

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

West Park Dental Practice

156 Cumberland Street, Macclesfield, SK10 1BP

Tel: 01625431063

Date of Inspection: 08 January 2013

Date of Publication: February 2013

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

Respecting and involving people who use services	✓	Met this standard
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 Paul Smith
Overview of the service	West Park Dental Practice provides general dentistry, oral health and restorative work to adults and children. The practice is situated close to Macclesfield town centre.
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	5
Our judgements for each standard inspected:	
Respecting and involving people who use services	6
Care and welfare of people who use services	7
Safeguarding people who use services from abuse	9
Cleanliness and infection control	10
Supporting workers	11
Complaints	12
About CQC Inspections	13
How we define our judgements	14
Glossary of terms we use in this report	16
Contact us	18

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 announced 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 8 January 2013, talked with people who use the service and talked with staff.

What people told us and what we found

We spoke to three people who used the service who told us they were given appropriate information and support regarding their treatment options and costs. They were very positive about the care and treatment they received.

People told us that consultations and treatments were undertaken in private and they felt their privacy was respected.

People spoken with also reported that appointments were flexible to meet their needs and the service was accessible, comfortable, clean and accommodating. Some comments made were; -

"It's a great service. All the staff are friendly."

"The service is very good and supports me with my dental health."

We found that the people who used the service were given information around their treatment options, costs and health care advice.

There were systems in place to gather the views of the people who used the service about the care and support provided.

The surgeries and reception areas were clean and there were systems in place to promote good hygiene.

The staff were provided with the support and training needed to appropriately support the needs of the people who used the service.

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

Respecting and involving people who use services ✓ Met this standard

People should be treated with respect, involved in discussions about their care and treatment and able to influence how the service is run

Our judgement

The provider was meeting this standard.

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

Reasons for our judgement

We spoke with three people who used the service who told us they were given appropriate information and support regarding their treatment options and costs.

People told us that consultations and treatments were undertaken in private and they felt their privacy was respected.

We saw there was information in the reception areas for the people who used the service to refer to. This included information about the practice and dental healthcare leaflets to promote healthy teeth and gums. The dentist had further information leaflets for patients around dental health that were given out following treatment or a consultation.

We saw that consultations and treatments took place in private. The staff had been made aware of the importance of confidentiality and any recorded information relating to the people who used the service was held securely.

We saw that consultations with the people who used the service about their dental care were recorded including advice about treatment options and costs.

We saw there were systems in place to seek feedback from the people who used the service. People were asked to complete surveys about the service they had received. They were also encouraged to make suggestions for improvements following their visit to the practice. We saw that some suggestions made such as making a calendar available in the reception area had been implemented.

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

The three people we spoke with were all very positive about the care and treatment they had received. They told us that they had been given enough information to make a decision about their treatment and that the dentist talked through all treatment options and costs.

The people we spoke to said that their medical history was taken into account when planning their treatment. They said that appointments were flexible to meet their needs and that the practice was clean, comfortable and accommodating. Some comments made were; -

"It's a great service. All the staff are friendly."

"The service is very good and supports me with my dental health."

We saw that the medical and social history of the people who used the service was recorded. We saw individualised clinical notes that detailed the examination, treatment planning and costs. Patients confirmed that they had received oral health education where this had been necessary and we saw evidence of this recorded in clinical notes.

Staff told us they had received training in dealing with medical emergencies and we saw evidence of staff certificates to confirm this.

There were safe working practices in place for the use of x-ray equipment and local guidelines where in each treatment room for staff to refer to. The provider confirmed that only trained staff were involved in taking and processing x rays. Records showed that radiological equipment had been checked within the recommended guidelines.

There was a system in place to recall patients based on a risk assessment of their dental health.

There were procedures in place to follow if a patient needed to be referred to other healthcare professionals.

Members of the staff team spoken with told us they had regular meetings to discuss issues

related to the service including good working practices. We saw records of these meetings that confirmed this.

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

The service had information for staff to refer to on the local area child and adult safeguarding policies and procedures, including contact details. The staff we spoke with demonstrated a good understanding of their roles and responsibilities regarding who to refer concerns to.

Training records showed that staff had attended training around the child safeguarding procedures. The provider had a plan in place for staff to attend training around safeguarding adults from abuse within the next twelve months. In the interim the provider confirmed that the process for making a referral to social services should there be any concerns about the welfare of an adult had been discussed at a staff meeting.

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

People who used the service told us that the reception areas and treatment rooms were clean.

We saw a treatment room and found this was clean, free from clutter with surfaces that could be cleaned and disinfected between patients. There were supplies of soap, hand towels, masks and gloves for the staff team to use.

There were infection control procedures in place for staff to refer to. The technique for hand washing to prevent infection was on display.

Staff members spoken with reported they had received infection control training. They demonstrated a clear understanding and recognised the importance of infection control. Training records confirmed that staff had up to date training in this area.

We were shown how instruments that require decontamination were processed. The treatment room was being used for this process at the time of our visit. We observed a demonstration of how instruments were cleaned and the protocols in place to ensure the dirty instruments did not contaminate the clean ones. We were shown up to date records of equipment used for decontamination being serviced and maintained.

The provider had a plan for the setting up of a separate decontamination room. We were shown the area to be used. This provided a more spacious area in which to carry out this process and for the storage of equipment.

We saw that infection control audits took place to ensure that a good standard was maintained.

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

People who used the service told us they were confident in the skills and expertise of the dentist and dental nurses. They said that the staff were friendly and put them at ease.

Records demonstrated that new staff received an induction to ensure they had the skills and knowledge to support the people who used the service.

We spoke with two dental nurses who said they were given good training opportunities. They said the registered provider supported them to maintain their continuous professional development training. This enabled them to maintain their professional registration as dental nurses. We saw a sample of training records that confirmed the training provided.

The training records of the dentist showed evidence of ongoing professional development.

The staff spoken with said regular staff meetings and informal training sessions took place. This was to enable information to be shared and to discuss internal practice issues.

The provider may find it useful to note that although staff had up to date training in medical emergencies, emergency practice drills to ensure staff had adequate knowledge and skills in between training events were not taking place on a regular basis.

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

There was a complaint procedure available for the people who used the service to refer to. The procedure was displayed in the reception area of the service.

Records showed that where an issue had been raised the provider had taken appropriate action and had made a record of the action taken and the outcome.

The three people we spoke with were aware of how to make a complaint should they ever need to.

The people who used the service were also encouraged to give their views about how the service operated through surveys and suggestion forms.

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 dentists and other services at least once every two years. 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 but we always inspect at least one standard from each of the five key areas every year. We may check fewer key areas in the case of dentists and some other services.

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. We make a judgement about the level of impact on people who use the service (and others, if appropriate to the regulation) from the breach. 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.
