

# Review of compliance

<p>Kew Dental Care Limited Kew Dental Care</p>	
<p><b>Region:</b></p>	<p>London</p>
<p><b>Location address:</b></p>	<p>105 North Road Kew Richmond Surrey TW9 4HJ</p>
<p><b>Type of service:</b></p>	<p>Dental service</p>
<p><b>Date of Publication:</b></p>	<p>July 2012</p>
<p><b>Overview of the service:</b></p>	<p>Kew Dental care provides diagnostic and screening, treatment and surgical dental services to patients. The practice has private treatment rooms and a central reception area. It is located in the Kew Gardens area of London.</p>

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

## Our current overall judgement

**Kew 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 26 June 2012, talked to staff and talked to people who use services.

### What people told us

People who use the service told us during our visit and in the questionnaires returned to the practice that they were very satisfied with the treatment they had received and way it was provided. One person said "This practice is second to none". The procedure for consultation and treatment was clearly explained to them including the fees charged. They were also told about any risks that might arise from treatments chosen. People felt treated with dignity, respect and had received consultations and treatment in private. They did not comment on safeguarding procedures or infection control. They did say the practice was kept clean, tidy and well maintained.

### What we found about the standards we reviewed and how well Kew 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**

People's privacy, dignity and independence were respected. People's views and experiences were taken into account in the way the service was provided and delivered in relation to their care.

Overall the provider was meeting this standard.

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

People experienced care, treatment and support that met their needs and protected their

rights.

Overall the provider was meeting this standard.

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

People are protected from abuse, or the risk of abuse, and their human rights are protected.

Overall the provider was meeting this standard.

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

People were protected from the risk of infection because appropriate guidance had been followed. They were cared for in a clean, hygienic environment.

Overall the provider was meeting this 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.

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

People who use the service understood the care and treatment choices available to them. They were given enough information regarding available treatment options to decide the treatment best for them and if they wished to proceed with it. This was during consultation and throughout the treatment. It included any risks attached to the treatment, options and cost. Written information was also available. They said they were treated with dignity, respect and their privacy was protected by everyone at the practice.

#### Other evidence

People who use the service were given appropriate information and support regarding their care and treatment. Written information about treatments and the practice was available at the practice and on the website. It supported the verbal and written information given during consultation. This included photographic and x-ray evidence that showed why a particular treatment may be required. It gave more opportunity for people to decide if this was the treatment they wanted. They were also given a treatment plan that they could take away with them to help them decide. All consultations took place in a private consulting and treatment rooms. Staff also told us and records showed that there was a policy regarding dignity and respect for people that they were familiar with and followed. This was confirmed by the

staff practice followed during our visit with people being treated with courtesy, dignity and respect.

**Our judgement**

People's privacy, dignity and independence were respected. People's views and experiences were taken into account in the way the service was provided and delivered in relation to their care.

Overall the provider was meeting this 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's needs were assessed and care and treatment was planned and delivered in line with their individual care plan. They said they were very satisfied with the treatment, care and support they received throughout their experience of the service. One person told us "I have travelled three hours from Norfolk just to attend this practice". People said the service was delivered efficiently, in a re-assuring way that they felt comfortable with and wanted. The dentist and staff were very accommodating and made every effort to make appointments that suited them and took place at the agreed time. They also told us that they were required to sign consent to treatment forms before it commenced.

##### Other evidence

Care and treatment was planned and delivered in a way that ensured peoples safety and welfare. The dentist and practice staff explained the experience of patients from first point of contact. This included how treatments and choices were discussed and explained at each stage of the process. Risk assessments took place as part of patient medical history updating, assessment and examination. Any risks and treatment benefits were explained and discussed. This ensured people fully understood the care and treatment provided. Medical history was updated before and after each consultation or treatment. We saw a sample of the consent to treatment forms that people were required to sign before any treatment took place.

The dentist told us that all of the procedures for care and treatment were carried out in line with up to date published research and good practice guidelines.

Staff working at the service had the relevant qualifications and experience to deliver the service provided. There were arrangements in place to deal with foreseeable

emergencies with staff trained in resuscitation and defibrillation procedures. The practice made follow up telephone calls and e-mails after treatment to make sure that it had been successful and people were happy with it.

**Our judgement**

People experienced care, treatment and support that met their needs and protected their rights.

Overall the provider was meeting this 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

People did not comment on the safeguarding procedures of the practice. They did tell us the treatment they received was delivered in a way and environment that they felt safe in.

##### 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. The practice had a safeguarding policy and procedure that staff were aware of. This was explained by the dentist who knew what constituted abuse and the circumstances under which they may need to initiate the procedure. This included who to contact and there was direct access to the lead area nurse for safeguarding. The practice safeguarding lead attended a safeguarding course and information was provided for all staff during a minuted practice meeting. There were no previous or current safeguarding alerts raised. All personal information was kept securely on a computerised system or in locked filing cabinets.

All staff had current Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) checks.

##### Our judgement

People are protected from abuse, or the risk of abuse, and their human rights are protected.

Overall the provider was meeting this 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

People said the practice was clean and tidy. They did not comment on infection control procedures.

##### Other evidence

There were effective systems in place to reduce the risk and spread of infection. When we visited a staff member demonstrated and explained the daily procedures followed from when the practice opened, to when it closed. This included before each new patient was seen and after they had received treatment. They told us that all equipment was wiped down including dental chairs and work surfaces and how re-usable instruments were checked for debris and residual matter after washing and before sterilisation including magnification. They also explained how sterilizers and other equipment was checked and how the checks were recorded. There was a clear process followed to ensure that clean and dirty instruments did not cross contaminate. Regular infection control audits were also recorded. Autoclaves were checked individually, on a daily basis and there were am and pm read outs.

Required equipment used was under contract and regularly checked and serviced by engineers.

Sharp boxes were in evidence and emptied by contractors when three quarters full and clinical waste appropriately stored and disposed of under contract. Medication was regularly audited and disposed of if out of date. All medication was kept locked away. These procedures followed standard infection control guidance.

A tour of the clinic showed us all areas including reception, treatment and decontamination rooms were clean and well maintained. There were separate sinks used for hand washing and used instruments. The dental chairs were clean and well maintained. Decontamination barriers were present on equipment and in areas

required. Staff were provided with appropriate protective clothing and equipment.

**Our judgement**

People were protected from the risk of infection because appropriate guidance had been followed. They were cared for in a clean, hygienic environment.

Overall the provider was meeting this 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.

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

<b>Document purpose</b>	Review of compliance report
<b>Author</b>	Care Quality Commission
<b>Audience</b>	The general public
<b>Further copies from</b>	03000 616161 / <a href="http://www.cqc.org.uk">www.cqc.org.uk</a>
<b>Copyright</b>	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

<b>Website</b>	<a href="http://www.cqc.org.uk">www.cqc.org.uk</a>
<b>Telephone</b>	03000 616161
<b>Email address</b>	<a href="mailto:enquiries@cqc.org.uk">enquiries@cqc.org.uk</a>
<b>Postal address</b>	Care Quality Commission Citygate Gallowgate Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 4PA