

Roberts-Harry Clinic Ltd

Harrogate

Inspection Report

East Parade
Harrogate
North Yorkshire
HG1 5LB
Tel:01423522555
Website:www.rhclinic.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 26 July 2017
Date of publication: 10/08/2017

Overall summary

We carried out this announced inspection on 26 July 2017 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.

We told the NHS England area team and Healthwatch that we were inspecting the practice. We did not receive any information of concern from them.

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

Roberts-Harry Clinic Ltd is in Harrogate and provides NHS specialist orthodontic services and private treatment to adults and children.

There is level access for people who use wheelchairs and pushchairs. Car parking spaces are available near the practice.

The dental team includes four orthodontic specialists, one periodontal specialist, four dentists (two with specialist interests in orthodontics), one dental implant

Summary of findings

dentist, 12 dental nurses (three of which are trainees), three dental hygiene therapists, six orthodontic therapists, three sterilisation assistants, six receptionists, a practice administration team and a practice manager.

The practice has seven surgeries, three are open plan to deliver orthodontic treatments, a dedicated room for taking Orthopantomogram (OPG), cone beam computed tomography (CBCT) scans and X-rays, a decontamination room for sterilising dental instruments, two treatment co-ordinator rooms, a laboratory, a staff room/kitchen and general offices.

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 Roberts-Harry Clinic Ltd was the revenue manager and this was due to be transferred over to the practice manager.

On the day of inspection we collected 32 CQC comment cards filled in by patients. This information gave us a positive view of the practice.

During the inspection we spoke with two specialist orthodontists, one periodontal specialist, two dental nurses, one dental hygiene therapist, two orthodontic therapists, the practice manager and an orthodontic project manager. We looked at practice policies and procedures and other records about how the service is managed.

The practice is open:

Monday – Thursday 8am – 7pm

Friday 8am – 4:30pm

Our key findings were:

- The practice was clean and well maintained.
- The practice had infection control procedures which reflected published guidance.
- Staff knew how to deal with emergencies. Appropriate medicines and life-saving equipment were available.
- The practice had systems to help them manage risk.
- The practice had suitable safeguarding processes and staff knew their responsibilities for safeguarding adults and children.
- The practice had thorough staff recruitment procedures.
- The clinical staff provided patients' care and treatment in line with current guidelines.
- The specialist orthodontists carried out an assessment in line with recognised guidance from the British Orthodontic Society (BOS).
- Staff treated patients with dignity and respect and took care to protect their privacy and personal information.
- The appointment system met patients' needs.
- The practice had effective leadership. Staff felt involved and supported and worked well as a team.
- The practice asked staff and patients for feedback about the services they provided.
- The practice dealt with complaints positively and efficiently.

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

- Review the need for an updated Legionella risk assessment.
- Review the practice's protocols for the use of closed circuit television cameras (CCTV) taking into account guidelines published by the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO).

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 received training in safeguarding and knew how to recognise the signs of abuse and how to report concerns.

Staff were qualified for their roles and the practice completed essential recruitment checks.

Premises and equipment were clean and properly maintained. The practice followed national guidance for cleaning, sterilising and storing dental instruments.

The practice had recently been renovated and required a new legionella risk assessment.

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

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, informative and very friendly. The clinical team discussed treatment with patients in detail so they could give informed consent and recorded this in their records.

The practice had clear arrangements when patients needed to be referred to other dental or health care professionals.

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 32 people. Patients were positive about all aspects of the service the practice provided. They told us staff were welcoming, amazing and always had time to spend with everyone. They said that they were given helpful, honest and detailed explanations about dental treatment, and said their clinical team listened to them. Patients commented that they made them feel at ease, especially when they were anxious about visiting the practice.

CCTV was in operation within the practice and we were told there were no policies in place for its justification and safe use. There was no supporting evidence to show the practice had registered the CCTV with the ICO.

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 access to telephone or face to face interpreter services and had arrangements to help patients with sight or hearing loss.

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 clearly defined management structure and staff felt supported and appreciated.

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

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

Reporting, learning and improvement from incidents

The practice had policies and procedures to report, investigate, respond and learn from accidents, incidents and significant events. Staff knew about these and understood their role in the process.

The practice recorded, responded to and discussed all incidents to reduce risk and support future learning. Staff described an incident which was shared with all staff and they were given the opportunity to respond to how improvements could be made to prevent it happening again. As a result of this, information was collated and a new protocol was introduced.

