

We are the regulator: Our job is to check whether hospitals, care homes and care services are meeting essential standards.

Guinea Court Dental Surgery

21-22 Guinea Court, Chineham, Basingstoke,
RG24 8XJ

Tel: 01256840141

Date of Inspection: 01 July 2013

Date of Publication: July 2013

We inspected the following standards as part of a routine inspection. This is what we found:

Care and welfare of people who use services	✓ Met this standard
Safeguarding people who use services from abuse	✓ Met this standard
Cleanliness and infection control	✓ Met this standard
Supporting workers	✓ Met this standard
Complaints	✓ Met this standard

Details about this location

Registered Provider	Mr Harvey Rook And Mrs Michelle Rook
Registered Manager	Mr. Harvey Rook
Overview of the service	Guinea Court Dental Surgery is a dental practice providing a range of dental services to both children and adults. Children up to the age of 18 receive treatment which is covered by the NHS.
Type of service	Dental service
Regulated activities	Diagnostic and screening procedures Surgical procedures Treatment of disease, disorder or injury

Contents

When you read this report, you may find it useful to read the sections towards the back called 'About CQC inspections' and 'How we define our judgements'.

	Page
Summary of this inspection:	
Why we carried out this inspection	4
How we carried out this inspection	4
What people told us and what we found	4
More information about the provider	4
Our judgements for each standard inspected:	
Care and welfare of people who use services	5
Safeguarding people who use services from abuse	7
Cleanliness and infection control	8
Supporting workers	10
Complaints	11
About CQC Inspections	12
How we define our judgements	13
Glossary of terms we use in this report	15
Contact us	17

Summary of this inspection

Why we carried out this inspection

This was a routine inspection to check that essential standards of quality and safety referred to on the front page were being met. We sometimes describe this as a scheduled inspection.

This was an unannounced inspection.

How we carried out this inspection

We looked at the personal care or treatment records of people who use the service, carried out a visit on 1 July 2013, observed how people were being cared for and checked how people were cared for at each stage of their treatment and care. We talked with people who use the service and talked with staff.

What people told us and what we found

We spoke with four patients in the practice and one patient by telephone following our visit to the service. People were complementary about the quality of the service provided at the practice. One patient told us "They are very good. He is so friendly and approachable and nothing is too much trouble." Another said "Cannot fault the service. All the staff are welcoming and professional." The practice was described as "excellent" and "highly professional" by other patients. People told us they had been treated respectfully and the practice was well run and efficient. We were told that the dentists fully explained treatment options in a way people could understand and explained the various costs involved if applicable.

Records for people who used the services were up-to-date and stored electronically. The premises were clean and well organised and staff routinely followed infection control procedures when carrying out treatments. Staff received appropriate training to enhance their knowledge and skills and to keep them up-to-date. The practice had a complaints procedure and people felt they would be listened to if they raised a concern or had a complaint about the services provided.

You can see our judgements on the front page of this report.

More information about the provider

Please see our website www.cqc.org.uk for more information, including our most recent judgements against the essential standards. You can contact us using the telephone number on the back of the report if you have additional questions.

There is a glossary at the back of this report which has definitions for words and phrases we use in the report.

Our judgements for each standard inspected

Care and welfare of people who use services

✓ Met this standard

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

Our judgement

The provider was meeting this standard.

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

Reasons for our judgement

People's needs were assessed and care and treatment was planned and delivered in line with their individual care plan. People told us they were extremely happy with the standards of treatment and care provided. We received positive comments from everyone spoken with about the appointment system, the competence and professionalism of staff and the level of information provided when people attended the practice. People told us that when an emergency appointment had been required the practice would do their utmost to fit them in without delay.

The reception area and waiting areas were comfortable and there were a range of leaflets available to patients about the services on offer. We observed the receptionist greeting people as they arrived for their appointments in a warm and friendly manner. People we spoke with told us that all the practice staff were friendly and welcoming and the waiting areas were informal and relaxing. People told us that they were always treated with respect and the atmosphere was calm and put them at ease.

