

Review of compliance

Corfe Mullen Dental Surgery Corfe Mullen Dental Surgery	
Region:	South West
Location address:	186 Wareham Road Corfe Mullen Wimborne Dorset BH21 3LN
Type of service:	Dental service
Date of Publication:	April 2012
Overview of the service:	Corfe Mullen Dental Surgery provides preventative and restorative dental services under the NHS. It will also carry out some cosmetic dental procedures such as tooth whitening or provide white fillings under private arrangements. The practice facilities include four treatment rooms, a decontamination room and an oral hygiene/dental health education room. The dental care team comprises

	four dentists, one part-time dental hygienist and five dental nurses.
--	---

Summary of our findings for the essential standards of quality and safety

Our current overall judgement

Corfe Mullen Dental Surgery was meeting all the essential standards of quality and safety.

The summary below describes why we carried out this review, what we found and any action required.

Why we carried out this review

We carried out this review as part of our routine schedule of planned reviews.

How we carried out this review

We reviewed all the information we hold about this provider, carried out a visit on 21 March 2012, checked the provider's records, looked at records of people who use services, talked to staff and talked to people who use services.

What people told us

During our inspection visit on 21 March 2012 we were able to speak with 12 people attending the practice either for routine check –ups, examinations or treatment. We spoke with some people both before and after they had seen their dentist in order to hear about their experiences.

With the agreement of one person we also observed them having an examination as part of their first visit to the dental practice. This was not in order to observe clinical procedures but the behaviour and attitude of staff. It was also to see how people were informed about dental care issues and how infection control procedures were implemented.

People we spoke with told were largely complimentary and expressed positive views about the dentists, other staff and the environment. Several people said that they could not find any fault with the practice. People described their dentists as "brilliant", "excellent", "very nice", "gentle" and "competent". Other staff were described as "pleasant", "helpful", "polite" and "good".

A number of people commented about the premises and how the practice operated. They told us they thought it was "clean" and "ultra modern" and "well organised and efficient".

One person we spoke with told us that their experience on their first visit was negative but subsequently they had changed their opinion.

People told us they had no difficulty making appointments and that if urgent treatment was required it was arranged very quickly. We spoke with one person who telephoned the

practice for emergency treatment at 9:30 a.m. on the day of our inspection and was seen within three hours.

Everyone told us that dentists and the hygienist explained everything. They said that X-rays were used to help them understand why treatment was required and that they received advice about dental care and oral hygiene. They told us they were given printed plans when they needed treatment that set out the treatment required and its cost. They said they had to provide information about their medical history and that this was regularly updated.

What we found about the standards we reviewed and how well Corfe Mullen Dental Surgery was meeting them

Outcome 01: People should be treated with respect, involved in discussions about their care and treatment and able to influence how the service is run

People using the services of Corfe Mullen Dental Surgery are treated as individuals, their views are sought and they are able to discuss and be involved in the treatment they receive.

Overall we found that Corfe Mullen Dental Surgery was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 04: People should get safe and appropriate care that meets their needs and supports their rights

People using the services of Corfe Mullen Dental Surgery can be sure they receive safe, effective and appropriate care and treatment.

Overall we found that Corfe Mullen Dental Surgery was meeting this essential standard

Outcome 07: People should be protected from abuse and staff should respect their human rights

People using the services of Corfe Mullen Dental Surgery can be confident that the practice will ensure they are protected from harm.

Overall we found that Corfe Mullen Dental Surgery was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 08: People should be cared for in a clean environment and protected from the risk of infection

People who use the services of Corfe Mullen Dental Surgery can be confident they are protected from the risk of infection by robust systems and procedures.

Overall we found that Corfe Mullen Dental Surgery was meeting this essential standard.

Other information

Please see previous reports for more information about previous reviews.

**What we found
for each essential standard of quality
and safety we reviewed**

The following pages detail our findings and our regulatory judgement for each essential standard and outcome that we reviewed, linked to specific regulated activities where appropriate.

We will have reached one of the following judgements for each essential standard.

Compliant means that people who use services are experiencing the outcomes relating to the essential standard.

A **minor concern** means that people who use services are safe but are not always experiencing the outcomes relating to this essential standard.

A **moderate concern** means that people who use services are safe but are not always experiencing the outcomes relating to this essential standard and there is an impact on their health and wellbeing because of this.

A **major concern** means that people who use services are not experiencing the outcomes relating to this essential standard and are not protected from unsafe or inappropriate care, treatment and support.

Where we identify compliance, no further action is taken. Where we have concerns, the most appropriate action is taken to ensure that the necessary improvements are made. Where there are a number of concerns, we may look at them together to decide the level of action to take.

