

Review of compliance

Dr J D Hull And Associates Limited Belgravia Dental Care

Region:	London
Location address:	2 Eccleston Street London SW1W 9LN
Type of service:	Dental service
Date of Publication:	August 2012
Overview of the service:	Belgravia Dental Care is one of the practices owned by Dr J D Hull and Associated Limited. The practice provides general, aesthetic and restorative dental services to adults and children. The practice offers extended opening hours two days a week. Belgravia Dental Care is situated in Victoria, Central London.

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

Our current overall judgement

Belgravia Dental Care was meeting all the essential standards of quality and safety inspected.

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 30 July 2012, talked to staff and talked to people who use services.

What people told us

We spoke with people who use the service and looked at 21 feedback questionnaires that had been completed in June 2012. Overall, people were happy with the quality of care and treatment provided by the service. One person described the staff as "lovely". Another person had turned up as an emergency appointment and had been seen straight away. People felt that they were given sufficient information to make a decision about their treatment. Most people reported that they would recommend the service.

What we found about the standards we reviewed and how well Belgravia Dental Care 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

The provider was meeting this standard. People's privacy, dignity and independence were respected.

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

The provider was meeting this standard. People experienced care, treatment and support that met their needs and protected their rights.

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

The provider was meeting this standard. People who use the service were protected from the risk of abuse, because the provider had taken reasonable steps to identify the possibility of abuse and prevent abuse from happening.

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

The provider was meeting this standard. People were cared for in a clean, hygienic environment.

Outcome 16: The service should have quality checking systems to manage risks and assure the health, welfare and safety of people who receive care

The provider was meeting this standard. The provider had an effective system to regularly assess and monitor the quality of service that people receive.

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.

Where we judge that a provider is non-compliant with a standard, we make a judgement about whether the impact on people who use the service (or others) is minor, moderate or major:

A minor impact means that people who use the service experienced poor care that had an impact on their health, safety or welfare or there was a risk of this happening. The impact was not significant and the matter could be managed or resolved quickly.

A moderate impact means that people who use the service experienced poor care that had a significant effect on their health, safety or welfare or there was a risk of this happening. The matter may need to be resolved quickly.

A major impact means that people who use the service experienced poor care that had a serious current or long term impact on their health, safety and welfare, or there was a risk of this happening. The matter needs to be resolved quickly.

Where we identify compliance, no further action is taken. Where we have concerns, the most appropriate action is taken to ensure that the necessary changes are made.

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

We spoke with people who use the service and looked at 21 feedback questionnaires that had been completed in June 2012. People told us that the dental surgeons had explained the different treatment options available. One person told us that they had been advised on the most appropriate treatment, but had not been pressurised to commit to it. People felt that staff had listened to their concerns.

Feedback from questionnaires indicated that people were happy with the service provided at Belgravia Dental Care.

Other evidence

We observed staff welcoming people and clinicians speaking to people in a professional and friendly way. All consultations took place in private.

People who use the service were given appropriate information and support regarding their care or treatment and they understood the choices available to them. Information leaflets on different conditions and treatments were available in the waiting area. In addition, there was a patient handbook which included information on the dental team, the complaints procedure and how to give feedback.

Dental surgeons used models , pictures and videos to explain the treatment required, what it involved and the associated costs. Each patient was given a copy of their treatment plan in order to make a decision. Non-emergency procedures were not carried out on the same day.

People's diversity, values and human rights were respected. Some people who use the service were visitors from overseas. Staff told us that most people came with someone who spoke English, but that they had access to a translation service, if required.

Our judgement

The provider was meeting this standard. People's privacy, dignity and independence were respected.

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

We spoke with people who use the service and looked at 21 feedback questionnaires that had been completed in June 2012. Feedback questionnaires demonstrated that most people were happy with the quality of treatment they received. People we spoke with were positive about the service. One person told us that they had telephoned for an emergency appointment and had been seen straight away.

