

Review of compliance

The Walpole Street Practice Limited
The Walpole Street Dental Practice

Region:	London
Location address:	16 Walpole Street London SW3 4QP
Type of service:	Dental service
Date of Publication:	August 2012
Overview of the service:	<p>The Walpole Street Dental Practice has been in operation since 1990 and provides private dental treatment to children and adults. Services provided include general dentistry, oral surgery, prosthodontics and dental implants.</p> <p>Staff at the practice include two dentists, three dental nurses, two hygienists and two administrators.</p>

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

Our current overall judgement

The Walpole Street Dental Practice 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 5 July 2012, talked to staff and talked to people who use services.

What people told us

We spoke with two patients who both said that they were given appropriate information about their treatment and fees. They told us that they were treated with respect and dignity and always had procedures explained to them. Patients said that staff were always polite and courteous and one patient said that they were "marvellous" at explaining the treatment process to her.

Patients said that were satisfied with the quality of the care and treatment they received. One patient described her treatment as "First rate" and all staff were described as "professional, kind and caring". Evidence from one 'thank you' card stated "I really appreciate your kindness and for making me feel so comfortable and safe".

Patients said that the practice was always clean, tidy and well maintained. One patient said that the practice observed the "highest standards of hygiene".

What we found about the standards we reviewed and how well The Walpole Street Dental Practice 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

Patient's privacy, dignity and independence 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

Patients experienced care and treatment 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

Patients 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

Patients were cared for in a clean, hygienic environment and were protected from the risk of infection because appropriate guidance had been followed. The provider was meeting this standard.

Outcome 14: Staff should be properly trained and supervised, and have the chance to develop and improve their skills

Patients were cared for by staff who were supported to deliver care and treatment safely and to an appropriate standard. 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 two patients who both said that they were given appropriate information about their treatment and fees. They told us that they were treated with respect and dignity and always had procedures explained to them. One patient said that staff at the practice were "marvellous" at explaining the treatment process to her.

Other evidence

Patients understood the treatment choices available to them because the dentist gave each patient verbal explanations about their treatment. We observed that staff spoke with patients in a polite and respectful manner.

Patients were given appropriate information regarding their treatment. The practice had patient information leaflets that gave information on the services available, opening times, fees and advice following treatment. There was also an ipad with internet access in the waiting area where patients could access information on the practice.

Patients' diversity, values and human rights were respected. Dentists treated patients in privacy and with dental nurses present. The clinic was not accessible to patients who used wheelchairs, but there were arrangements in place for such patients to be treated at an alternative practice if necessary.

Our judgement

Patient's privacy, dignity and independence 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

Patients we spoke with told us that they were satisfied with the quality of the care and treatment they received. One patient described her treatment as "First rate" and all staff were described as "professional, kind and caring".

Other evidence

Patients' needs were assessed and care and treatment was planned and delivered in line with their individual treatment plan. Staff told us patients were encouraged to complete a medical history form before brief dental examinations were carried out at the first appointment, following which diagnoses were made. The dentist also carried out further assessments of each patient's dental needs at their second appointment prior to undertaking any treatment.

Treatment options were discussed with patients and their consent was sought prior to treatment. We saw evidence that patients were given written treatment plans and electronic records of their treatment were maintained. There was evidence that the practice followed best practice NICE Guidance on extracting wisdom teeth.

There were arrangements in place to deal with foreseeable emergencies. The practice had medical emergency policies in place and all staff were trained in what to do in such circumstances. There were suitable medicines and equipment to deal with medical emergencies including oxygen and a defibrillator. Staff knew where these were kept and there were records of monthly checks on them.

Our judgement

Patients experienced care and treatment 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

We spoke with patients, but their feedback did not relate to this standard. However, evidence from one 'thank you' card stated "I really appreciate your kindness and for making me feel so comfortable and safe".

Other evidence

Patients 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 registered manager was the nominated lead for child protection and safeguarding vulnerable adults.

The clinic had policies in place on child protection and safeguarding vulnerable adults and staff had attended the relevant training. Staff we spoke with knew how to recognise the signs of abuse and how they should be reported internally. There was a written procedure on how to escalate concerns about a patient's welfare, which included details on how to contact child protection and safeguarding vulnerable adults teams at the local authority.

Our judgement

Patients 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

Patients we spoke with told us that the practice was always clean, tidy and well maintained. One patient said that the practice observed the "highest standards of hygiene".

Other evidence

There were effective systems in place to reduce the risk and spread of infection. A dental nurse was the infection control lead which ensured there was a named person responsible for overseeing the standards and practices. There was an infection control policy that included procedures for the decontamination of instruments. On the day of the inspection the environment was clean and well maintained.

The decontamination procedure was explained to us by a dental nurse. There was a dedicated decontamination room with separate sinks for hand washing, cleaning and rinsing instruments. The procedure ensured that reprocessed instruments were free from visible contaminants prior to sterilization and included using a washer/disinfector and inspecting instruments with an illuminated magnifying glass. There were clearly identified clean and dirty areas that minimised the risk of clean instruments becoming contaminated.

Cleaned instruments were sterilized in a vacuumed autoclave. Sterilized instruments were packaged and stored for a maximum of 60 days, which ensured that they would not become contaminated before re-use.

We saw evidence that the clinic carried out decontamination audits on a quarterly basis in accordance with Health Technical Memorandum 01-05, which details the

government standards for decontamination in dental practices. There was also evidence that the autoclave was checked regularly to ensure it was working effectively.

There was evidence that a risk assessment for legionella had been carried out and a current certificate was available. Hot and cold water lines were routinely flushed and cleaned on a regular basis.

Our judgement

Patients were cared for in a clean, hygienic environment and were protected from the risk of infection because appropriate guidance had been followed. The provider was meeting this standard.

Outcome 14: Supporting workers

What the outcome says

This is what people who use services should expect.

People who use services:

* Are safe and their health and welfare needs are met by competent staff.

What we found

Our judgement

The provider is compliant with Outcome 14: Supporting workers

Our findings

What people who use the service experienced and told us

We spoke with patients but the feedback did not relate to this standard.

Other evidence

Staff received appropriate professional development. We were told and we saw evidence that staff had undertaken mandatory training including fire safety, resuscitation, infection control and safeguarding vulnerable adults. The dentist supported the dental nurses in their work and regularly met with them on a one-to-one basis away from the practice. Staff were appraised on their performance on an ongoing basis.

The provider safeguards high standards of care by creating an environment where clinical excellence can do well. Monthly staff meetings took place where matters of clinical relevance were discussed. The dentist undertook continuing professional development, ran a journal club and was the editor-in-chief of a dental journal.

Our judgement

Patients were cared for by staff who were supported to deliver care and treatment safely and to an appropriate standard. 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