More information about each of the outcomes can be found in the *Guidance about compliance: Essential standards of quality and safety*

Outcome 01: Respecting and involving people who use services

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

- * Understand the care, treatment and support choices available to them.
- * Can express their views, so far as they are able to do so, and are involved in making decisions about their care, treatment and support.
- * Have their privacy, dignity and independence respected.
- * Have their views and experiences taken into account in the way the service is provided and delivered.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 01: Respecting and involving people who use services

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

People we spoke with told us that dentists and the hygienist explained what they were doing and why, when they were carrying out check-ups and dental treatment. They said they were involved in making decisions about the treatment they required. One person who said the dentist had adapted their treatment to meet their expressed needs. They said that consequently they felt fully in control of what was happening to them.

Other evidence

With their agreement we observed one person being examined by a dentist who was attending the practice for their first visit. They had made an appointment because they had lost a filling. We saw that the dentist was polite, explained the purpose of each part of the examination and what it revealed, both good and bad. We saw that an X-ray was used to show the person a problem that had been identified and the proposed treatment was discussed including its cost.

There was information on display in the reception area about the level of fees under NHS arrangements. There was also information about the costs of dental procedures that could only be provided under private arrangements.

We looked at the "proof" of a new information leaflet that was being prepared about the

practice. We noted that it included information about the staff, what a new patient could expect, the services provided, opening hours and out of hours emergency contact telephone numbers. It was planned to include the following statement. "Estimates are provided before a course of treatment begins ...".

Information about the practice's complaints procedure was on display near the entrance to the reception area. We also saw that the new information leaflet would include the following. "We have a complaints procedure that complies with NHS regulations. If you have any concerns please let a member of staff know so that we can rectify any problems. If you have more serious concerns you may wish to speak to the Practice Manager".

The practice had systems in place for improving the services it provided and these included obtaining the views of people using them. We looked at the results of a "patient satisfaction survey" carried out in February 2012. We saw that the views of a total of 100 people were obtained. They were made up of 20 people seen by each of the four dentists and the hygienist. The outcomes showed that 85% rated the overall practice as excellent and 15% as good. We noted that the practice had put into place an action plan as a result of the survey. We also saw evidence that checks (audits) were made of working procedures and clinical practice in order that the practice could identify if necessary where improvements could be made.

We looked at a range of written policies and procedures kept by the practice that staff were required to read and sign to ensure they influenced the way they worked. They included among other things the following issues, "equal opportunities", "equality and diversity", "human rights", "confidentiality" and "data protection".

The practice manager told us that if a person's first language was not English and they had difficulty communicating they could access a translation service through the local Primary Care Trust. They told also told us in their experience people who had difficulty communicating or understanding, were usually accompanied and supported by a relative or carer.

We saw that there was a ramp and automatic door at the entrance to the practice premises. The practice manager told us that an induction loop system was in place. This is Hearing Assistive Technology (HAT)/Assistive Listening Devices (ALDs) that works together with hearing aids to help hard of hearing people hear better.

We noted that treatment rooms were all located on the ground floor that ensured they could be easily accessed by people with poor mobility or who used wheelchairs.

Our judgement

People using the services of Corfe Mullen Dental Surgery are treated as individuals, their views are sought and they are able to discuss and be involved in the treatment they receive.

Overall we found that Corfe Mullen Dental Surgery was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 04: Care and welfare of people who use services

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

* Experience effective, safe and appropriate care, treatment and support that meets their needs and protects their rights.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 04: Care and welfare of people who use services

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

People we spoke with told us said that they were given advice about dental care and hygiene. They said if they needed treatment this was discussed with them including options or alternative treatment if this was relevant. They told us they were asked to provide details of their medical history and this was updated. They said that that if they needed urgent treatment this could be arranged quickly. People said making appointments for treatment was easy. They told us the practice sent them a text message the day before an appointment to remind them about it.

One person described their dental treatment as, "as good as I have ever had".

Other evidence

With their agreement we observed one person being examined by a dentist who was attending the practice for their first visit. We noted that the dentist asked about how the person cared for their teeth and history of dental treatment. They also asked about their medical history and any lifestyle activities that could compromise their dental care such as smoking and the consumption of alcohol. We saw that the details of the outcome of the person's dental examination was entered on a computerised record system.

We looked at some other dental records for each of the dentists working and hygienist at the practice. They were all held on a computer system. They showed that information was recorded about the condition of people's teeth and any problems that had been identified. They also included information about the outcome of check-ups and details of any treatment provided. We also saw that information about people's medical

histories was recorded and updated.

We saw that the computer system enabled specific issues important about an individual to be highlighted. This was particularly important for anything that could compromise their treatment, such as an allergy to penicillin.

