


THE CQC, A LIKELY STORY

A SPECIAL REPORT BY EILEEN CHUBB

© SEPTEMBER 2017

PLEASE CREDIT THE CONTENTS OF THIS REPORT TO THE AUTHOR

likely

/ˈlɪkli/ 

adjective

1. such as well might happen or be true; probable.
"speculation on the likely effect of opting out"
synonyms: [probable](#), distinctly possible, to be expected, [odds-on](#), [on](#), [possible](#), [credible](#), [plausible](#), [believable](#), within the bounds of possibility, [imaginable](#); [More](#)
2. apparently suitable; promising.
"a likely-looking spot"
synonyms: [suitable](#), [appropriate](#), [apposite](#), [fit](#), [fitting](#), [acceptable](#), [proper](#), [right](#); [More](#)

adverb

1. probably.
"we will most likely go to a bar"
synonyms: [probably](#), in all probability, [presumably](#), no doubt, [doubtlessly](#); [More](#)



[Translations](#), [word origin](#), and [more definitions](#)

A SPECIAL REPORT BY EILEEN CHUBB

© September 1st 2017

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

In December 2015 I published "[CQC An On-going Concern](#)" and a copy was sent to the Minister for Social Care. This report exposed how hundreds of care homes across the country were being re-registered as under new ownership when in fact it was exactly the same old owners. Due to this re-registration scam these homes were being given a clean slate by the CQC as all their inspection histories were buried in an archive as a result of being registered as new. I have never received a response to my findings. Since that time I have monitored these homes and the CQC website and published further reports including "Coppice Lodge", "The 47 Worst Homes" and "Sussex Health Care".

The CQC registration scam continues unchecked and homes we exposed in "CQC An On-going Concern" have subsequently gone on to harm people. Sussex Health Care for example is now being investigated for multiple deaths and injuries.

Subsequently internal emails between the Department of Health and senior management at the CQC show who knew what, when they knew it and what they did about it.

This background is important because we have never stopped bringing this issue to Jeremy Hunt's attention, all of our letters have been ignored and all this evidence needs to be fully considered in light of what I have now discovered.

Please see "[The Hunt for Accountability](#)".

The following homes have all been re-registered by the CQC and their histories archived. In every single case the following statement was posted by CQC:

*“CQC have **not** inspected this service yet.*

This service was registered on (various dates around January 2017)

New services are assessed to check they are likely to be

SAFE

EFFECTIVE

CARING

RESPONSIVE

WELL LED

These assessments can include

Site visits

Criminal record checks

Interviews with key managers

A detailed review of how the service will be run”

WHAT THIS MEANS

This means that a care home that has been registered to the same company under a slightly different name will be run as it always has been in the past:

- The same company procedures
- The same management
- The same paperwork
- The same staff, good and bad
- The same weaknesses and strengths
- The same residents
- The same culture
- The same problems or good points that featured in the previous inspection report histories.

For example if on January 2nd 2017 Care Home A is inadequate, with a lack of staff, poor management and abusive culture and that same care home is re-registered on January 3rd 2017, it will be **exactly** the same care home as the **day before**.

However **none** of this past information is being used by CQC in forming a judgement that **“New services are assessed to check they are likely to be safe, effective, caring, responsive and well led.”** Furthermore the CQC are telling

the public this home is “*likely to be*” meeting the standards. I now challenge that **Likelihood** with evidence.

CALCULATING THE ODDS BASED ON FORM

As Jeremy Hunt clearly has no intention of doing anything other than protecting CQC, I have decided to take the unprecedented action of approaching this from the angle of the odds of an outcome based on a home’s “form” which is calculated on how they performed in the past based on the evidence in order to demonstrate the risk of harm to vulnerable people.

It’s a damning indictment that I have to write yet another report in order to expose the continued risk of harm to vulnerable people.