Care and treatment was planned and delivered in a way that was intended to ensure people's safety and welfare. We saw that all consultations took place in private consulting rooms. People's records were maintained electronically and arrangements were in place to ensure people's records were stored safely and securely. We were told by staff that patients were seen in private and their confidentiality was maintained throughout the consultation. An examination and initial consultation was undertaken and the person's medical history was obtained and updated regularly. We saw records of dental examinations and observed that all patients' records documented their medical information and the results of consultations. We saw that any significant medical conditions were highlighted within the electronic record by a red cross. This alerted the dentist to take account of the person's medical needs. People we spoke with told us that treatment options and costs were always explained thoroughly to them. Everyone we spoke with told us that they received their treatment plan in writing.

We saw that the practice maintained a range of emergency medical equipment that included a defibrillator, oxygen mask and a range of medicines. Staff told us that these were checked as in date and working on a monthly basis. These checks were not recorded. Some information about potential emergency situations was stored together with the emergency equipment in order to guide staff should such a situation arise. There was also information stored with each medicine again to guide staff in the event of an emergency arising. Staff told us that the practice used an emergency first aid trainer from the health authority. They attended the practice annually to train all staff and whilst there they reviewed the emergency equipment and medicines to ensure that everything was up to date.

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

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.

Reasons for our judgement

People who used 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. All members of staff had undertaken safeguarding adults and child protection training provided by a private training provider and certificates of completion dated March 2013 were seen. This training had included consideration of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 and the deprivation of liberty safeguards. Staff told us that some practices had been enhanced as a result of the training. For example additional information was now recorded such as the schools attended by children.

Staff spoken with demonstrated a good understanding of safeguarding and mental capacity issues. They were able to provide a clear account of what action they would take if they suspected that abuse had taken place. Staff told us they felt confident they could raise concerns and that these would be listened to and addressed by management. Contact details for the local safeguarding teams and child protection teams were available within the practice.

When we spoke with people who used the service they told us they were very happy with their care and they felt safe with the dentists and other staff. We were told that people felt confident in raising concerns and knew how to do this. Most people said that depending on the type of concern they would speak with the dentist.

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

Our judgement

The provider was meeting this standard.

People were protected from the risk of infection because appropriate guidance had been followed.

Reasons for our judgement

There were effective systems in place to reduce the risk and spread of infection. During our visit the practice was clean and well maintained. There was a designated decontamination room and all nurses were expected to take responsibility for decontamination of all practice instruments on a daily rota basis. This system ensured that all nursing staff were kept up to date with infection control procedures. One senior dental nurse was designated as the infection control lead. All nurses were responsible for cleaning all areas of the consultation room in which they were working. We saw that appropriate personal protective equipment was available and in use. Staff in the practice received infection control and relevant health and safety updates through recognised external trainers.

We asked staff to demonstrate how they prepared the room between patients. They showed us that the chair and all surfaces were cleaned and all items used were disposed of or decontaminated. Staff wore uniforms and told us that they changed into uniforms when they arrived at the practice and whenever they left throughout the day. Staff were responsible for laundering their own uniforms. We were shown how instruments that required decontamination were processed in the dedicated decontamination room. Instruments were managed in trays or individually throughout the decontamination process. There were procedures in the room to ensure that clean and dirty instruments did not contaminate each other. Staff also showed us the manual checking of instruments after the washing phase. They described how any residual matter would be cleaned, and then the instrument re-washed prior to sterilisation. We saw that there was a cleaning task list for each consulting room which nurses had to sign as having completed each day. Nurses also had to sign as having completed all cleaning tasks in the decontamination room at the end of each day. However, there was no cleaning task list for the decontamination room available. All documentation to support the cleanliness and infection control procedures were available and seen. We were shown evidence of instrument decontamination, cleaning and general infection control audits.

The practice had a system in place for quality testing the washer-disinfector and the steriliser unit each day and after each cycle using an electronic reader. We saw that these tests were undertaken and records seen confirmed this. All equipment was regularly

maintained and serviced and records seen confirmed that this was the case.

The practice had employed an external contractor to undertake legionella testing and a risk assessment. Staff told us that this company were due to visit the practice the following day to carry out routine testing of the water supply. The infection control lead showed us an external audit of infection control procedures which was submitted online to the Infection Prevention Society. The most recent results were seen and indicated that the practice had a high compliance rate with infection control and we were told that identified areas for improvement were being addressed.