The practice had an oral hygiene/dental health education room. The practice manager told us that the room was used to enable people to be given advice about dental care, diet and smoking cessation. We noted a range of information leaflets about dental care. They included, "gum disease", "healthy mouth, healthy body", "caring for my teeth", and "dental decay". We also saw that there were other educational aides including an extra large set of teeth and toothbrush.

In their application form to register the practice under the Health and Social Care Act 2008 the practice stated the following. "The practice is family run and wants to be part of the community. To this aim it carries out school visits to help spread the oral health message and reduce fears of visiting the dentist. We are also planning open days to show the community the resources it can offer them".

We spoke with three of the four dentists who worked at the practice and they all told us that they carried out regular clinical audits (checks) in order to identify if any improvement was required. These audits were required by the local Primary Care Trust. We saw that they had included radiography, patient records and patient satisfaction.

We spoke with staff working at the practice on the day of our inspection. They all told us that they received training in basic life support and managing medical emergencies. We looked at staff training records that confirmed this. We also looked at records that showed that two staff had received training in first aid.

We saw that appropriate equipment and drugs were available should they be required in such an event. We looked at records that showed that these drugs and equipment were checked every month to ensure they were in date and safe to use.

The practice manager told us the medical emergency equipment did not include an automatic external defibrillator (AED). The practice manager told us that they were looking into obtaining an AED.

A publication produced specifically for dental practices by the Resuscitation Council (UK) recommends, that an AED is part of the minimum medical emergency resuscitation equipment. It also states the following, "It is an expectation of the public that AEDs should be available in every healthcare environment and the dental surgery is not seen as an exception to this".

Our judgement

People using the services of Corfe Mullen Dental Surgery can be sure they receive safe, effective and appropriate care and treatment.

Overall we found that Corfe Mullen Dental Surgery was meeting this essential standard

Outcome 07: Safeguarding people who use services from abuse

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

* Are protected from abuse, or the risk of abuse, and their human rights are respected and upheld.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 07: Safeguarding people who use services from abuse

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

We did not speak with people who were using the service about the protection of children and safeguarding of vulnerable adults.

Other evidence

We saw that the practice had written policies and procedures in place that set out how staff should respond when the suspected children or vulnerable adults were at risk of harm. We noted that there was a manual in each treatment room that contained information about the relevant personnel to contact in the Primary Care Trust and Local Authority about any safeguarding concerns.

In their application form to register the practice under the Health and Social Care Act 2008 the practice stated, "The practice always encourages vulnerable patients to be accompanied by their parent, partner or carer, as our practice has a mainly elderly population we have many patients with dementia".

We saw there was an appropriate system in place not only to enable staff where necessary to assess whether a vulnerable adult had the capacity to make a decision about treatment for them self. It also supported staff to make a best interest decision on behalf of someone who was unable to make their own decision in accordance with the code of practice under the Mental Capacity Act 2005.

We noted that there was information about the Dorset Safeguarding Children Board displayed in the entrance area to the practice premises. We also saw there were

information leaflets about domestic violence in a room used for providing education to people about oral hygiene and dental care.

All the staff we spoke with told us that they had attended training about child protection and safeguarding vulnerable adults at Bournemouth Hospital. They demonstrated a good understanding of what constituted abuse and knew what to do if they suspected or knew that someone was being harmed.

The practice manager told us that there was an unwritten understanding that no member of staff should be alone with a person in a treatment room. They said that if on occasions one of the two staff had to leave a treatment room the door was always left open. We spoke with staff who confirmed that this was the procedure they all followed.

Our judgement

People using the services of Corfe Mullen Dental Surgery can be confident that the practice will ensure they are protected from harm.

Overall we found that Corfe Mullen Dental Surgery was meeting this essential standard.

Outcome 08: Cleanliness and infection control

What the outcome says

Providers of services comply with the requirements of regulation 12, with regard to the Code of Practice for health and adult social care on the prevention and control of infections and related guidance.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 08: Cleanliness and infection control

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

We did not ask people we spoke with about the prevention and control of infection or dental instrument decontamination and sterilisation.

Other evidence

The practice had a copy of a Department of Health document published in November 2009 called "Health Technical Memorandum 01-05: Decontamination in primary care dental practices" (HTM01-05). It describes in detail the processes and practices essential to prevent the transmission of infections and ensure clean safe care. It also sets out two standards of compliance for dental practices. These are "essential quality requirements that must be achieved and "best practice" which are ideal and desirable. Dental practices were expected to be fully compliant with the essential quality requirements by 21 December 2010.

We looked at the "proof" of a new information leaflet that was being prepared about the practice. It stated among other things the following. " We have expanded from a two to a four surgery practice. As part of the build we have built a state of the art sterilisation room. This ... ensures we achieve "Best Practice" ... Disposable products are extensively used; instruments and hand-pieces are sterilised after each patient. All necessary precautions are taken in the practice to safeguard both patients and staff against blood-borne infections such as AIDs and Hepatitis".