The practice received national patient safety and medicines alerts from the Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Authority (MHRA). Relevant alerts were discussed with staff, acted on and stored for future reference.

Reliable safety systems and processes (including safeguarding)

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. Staff knew about the signs and symptoms of abuse and neglect and how to report concerns. The practice had a whistleblowing policy. Staff told us they felt confident they could raise concerns without fear of recrimination.

We looked at the practice's arrangements for safe dental care and treatment. These included risk assessments which staff reviewed every year. The practice followed relevant safety laws when using needles and other sharp dental items. The dentists used rubber dams in line with guidance from the British Endodontic Society when providing root canal treatment.

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

Medical emergencies

Staff knew what to do in a medical emergency and completed training in emergency resuscitation and basic life support every year.

Emergency equipment and 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.

Staff recruitment

The practice had a staff recruitment policy and procedure to help them employ suitable staff. This reflected the relevant legislation. We looked at all staff recruitment files. These showed the practice followed their recruitment procedure.

Clinical staff were qualified and registered with the General Dental Council (GDC) and had professional indemnity cover.

Monitoring health & safety and responding to risks

The practice's health and safety policies and risk assessments were up to date and reviewed to help manage potential risk. These covered general workplace and specific dental topics. The practice had current employer's liability insurance and checked each year that the clinicians' professional indemnity insurance was up to date.

A dental nurse worked with the all clinical staff when they treated patients.

Infection control

The practice had an infection prevention and control policy and procedures to keep patients safe. They followed guidance in The Health Technical Memorandum 01-05: Decontamination in primary care dental practices (HTM01-05) published by the Department of Health.

Staff completed infection prevention and control training regularly.

The practice had suitable arrangements for transporting, cleaning, checking, sterilising and storing instruments in line with HTM01-05. The records showed equipment staff used for cleaning and sterilising instruments was maintained and used in line with the manufacturers' guidance. There were dedicated sterilisation assistants who worked at the practice. All of the staff were very impressed with this way of working as they felt the

Are services safe?

sterilisation assistants had an overall awareness of the practice needs and took ownership of the process to ensure all decontamination process were delivered to a high standard.

The practice carried out infection prevention and control audits twice a year. The latest audit showed the practice was meeting the required standards. We found no action plan or learning outcomes were in place but were assured this would be addressed immediately.

The practice had procedures to reduce the possibility of Legionella or other bacteria developing in the water systems, in line with a risk assessment. The practice had recently undergone some renovation where by a new legionella risk assessment was required. We brought this to the attention of the practice manager and they told us this would be booked in as soon as possible.

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

Equipment and medicines

We saw servicing documentation for the equipment used. Staff carried out checks in line with the manufacturers' recommendations.

The practice had suitable systems for prescribing, dispensing and storing medicines.

Radiography (X-rays)

The practice had suitable arrangements to ensure the safety of the X-ray equipment. They met current radiation regulations and had the required information in their radiation protection file.

We saw evidence that the dentists justified, graded and reported on the X-rays they took. The practice carried out X-ray audits every year following current guidance and legislation. The registered provider worked closely with all staff members to ensure the audit process evolved in each cycle to ensure ease of use and full disclosure of results.

The practice had an OPG (Orthopantomogram) which is a rotational panoramic dental radiograph that allows the clinician to view the upper and lower jaws and teeth and gives a 2-dimensional representation of these. This machine could also take a cephalogram for use in orthodontic treatments.

The machine also provided cone beam computed tomography (CBCT). CBCT is an X-ray based imaging technique which provides high resolution visualisation of bony anatomical structures in three dimensions. All training and quality assurance processes had been booked for August 2017 and would be completed before the machine was used.

The practice also had a laser for use during dental surgical procedures. Safety protocols had been put in place for when this was in use including a do not enter sign on the treatment room door, specialised safety glasses for the staff and patients and blinds for the windows. A Laser Protection Advisor had been appointed and local rules were available for the safe use of the equipment. Evidence of staff training was also available.

Clinical staff completed continuous professional development in respect of dental radiography.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

Monitoring and improving outcomes for patients

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.

The Specialist Orthodontist carried out a detailed assessment in line with recognised guidance from the British Orthodontic Society (BOS). This included an assessment of the patient's oral hygiene and diet. Patients were recalled at suitable intervals for reviews of the treatment. After finishing their orthodontic treatment patients were recalled at specific intervals to ensure the patient was complying with the post-orthodontic care.