The majority of people said they would recommend Belgravia Dental Care to others.

Other evidence

People's care and treatment reflected relevant research and guidance. All clinical staff kept up to date with continuing professional development. Staff attended conferences and received relevant publications.

Care and treatment was planned and delivered in a way that ensured people's safety and welfare. An oral assessment was carried out for each patient, which included taking a detailed medical history. The dental surgeons used dental models, pictures and videos to ensure people who use the service understood the treatment required.

There were arrangements in place to deal with foreseeable emergencies. There was a procedure for staff on display and all staff had received basic life support training. There was emergency equipment and medication in place and we saw evidence that most of these were checked regularly. The provider might find it useful to note that the single use items in the emergency equipment were out of date.

Our judgement

The provider was meeting this standard. People experienced care, treatment and support that met their needs and protected their rights.

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 spoke with people using the service but their feedback did not relate to this standard.

Other evidence

People who use the service were protected from the risk of abuse, because the provider had taken reasonable steps to identify the possibility of abuse and prevent abuse from happening. There were policies and procedures in place for safeguarding vulnerable adults and children. The procedure for staff to follow was available in each surgery, which included the contact details for the local safeguarding team.

All staff received in-house child protection and safeguarding vulnerable adults training.

Our judgement

The provider was meeting this standard. People who use the service were protected from the risk of abuse, because the provider had taken reasonable steps to identify the possibility of abuse and prevent abuse from happening.

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 spoke with people who used the service. They were positive about the staff at Belgravia Dental Care. One person described the staff as "lovely".

Other evidence

On the day of our inspection, the practice appeared to be clean and well maintained.

There were effective systems in place to reduce the risk and spread of infection. There was an infection control policy and a designated infection control lead at the practice. All clinical staff had received infection control training. Infection control audits were carried out every three months and we saw evidence that any shortfalls were actioned.

The dental nurses were responsible for cleaning clinical areas. There were daily checklists in place and we saw evidence that these were being completed. There is a system in place for quality checking the ultrasonic cleaner and steriliser and we saw records of these checks.

The decontamination of reusable instruments took place in the dental surgeries within the practice. Each surgery was clearly divided into "clean" and "dirty" areas and there was a separate sink for handwashing. However, the provider might find it useful to note that one surgery was not equipped with mixer taps, in accordance with the Health Technical Memorandum 01-05: Decontamination in primary care dental practices.

Staff explained the decontamination process to us. Instruments were manually cleaned, placed in an ultrasonic cleaner, inspected and then sterilised. We saw that instruments were packaged and dated correctly.

Purified water was used in the practice's dental lines. A Legionella risk assessment had been carried out and water temperatures were measured monthly by staff.

Our judgement

The provider was meeting this standard. People were cared for in a clean, hygienic environment.

Outcome 16: Assessing and monitoring the quality of service provision

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

* Benefit from safe quality care, treatment and support, due to effective decision making and the management of risks to their health, welfare and safety.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 16: Assessing and monitoring the quality of service provision

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

We spoke with people using the service but their feedback did not relate to this standard.

Other evidence

The provider took account of complaints and comments to improve the service. Patient feedback questionnaires were collected and reviewed by the manager each month. Feedback was also monitored by the provider's central management team. Based on patient feedback, the practice had begun to operate extended opening hours twice a week.

There were systems in place to monitor the quality of service that people receive. We saw evidence that audits had been carried out on infection control and clinical practice. The manager told us that there was a national clinical lead whose role it was to monitor the quality of the care and treatment provided by the dental surgeons.

Accidents or incidents were logged and monitored by the manager. We saw evidence that any issues were discussed at monthly practice meetings.

Our judgement

The provider was meeting this standard. The provider had an effective system to regularly assess and monitor the quality of service that people receive.

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.

Where we judge that providers are not meeting essential standards, we may set compliance actions or take enforcement action:

Compliance actions: These are actions a provider must take so that they **achieve** compliance with the essential standards. 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