

Review of compliance

<p>Dr Michael Frankl Lotus Clinic Dental & Aesthetic Medicine London</p>	
Region:	London
Location address:	943 Finchley Road London NW11 7PE
Type of service:	Dental service
Date of Publication:	May 2012
Overview of the service:	The Lotus Clinic Dental and Aesthetic Medicine London provides dental services to private patients. It is located in the Golders Green area of north London close to local transport links. The practice has two treatment rooms and a separate waiting area.

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

Our current overall judgement

Lotus Clinic Dental & Aesthetic Medicine London 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 3 May 2012, talked to staff and talked to people who use services.

What people told us

We spoke with one patient on the day of our visit. They told us that their privacy and dignity were always respected by staff. They told us the dental care and treatment provided was 'top quality'. Staff were described as 'very friendly and very professional'. The patient understood the treatment choices available to them and a written treatment plan was provided to take away and consider. We saw a file where completed patient satisfaction forms were stored. Comments from people using the service in April 2012 included: 'the dentist knew what I needed' and 'it was painless'.

Effective systems for infection control were being implemented in the practice and instruments were safe to use.

What we found about the standards we reviewed and how well Lotus Clinic Dental & Aesthetic Medicine London 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 views and experiences were taken into account in the way the service was provided and delivered in relation to care. People's privacy and dignity were respected. 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.

The provider was meeting this standard.

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

People 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 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. People were treated in a clean, hygienic environment.

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

We spoke with one patient on the day of our visit. They told us that their privacy and dignity were always respected by staff. They said that treatment was explained to them in a way they understood and they were clear about the fees they would have to pay, in advance. They understood the treatment choices available to them and chose the course of treatment they preferred.

The waiting room was clean and well maintained. The premises could be accessed by people using a wheelchair.

Other evidence

Patients were given appropriate information regarding their individual treatment plan, including the costs involved. Treatment price lists were on display at the reception. We saw that individual treatment plans were provided to patients and these detailed the options available to them, the advantages and disadvantages of treatments, the risks involved in a particular treatment and the costs of each treatment. The information provided enabled patients to make informed decisions about the treatment they received.

Written post-procedure instructions were given to patients depending upon the type of

treatment they had received. This information included who to contact if they had any concerns later in the day. Patients sometimes received a follow-up phone call from staff the day after their treatment depending upon the type of procedure they had undergone. In this way patients were provided with appropriate information and support in relation to their care and treatment.

Patients were encouraged to complete satisfaction questionnaires before leaving the dental surgery to give feedback on their experience. We saw forms available at the reception. We also saw a file of completed questionnaires. These showed that patients were satisfied with the service they had received.

All consultations took place in the treatment rooms. Other discussions about treatment plans took place in a private room. In this way the privacy of patients was maintained.

Our judgement

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

We spoke with a patient, who had been using the dental clinic for many years, about their experience of the service. They told us the dental care and treatment provided was 'top quality'. Staff were described as 'very friendly and very professional'. The patient confirmed that the dentist explained everything in a way they could understand and the treatment options available were explained in detail. A written treatment plan or plans were provided to take away and consider. They said they had recommended the service to other family members.

We saw a file where completed patient satisfaction forms were stored. Comments from people using the service in April 2012 included: 'the dentist knew what I needed'; 'first class'; and 'it was painless'. These comments confirmed that patients were satisfied with the care and treatment provided by the dentist.

Other evidence

We reviewed some patient dental care records. These showed that patients' dental needs had been assessed. A full medical history was taken and a full dental examination was performed on each patient. Records were kept of findings and the treatments provided. Treatment options discussed with patients were recorded. The costs of treatment were clearly stated. Agreed treatment plans were signed by patients to show that they had given their consent.

There were arrangements in place to deal with possible emergencies. All staff had undertaken training in basic life support in January 2012. Emergency equipment was

regularly checked by staff to ensure it was in working order. We saw that records had been kept of the checks made. We checked all the medicines in the emergency drug kit. These were all within expiry dates. We noted that the adrenaline was missing from the kit. The practice manager explained that this had been removed after it expired at the end of April, three days prior to our visit. An order for a replacement had been made but it had not yet been delivered.

Our judgement

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

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

The patient we spoke with said that initially they had been nervous about using the dentist but staff had 'helped calm my nerves'. They had been coming to the service for many years and were confident in the dentist's skills.

Other evidence

There were policies in place in relation to the safeguarding of adults and children. Policies had been signed by staff to show that they had read and understood the policy and safeguarding procedures. Staff knew how to recognise safeguarding concerns and explained the most appropriate action to take if they had concerns about a child or vulnerable adult. A list of contacts for advice on safeguarding matters and referrals was on display where staff could see it. A flow chart, to help staff make decisions where they had safeguarding concerns, was available.

Our judgement

People 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 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

A patient we spoke with told us the clinic was always very clean and they saw staff using protective clothing including gloves.

Other evidence

There were effective systems in place to reduce the risk and spread of infection. For example, re-usable dental instruments were sterilised in order to minimise the risk of cross infection. The instruments were washed and inspected using a magnifier to ensure all debris was removed. They were then placed in the autoclave for sterilisation.

We saw that regular servicing and testing of the autoclave had been carried out to ensure that it was working effectively. Service records showed that the next service date for the autoclave was 29 November 2012. We saw that records of daily tests of the autoclave were kept.

Compliance with the infection control and decontamination requirements was audited annually. For example, we saw that an infection prevention audit had been undertaken in June 2011. Improvements needed were identified in an action plan and we saw that most of these had been implemented.

Surfaces of dental equipment including work surfaces and dental chairs were cleaned between patients. We saw that the dentist and dental nurse wore protective clothing including gloves when providing care and treatment. This helped reduce the risk of cross-infection.

Yellow sharps bins were used for the disposal of needles and other sharp objects. We

saw that these had not been over-filled. There were contracts in place for the removal of clinical and general waste. Waste awaiting collection was stored in locked bins outside the premises.

All staff had completed recent training in infection prevention. Up to date infection control policies were in place and being implemented. We saw from records of monthly staff meetings that infection control policies and procedures had been discussed. This ensured that all staff were adequately informed and able to provide safe treatment to patients that minimised infection risks.

Our judgement

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

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

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