We spoke with a hygiene therapist who 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 were made aware that successful treatment hinged upon their own compliance and were provided with patient specific prevention advice regimes. Patients with more severe gum disease were recalled at more frequent intervals to review their compliance and reinforced home care preventative advice.

The practice provided dental implants. The dentists and treatment co-ordinators explained the process which patients underwent prior to undertaking dental implant treatment. This included using X-rays and where justified, CBCT would be used to assess the quality and volume of the bone and whether there were any important structures close to where the implant was being placed. We saw evidence these X-rays were analysed to ensure the dental implant work was undertaken safely and effectively. We also saw that patients gum health was thoroughly assessed prior to any implants being placed. If the patient had any sign of gum disease then they underwent a course of periodontal treatment either in house with the specialist periodontist and hygiene therapist or at the referring practice. We were told the staff worked very closely with the referring practice to ensure the best outcomes for patients.

After the dental implant placement the patients were contacted by the patient co-ordinators to ensure that patients were well. A direct contact number for the dentist was provided so that questions or concerns could be addressed promptly. These measures were appreciated by patients.

It was evident the skill mix within the practice was conducive to improving the overall outcome for patients. The staff would have informal "huddle" meetings each day to ensure all patients information and lab work was available. The treatment co-ordinators were there to support the patient journey.

Health promotion & prevention

The practice believed in preventative 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 and worked closely with the referring practice to support the patient. They used fluoride varnish for children based on an assessment of the risk of tooth decay.

The staff told us 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.

Staffing

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

Staff told us they discussed training needs at annual appraisals. We saw evidence of completed appraisals.

We found there was excellent use of a multi-professional team. Staff were encouraged and supported to undertake dental qualifications, dental competencies and management/patient care qualifications. Staff reported that they felt valued both at the present time and for their future professional development.

Working with other services

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

The practice had a detailed referral policy which outlined the processes for referring patients out of the practice and also accepting referrals. Staff confirmed they referred patients to a range of specialists in primary and secondary care if they needed treatment the practice did not provide. These included 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. The practice monitored urgent referrals to make sure they were dealt with promptly.

The practice received referrals for dental implants, periodontal treatment and orthodontics. Upon receiving a referral letter a treatment co-ordinator reviewed the letter, the patient was contacted and sent a welcome pack specific to the treatment they were interested in or referred for.

When attending the initial consultation the treatment co-ordinator and clinician would make the patient aware of the proposed treatment and the timescales involved, the fact that treatment is on a private or NHS basis, the estimated costs involved, finance options and when payment for the treatment should be made, arrangements for out-of-hours emergency care during the course of the treatment and the practice's contact details.

Once treatment had been completed the patient was returned to the referring dentist for on-going care. A letter would be sent to the referring dentist with advice about the treatment provided and advice about future requirements.

Consent to care and treatment

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 and the staff were aware of the need to consider this when treating young people under 16. Staff described how they involved patients' relatives or carers when appropriate and made sure they had enough time to explain treatment options clearly.

Are services caring?

Our findings

Respect, dignity, compassion and empathy

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

Patients commented positively that staff were friendly, professional and knowledgeable. We saw that staff treated patients with respect, kindness and were friendly towards patients at the reception desk and over the telephone.

Nervous patients said staff were compassionate and understanding. Longer appointments were booked for children or nervous patients. Patients could choose whether they saw a male or female clinician.

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 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.

Music was played in the treatment rooms and there were magazines and an information television in the waiting room.

Information folders, patient survey results and thank you cards were available for patients to read.

A Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) camera was in the reception area. During the inspection we found CCTV signage was easily visible to ensure patients were aware of this. The practice did not have a policy, risk assessment or registration with the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO). We brought this to the attention of the practice manager who assured us this would be addressed.

Involvement in decisions about care and treatment

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. Staff described the conversations they had with patients to satisfy themselves they understood their treatment options.

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

The practice's website provided patients with information about the range of treatments available at the practice. These included general dentistry and treatments for gum disease and more complex treatment such as dental implants, specialist orthodontics and specialist periodontal treatment.

Each treatment room had a screen so the clinicians' could show patients photographs, videos and X-ray images when they discussed treatment options. Staff also used videos to explain treatment options to patients needing more complex treatment.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

Responding to and meeting patients' needs

Patients described high levels of satisfaction with the responsive service provided by the practice.