Staff told us they received regular training about infection control and instrument decontamination. We saw records that confirmed this.

We saw that the practice had a range of relevant written infection control policies and

procedures. These included, "decontamination of new reusable instruments", "disposal of clinical waste", "cleaning frequencies", "disinfection guidelines for clinical sessions", "moving instruments to and from the decontamination room", hand hygiene" and "the management of blood borne viruses".

We looked at minutes of practice meetings that were held each month. They showed that infection control and prevention was a topic that was routinely discussed.

With their agreement we observed one person being examined by a dentist who was attending the practice for their first visit. We saw that protective clothing and equipment such as gloves and masks were used appropriately.

We watched as staff carried out the cleaning and sterilisation of dental instruments. We saw that the practice had a separate decontamination room for all cleaning and sterilisation tasks. Dental instruments were transported in covered boxes to there from treatment room. The room was appropriately fitted out and equipped. The latter included an ultrasonic cleaner, an instrument washer-rinser, a hand-piece lubricator and three autoclaves (sterilisers). We saw that there was a clearly defined dirty to clean workflow and that after instruments had been cleaned they were inspected using illuminated magnifying glasses. This was to ensure there was no residual contamination, debris and damage before instruments were sterilised.

We looked at records and documents that showed the practice regularly checked (audited) its infection control procedures to ensure they were being followed properly. These included audits of hand washing and hygiene. They showed that the full range of tests, validation and servicing was being carried out on instrument cleaning, sterilising and other equipment. We also looked at documents that showed hazardous waste produced by the practice and other potential health and safety risks such as Legionella bacteria were managed properly.

Our judgement

People who use the services of Corfe Mullen Dental Surgery can be confident they are protected from the risk of infection by robust systems and procedures.

Overall we found that Corfe Mullen Dental Surgery was meeting this essential standard.

What is a review of compliance?

By law, providers of certain adult social care and health care services have a legal responsibility to make sure they are meeting essential standards of quality and safety. These are the standards everyone should be able to expect when they receive care.

The Care Quality Commission (CQC) has written guidance about what people who use services should experience when providers are meeting essential standards, called *Guidance about compliance: Essential standards of quality and safety*.

CQC licenses services if they meet essential standards and will constantly monitor whether they continue to do so. We formally review services when we receive information that is of concern and as a result decide we need to check whether a service is still meeting one or more of the essential standards. We also formally review them at least every two years to check whether a service is meeting all of the essential standards in each of their locations. Our reviews include checking all available information and intelligence we hold about a provider. We may seek further information by contacting people who use services, public representative groups and organisations such as other regulators. We may also ask for further information from the provider and carry out a visit with direct observations of care.

When making our judgements about whether services are meeting essential standards, we decide whether we need to take further regulatory action. This might include discussions with the provider about how they could improve. We only use this approach where issues can be resolved quickly, easily and where there is no immediate risk of serious harm to people.

Where we have concerns that providers are not meeting essential standards, or where we judge that they are not going to keep meeting them, we may also set improvement actions or compliance actions, or take enforcement action:

Improvement actions: These are actions a provider should take so that they **maintain** continuous compliance with essential standards. Where a provider is complying with essential standards, but we are concerned that they will not be able to maintain this, we ask them to send us a report describing the improvements they will make to enable them to do so.

Compliance actions: These are actions a provider must take so that they **achieve** compliance with the essential standards. Where a provider is not meeting the essential standards but people are not at immediate risk of serious harm, we ask them to send us a report that says what they will do to make sure they comply. We monitor the implementation of action plans in these reports and, if necessary, take further action to make sure that essential standards are met.

Enforcement action: These are actions we take using the criminal and/or civil procedures in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 and relevant regulations. These enforcement powers are set out in the law and mean that we can take swift, targeted action where services are failing people.

Information for the reader

Document purpose	Review of compliance report
Author	Care Quality Commission
Audience	The general public
Further copies from	03000 616161 / www.cqc.org.uk
Copyright	Copyright © (2010) Care Quality Commission (CQC). This publication may be reproduced in whole or in part, free of charge, in any format or medium provided that it is not used for commercial gain. This consent is subject to the material being reproduced accurately and on proviso that it is not used in a derogatory manner or misleading context. The material should be acknowledged as CQC copyright, with the title and date of publication of the document specified.

Care Quality Commission

Website	www.cqc.org.uk
Telephone	03000 616161
Email address	enquiries@cqc.org.uk
Postal address	Care Quality Commission Citygate Gallowgate Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 4PA