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

Our judgement

The provider was meeting this standard.

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

Reasons for our judgement

Staff received appropriate professional development. There were enough qualified, skilled and experienced staff to meet people's needs. Staff received appropriate professional development. Staff told us they received regular training in first aid, defibrillation and infection control and this was confirmed during examination of the records. We were told that there were bi monthly practice meetings that included nurses and reception staff. The staff told us the bi monthly meetings were well attended and valued by staff. We saw records which confirmed that a wide range of topics were discussed. Discussion topics included practice procedures, training needs and other relevant issues relating to the operation of the practice.

We spoke with the practice nurses. They told us that they were responsible for maintaining their own continuing professional development. However, training requirements were discussed regularly at meetings and with the dentists. We saw files that contained details and certificates of the training staff had received. Training courses attended included digital radiography, nutrition and oral health, motivational interviewing, safeguarding children and adults and medical emergencies.

Staff felt well supported by the dentists and described an 'open-door' policy which was practiced by them. The dentist and nurses told us that the flow of information between staff at the practice was very good and was achieved easily as the practice team was small and friendly. All staff spoken with told us that the practice was a very happy place to work where everyone worked well together and were supportive of each other.

Complaints

✓ Met this standard

People should have their complaints listened to and acted on properly

Our judgement

The provider was meeting this standard.

There was an effective complaints system available. Comments and complaints people made were responded to appropriately.

Reasons for our judgement

People were made aware of the complaints system. This was provided in a format that met their needs. The provider took account of complaints and comments to improve the service. The practice had a comprehensive complaints policy and procedure. Information about how to raise concerns or make comments was made available to patients and was posted on the wall in the waiting room. We were shown a comments and suggestions box that had recently been introduced in order to capture feedback from patients. A complaints record book was maintained. The record detailed the nature of the complaint and the action taken. There were no complaints recorded since 2010.

People we spoke with told us that they had "no concerns or complaints," however, most said they would go to the receptionists or dentists if they needed to. Every person spoken with said they were "confident that the dentists would listen and take their concerns seriously if they were raised."

The surgery conducted an annual patient satisfaction survey. We saw the results of the survey conducted in April 2012 which provided an overall picture of satisfaction and included some very complementary statements about the practice and the staff.

About CQC inspections

We are the regulator of health and social care in England.

All providers of regulated health and social 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 essential standards are described in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010 and the Care Quality Commission (Registration) Regulations 2009. We regulate against these standards, which we sometimes describe as "government standards".

We carry out unannounced inspections of all care homes, acute hospitals and domiciliary care services in England at least once a year to judge whether or not the essential standards are being met. We carry out inspections of other services less often. All of our inspections are unannounced unless there is a good reason to let the provider know we are coming.

There are 16 essential standards that relate most directly to the quality and safety of care and these are grouped into five key areas. When we inspect we could check all or part of any of the 16 standards at any time depending on the individual circumstances of the service. Because of this we often check different standards at different times.

When we inspect, we always visit and we do things like observe how people are cared for, and we talk to people who use the service, to their carers and to staff. We also review information we have gathered about the provider, check the service's records and check whether the right systems and processes are in place.

We focus on whether or not the provider is meeting the standards and we are guided by whether people are experiencing the outcomes they should be able to expect when the standards are being met. By outcomes we mean the impact care has on the health, safety and welfare of people who use the service, and the experience they have whilst receiving it.

Our inspectors judge if any action is required by the provider of the service to improve the standard of care being provided. Where providers are non-compliant with the regulations, we take enforcement action against them. If we require a service to take action, or if we take enforcement action, we re-inspect it before its next routine inspection was due. This could mean we re-inspect a service several times in one year. We also might decide to re-inspect a service if new concerns emerge about it before the next routine inspection.

In between inspections we continually monitor information we have about providers. The information comes from the public, the provider, other organisations, and from care workers.

You can tell us about your experience of this provider on our website.

How we define our judgements

The following pages show our findings and regulatory judgement for each essential standard or part of the standard that we inspected. Our judgements are based on the ongoing review and analysis of the information gathered by CQC about this provider and the evidence collected during this inspection.

