a disability risk assessment in February 2015. The practice had recognised the needs of different groups in the planning of its service. The dental practice is on the first floor of the health center and there were automatic doors at the entrance to the health center, low reception counters on the ground floor as well as an elevator. The practice was accessible to people using wheelchairs, or those with limited mobility, which included a disabled toilet, a ramp and disabled parking at the front of the practice.

Access to the service

We asked the principal dentist how patients were able to access care in an emergency. They told us that if patients called the practice in an emergency they were seen on the

same day. The practice had a patient leaflet in the reception area outlining the name of the dentists, how to make an appointment, the opening hours and emergency out of hours details.

If patients required an appointment outside of normal opening times they were directed to the local out of hours dental service. These contact details were given on the practice answer machine message when the practice was closed. The out of hour's information was also displayed on the door of the practice.

Feedback received from patients indicated that they were happy with the access arrangements. Patients said that it was easy to make an appointment.

Concerns & complaints

The practice had a complaints policy which described how formal and informal complaints were handled. Information about how to make a complaint was displayed in the reception area and patients had easy access to it. This included contact details of other agencies to contact if a patient was not satisfied with the outcome of the practice investigation into their complaint.

We looked at the practice procedure for acknowledging, recording, investigating and responding to complaints, concerns and suggestions made by patients and found there was an effective system in place which ensured a timely response. We reviewed the complaints that the practice received in the last 12 months and saw that they were resolved in line with the practice complaints policy. The practice team viewed complaints as a learning opportunity and discussed those received in order to improve the quality of service provided.

We discussed the complaints received with the provider. The provider told us that based on feedback from patients changes had been made to scheduling appointments with different dentist. Patients are now informed which dentist they will see at the time of booking their appointments. This is to ensure that patients know who they will be seeing when they attend for their appointment. Patients can be offered an alternative appointment at an earlier date if they wish to see another dentist.

Are services well-led?

Our findings

Governance arrangements

The practice had good governance arrangements with an effective management structure. There were relevant policies and procedures in place. These were all frequently reviewed and updated. Staff were aware of the policies and procedures and acted in line with them.

The principal dentist had implemented suitable arrangements for identifying, recording and managing risks through the use of scheduled risk assessments and audits. For example, we saw that risk assessments had been carried out for clinical waste, manual handling, slip, trips and falls. The practice had carried out a risk assessment following the Health and Safety (Sharp Instruments in Healthcare) Regulations 2013.

The principal dentist organised staff meetings every month to discuss key governance issues and staff training sessions. We saw records of staff meetings discussing topics such as decontamination, safeguarding children and vulnerable adults and medical emergencies. Staff told us there were informal discussions on a daily basis. The provider had responsibility for the day to day running of the practice and was fully supported by the practice team. There were clear lines of responsibility and accountability; staff knew who to report to if they had any issues or concerns.

Dental care records we reviewed were complete, legible and accurate and stored securely in locked filing cabinets.

Leadership, openness and transparency

The principal dentist told us they led by example and this was confirmed in conversations we had with staff. Staff were very proud to work in the service and spoke respectfully about the leadership and support they received from the principal dentist as well as other colleagues. Staff we spoke with were confident in approaching the principal dentists if they had concerns and displayed appreciation for the leadership. The staff we spoke with described an open and transparent culture which encouraged honesty. We found staff to be hard working, caring and a cohesive team and there was a system of yearly staff appraisals to support staff in carrying out their roles.

We spoke with the principal dentist about future plans for the practice. This included computerised dental care records and digital X-rays.

Learning and improvement

The practice had a programme of audits in place. Various audits had been completed over the past 12 months and included audits on record keeping, radiography and infection control. A record keeping audit was carried out in August 2015 and areas of improvement were identified. While this audit included the justification and reporting on X-rays, improvements could be made to include grading of the X-rays. The practice carried out an X-ray audit in 2015. However, there was limited analysis and the audit did not identify the specific faults with X-rays in order to drive improvement. We discussed this with the principal dentist who planned to review these protocols before re-auditing takes place.

Staff were supported to meet their professional standards and complete continuing professional development (CPD) standards set by the GDC. 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 GDC. The practice completed training as a team in areas such as medical emergency and safeguarding children and vulnerable adults.

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

The practice gathered feedback from patients through the use of a yearly patient satisfaction survey. We saw records that showed that the practice discussed patient feedback in staff meetings and had implemented changes. Staff told us that patients completed the NHS friends and family test but this had not been analysed. We reviewed 17 friend and family test comment cards and patients were positive in their feedback about the service.

Staff commented that the principal dentist was open to feedback regarding the quality of the care. The appraisal system and staff meetings also provided appropriate forums for staff to give their feedback.