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.

Staff told us that they currently had some patients for whom they needed to make adjustments to enable them to receive treatment. The staff told us they had new sturdy chairs for patients who struggled with the sofas.

Tackling inequity and promoting equality

The practice had taken into consideration the needs of different groups of people, for example, people with disabilities, and put in place reasonable adjustments, for example, handrails to assist with mobility, step free access, a hearing loop, a magnifying glass and accessible toilet with hand rails and a call bell.

Staff said they could provide information in different formats and languages to meet individual patients' needs. They had access to interpreter and translation services which included British Sign Language and braille.

The practice was accessible to wheelchair users. All of the treatment rooms were located on the ground floor along with the patient toilet facilities.

Access to the service

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

We confirmed the practice kept waiting times and cancellations to a minimum.

The practice was committed to seeing patients experiencing pain on the same day and kept appointments free to facilitate this. The practice provided urgent care facilities to deal with issues arising from treatment provided. All other urgent care would be provided by the referring practice.

The website, information leaflet and answerphone provided telephone numbers for patients needing emergency dental treatment during the working day and when the practice was not open.

Concerns & complaints

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. Staff told us they would tell the practice manager about any formal or informal comments or concerns straight away so patients received a quick response.

The practice manager told us they aimed to settle complaints in-house and invited patients to speak with them in person to discuss 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. These showed the practice responded to concerns appropriately and discussed outcomes with staff to share learning and improve the service.

We were told of an example of when a complaint was used to make changes within the practice. It was clear the practice used complaints as a way of improving the service for patients.

Are services well-led?

Our findings

Governance arrangements

The practice was a member of a 'good practice' accreditation scheme. This is a quality assurance scheme that demonstrates a visible commitment to providing quality dental care to nationally recognised standards.

The organisation had overall responsibility for the management and clinical leadership of the practice. The practice manager was responsible for the day to day running of the service. Staff knew the management arrangements and their roles and responsibilities.

The practice had policies, procedures and risk assessments to support the management of the service and to protect patients and staff. These included arrangements to monitor the quality of the service and make improvements.

The practice had information governance arrangements and staff were aware of the importance of these in protecting patients' personal information.

Leadership, openness and transparency

Staff were aware of the duty of candour requirements to be open, honest and to offer an apology to patients if anything went wrong.

Staff told us there was an open, no blame culture at the practice. They said the practice manager encouraged them to raise any issues and felt confident they could do this. They knew who to raise any issues with and told us the practice manager was approachable, would listen to their concerns and act appropriately. The practice manager discussed concerns at staff meetings and it was clear the practice worked as a team and dealt with issues professionally.

The practice held meetings where staff could raise any concerns and discuss clinical and non-clinical updates. Immediate discussions were arranged to share urgent information.

Learning and improvement

Duty of candour was seen as part of the everyday ethos of the practice. Each member of staff understood that they should be open and honest to each other and any findings from audits and peer reviews were shared with the team so everyone could improve on areas highlighted.

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

The team showed a commitment to learning and improvement and valued the contributions made to the team by individual members of staff. The whole staff team had annual appraisals. They discussed learning needs, general wellbeing and aims for future professional development. We saw evidence of completed appraisals in the staff folders.

Staff told us they completed highly recommended training, including medical emergencies and basic life support, each year. The General Dental Council requires clinical staff to complete continuous professional development. Staff told us the practice provided support and encouragement for them to do so.

We were told of several staff members who had been supported to develop their skills within the practice by completing extended duty course and progressing on to do the orthodontic therapy training. One staff member had joined the practice as a receptionist and had an interest in dental nursing so the practice provided them the opportunity to complete their training.

Staff told us they completed training, including medical emergencies and basic life support, each year. The General Dental Council requires clinical staff to complete continuous professional development. Staff told us the practice provided support and encouragement for them to do so.

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

The practice had a system in place to seek the views of patients about all areas of service delivery through the use of regular patient surveys and a suggestion box. Online facilities were available and the practice also had a tablet to gather feedback. Social media forums were accessible for patients to leave comments.

Patients were encouraged to complete the NHS Friends and Family Test (FFT). This is a national programme to allow patients to provide feedback on NHS services they have used.

Are services well-led?

The practice gathered feedback from staff through meetings, surveys, and informal discussions. Staff were encouraged to offer suggestions for improvements to the service and said these were listened to and acted on.