We reach one of the following judgements for each essential standard inspected.

✓ Met this standard This means that the standard was being met in that the provider was compliant with the regulation. If we find that standards were met, we take no regulatory action but we may make comments that may be useful to the provider and to the public about minor improvements that could be made.

✗ Action needed This means that the standard was not being met in that the provider was non-compliant with the regulation. We may have set a compliance action requiring the provider to produce a report setting out how and by when changes will be made to make sure they comply with the standard. We monitor the implementation of action plans in these reports and, if necessary, take further action. We may have identified a breach of a regulation which is more serious, and we will make sure action is taken. We will report on this when it is complete.

✗ Enforcement action taken If the breach of the regulation was more serious, or there have been several or continual breaches, we have a range of actions we take using the criminal and/or civil procedures in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 and relevant regulations. These enforcement powers include issuing a warning notice; restricting or suspending the services a provider can offer, or the number of people it can care for; issuing fines and formal cautions; in extreme cases, cancelling a provider or managers registration or prosecuting a manager or provider. These enforcement powers are set out in law and mean that we can take swift, targeted action where services are failing people.

How we define our judgements (continued)

Where we find non-compliance with a regulation (or part of a regulation), we state which part of the regulation has been breached. Only where there is non compliance with one or more of Regulations 9-24 of the Regulated Activity Regulations, will our report include a judgement about the level of impact on people who use the service (and others, if appropriate to the regulation). This could be a minor, moderate or major impact.

Minor impact – 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.

Moderate impact – 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.

Major impact – 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

We decide the most appropriate action to take to ensure that the necessary changes are made. We always follow up to check whether action has been taken to meet the standards.

Glossary of terms we use in this report

Essential standard

The essential standards of quality and safety are described in our *Guidance about compliance: Essential standards of quality and safety*. They consist of a significant number of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010 and the Care Quality Commission (Registration) Regulations 2009. These regulations describe the essential standards of quality and safety that people who use health and adult social care services have a right to expect. A full list of the standards can be found within the *Guidance about compliance*. The 16 essential standards are:

Respecting and involving people who use services - Outcome 1 (Regulation 17)

Consent to care and treatment - Outcome 2 (Regulation 18)

Care and welfare of people who use services - Outcome 4 (Regulation 9)

Meeting Nutritional Needs - Outcome 5 (Regulation 14)

Cooperating with other providers - Outcome 6 (Regulation 24)

Safeguarding people who use services from abuse - Outcome 7 (Regulation 11)

Cleanliness and infection control - Outcome 8 (Regulation 12)

Management of medicines - Outcome 9 (Regulation 13)

Safety and suitability of premises - Outcome 10 (Regulation 15)

Safety, availability and suitability of equipment - Outcome 11 (Regulation 16)

Requirements relating to workers - Outcome 12 (Regulation 21)

Staffing - Outcome 13 (Regulation 22)

Supporting Staff - Outcome 14 (Regulation 23)

Assessing and monitoring the quality of service provision - Outcome 16 (Regulation 10)

Complaints - Outcome 17 (Regulation 19)

Records - Outcome 21 (Regulation 20)

Regulated activity

These are prescribed activities related to care and treatment that require registration with CQC. These are set out in legislation, and reflect the services provided.

Glossary of terms we use in this report (continued)

(Registered) Provider

There are several legal terms relating to the providers of services. These include registered person, service provider and registered manager. The term 'provider' means anyone with a legal responsibility for ensuring that the requirements of the law are carried out. On our website we often refer to providers as a 'service'.

Regulations

We regulate against the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010 and the Care Quality Commission (Registration) Regulations 2009.

Responsive inspection

This is carried out at any time in relation to identified concerns.

Routine inspection

This is planned and could occur at any time. We sometimes describe this as a scheduled inspection.

Themed inspection

This is targeted to look at specific standards, sectors or types of care.

Contact us

Phone: 03000 616161

Email: enquiries@ccq.org.uk

Write to us
at: Care Quality Commission
Citygate
Gallowgate
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE1 4PA

Website: www.cqc.org.uk

Copyright Copyright © (2011) 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.
