Inspection Report

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

Cotswold Periodontal Centre

145 Hales Road, Cheltenham, GL52 6TD Tel: 01242269498

Date of Inspection: 02 December 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
Assessing and monitoring the quality of service provision	✓ Met this standard

Details about this location

Registered Provider	Cotswold Periodontal Centre Limited
Registered Manager	Mr. Clifford Reginald Nissen
Overview of the service	Cotswold Periodontal Centre provides specialist treatment for periodontal (gum) disease. Patients are predominantly adult and are all treated privately.
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'.

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 2 December 2013, talked with people who use the service and talked with staff.

What people told us and what we found

We spoke with three people who had received treatment from the periodontist. They made positive comments about the practice and their treatment. One person commented that they were "very impressed" with the service they had received. People also told us how information about their periodontic treatment had been explained to them. One person commented that they had received "a good explanation". There were arrangements in place to protect children and vulnerable adults from the risk of abuse. We found that there were effective procedures in use for the decontamination of dental instruments. In addition everyone we spoke to said that the practice environment was clean when they visited. We also found that quality monitoring systems were in place that included seeking the views of people using 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

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.

Care and treatment was planned and delivered in a way that was intended to ensure people's safety and welfare. Arrangements were in place to ensure that people benefitted from understanding their treatment.

Reasons for our judgement

People's needs were assessed and care and treatment was planned and delivered in line with their treatment plan. We looked at patient records to check the information recorded and discussed these with the periodontist and the hygienist. As a periodontic practice, people would usually be referred from the dental practice they normally used. If they were assessed as suitable for treatment then they would receive a written treatment plan that included costs. We saw examples of treatment plans, these were detailed and included advice and explanations of risks and benefits. Written consent would then be sought before treatment commenced. As well as providing information to patients, the periodontist also liaised with the referring dentist about any planned treatment. We spoke with the hygienist who worked with the periodontist. They explained how they would use a patient's treatment plan as the basis for the treatment and advice given. They also explained the importance of understanding information about a patient's current health in a holistic way when they provided treatment.

Care and treatment was planned and delivered in a way that was intended to ensure people's safety and welfare. We saw how medical information such as allergies or a medical condition was recorded on patient records. Medical information had been checked for any changes and records updated if necessary at each visit. Checks had also been made on any recent dental treatment that a patient may have received. The periodontist explained how referrals to other services were rare. They gave us examples of referrals made in the past from the periodontal practice, such as a referral for endodontic (root canal) treatment. Referrals made to other services helped to ensure that patients received the most suitable treatment.

All of the people we spoke to were pleased with the treatment they had received. One person told us that their treatment had been "first class" and the treatment they had received from the hygienist was "very good". Another person told us how all stages of their treatment had been explained by the periodontist and the hygienist.

There were arrangements in place to deal with foreseeable emergencies. The practice had emergency drugs, oxygen and a defibrillator available for use in the event of a medical emergency. Equipment had been checked on a weekly basis and all staff had received training in dealing with medical emergencies. The practice also had contingency arrangements in place for guidance in the event of any disruption to the service provided.

Safeguarding people who use services from abuse ✓ Met this standard

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

Our judgement

The provider was meeting this standard.

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. The staff were able to protect people from the risk of abuse because they had relevant procedures to follow and knew who to contact.

Reasons for our judgement

The practice had policies for guiding staff in safeguarding children and vulnerable adults. Local contact details were also available for reporting any concerns. We found that staff had received training in safeguarding children and vulnerable adults. We spoke to the hygienist and they were clear about the procedures for reporting any allegation of abuse relating to people that used the service. They told us how they would refer to the guidance available in the surgery room for staff to follow. There had been no reported safeguarding concerns in relation to children or adults that used the service.

The practice had information for staff to refer to about the Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA). In addition staff had received training in the MCA and the hygienist explained their understanding of this. The MCA was intended for safeguarding people over the age of 16 years who may lack mental capacity in some areas of decision making. 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.

Cleanliness and infection control ✓ Met this standard

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. There were effective systems in place to reduce the risk of infection during treatment.

Reasons for our judgement

There were effective systems in place to reduce the risk and spread of infection. We observed the decontamination room and a dental nurse explained the procedures for decontamination of instruments. A specific decontamination protocol was in place for instruments used in periodontal treatment. A dental nurse explained how this protocol was followed in practice with thorough checking of the effectiveness of the cleaning procedures before instruments were sterilised. Instruments were safely transported from the surgery room to the decontamination room. A dirty to clean work flow was used in a well organised working environment. Various regular checks were carried out to ensure the effectiveness of processes and equipment for cleaning and sterilisation. Appropriate records of these checks were maintained. We observed that the dental nurse used personal protective equipment (PPE) to reduce the risk of cross infection. PPE was readily available for staff in the decontamination room. All staff with responsibility for working in the decontamination room had received appropriate training.

The practice had carried out an infection control audit against compliance with the Department of Health Decontamination Health Technical Memorandum 01–05 in primary care dental practices (HTM 01-05). This document had detailed guidance on decontamination and infection prevention and control procedures. The practice had the latest version of HTM 01-05 available for staff to refer to. The latest audit had been completed in October 2013 with a score of 100%. The practice also had a detailed plan for moving towards 'best practice' as described in HTM 01-05.

A checklist was in place that recorded the procedures followed for cleaning the dental surgery rooms. This was completed on a daily basis. The dental practice was clean throughout and people using the service that we spoke to told us it was always clean when they visited. All general equipment for cleaning was colour coded to help prevent cross infection. Audits had been carried out on both the cleaning of clinical areas and the general cleanliness of the practice to ensure that the expected level of cleanliness had been maintained. A risk assessment had been carried out by a specialist consultant in relation to Legionella in water systems. Staff had followed actions recommended in the risk assessment to minimise any risk. The practice had a contract for the collection of clinical

waste and we observed that it was stored securely before collection.

Assessing and monitoring the quality of service provision ✓ Met this standard

The service should have quality checking systems to manage risks and assure the health, welfare and safety of people who receive care

Our judgement

The provider was meeting this standard.

The provider had an effective system to regularly assess and monitor the quality of service that people received. Systems were in place to monitor the success of the treatment provided.

Reasons for our judgement

The provider took account of complaints and comments to improve the service. During our visit we found that arrangements were in place to assess and monitor the quality of service provision. The practice had sought the views of people that used the service through a patient feedback exercise, this was still in progress during our visit. We looked at some responses which contained positive comments about the service provided. One person that we spoke to during our visit told us how they had felt they were receiving a "quality" service. At the time of our visit, no complaints had been received about the service provided.

The hygienist explained how treatment had been continually assessed to check progress and success. We saw how computer generated graphs were used for this purpose. The practice had also carried out an audit on record keeping that examined such areas as how patient's medical history was recorded, recording of consent and the completion of periodontal charts. The results of the audit had been evaluated and notes made for areas of improvement. In addition an annual audit had been completed that examined the quality of x ray images.

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@cqc.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.