From the following group of 101 Care homes, **61** have a history of problems to some degree. **All** of these 61 homes have failed one or more of the five key standards which CQC state they have assessed as “Likely To Be” met. Some of these homes may have failed one inspection prior to being registered as “New” for a second time. Some of these homes have consistently failed inspections for years prior to being falsely registered as new. I am betting that given all that is known about a home’s past form, that the CQC assessment as stated i.e. “likelihood” is not a reliable calculation based on past form. I have chosen a selection of these homes.

CQC have re-registered these homes stating that they are **are assessed to check they are likely to be** compliant I am betting the evidence **contradicts** this assessment.

If each of the following homes was a horse,
 You **could** change its name
 You **could** falsely claim to change its owner
 But you could **not** change its legs.

These homes have been sold to HC1, so shortly all the current reports will also be archived and a new provider registration page will be posted, a further set of links to old reports will further confuse matters as there will be so many links on each page. Also it is like watching the Southern Cross situation unfold yet again despite all the promises that lessons have been learnt. I note that the larger BUPA homes have been sold, homes **too big to close** when things go wrong.

HOME ONE AMERIND GROVE

Raleigh Road BS3 1QN

171 vulnerable people live in this home.(Please see [Tales of the Uninspected Home 99](#))

Previous Owner BUPA Care Homes (CFH Care) Ltd, part of the company BUPA.

Current Owner BUPA Care Homes Limited, part of the company BUPA

CQC state this home is likely to be:

SAFE**EFFECTIVE****CARING****RESPONSIVE****WELL LED**

This home was registered as a new service on January 31st 2017 and has not been inspected since then.

THE MOST RECENT INSPECTION WAS APRIL 2016 (nine months earlier)

SAFE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
EFFECTIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
CARING	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
RESPONSIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
WELL LED	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT

INSPECTION 2. FEBRUARY 2016

This gives an overall rating to the home of Inadequate (the worst rating) and refers to a warning notice given the year before which has still not been met.

SAFE **FAILED** **INADEQUATE**

INSPECTION 3. FEBRUARY 2015

SAFE	FAILED	INADEQUATE
EFFECTIVE	FAILED	INADEQUATE
CARING	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
RESPONSIVE	PASSED	COMPLIANT
WELL LED	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT

INSPECTION 4. SEPTEMBER 2015

SAFE	FAILED	INADEQUATE
EFFECTIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
CARING	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
RESPONSIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
WELL LED	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT

INSPECTION 5. SEPTEMBER 2014**Old inspection system****NOT COMPLIANT WITH ALL STANDARDS, FAILED TWO, PASSED FIVE**

Since 2010 out of 7 further inspections this home has only once been fully compliant in JANUARY 2013

I bet that the likelihood is that this home is not

SAFE
EFFECTIVE
CARING
RESPONSIVE
WELL LED

HOME TWO GODDEN LODGE

Hart Road Benfleet SS7 3GL

Number of people resident: 133

Previous Owner BUPA Care Homes (CFH) Ltd, part of the company BUPA
 Current Owner BUPA Care Homes Limited. Part of the the company BUPA

The CQC website for this home states

“CQC have not inspected this service yet”

“This service was registered on 31st January 2017. New services are assessed to check they are likely to be

SAFE
EFFECTIVE
CARING
RESPONSIVE
WELL LED”

GODDEN LODGE INSPECTION HISTORY:

INSPECTION 1. JUNE 2016 (6 months prior to CQC re-registration assessment)

SAFE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
EFFECTIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
CARING	PASSED	COMPLIANT
RESPONSIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
WELL LED	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT

INSPECTION 2. JANUARY 2016

SAFE	FAILED	INADEQUATE
EFFECTIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
CARING	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
RESPONSIVE	FAILED	INADEQUATE
WELL LED	FAILED	INADEQUATE

INSPECTION 3. SEPTEMBER 2015 (only 3 standards inspected)

CARING	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
RESPONSIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
WELL LED	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT

INSPECTION 4. JULY 2015

SAFE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
EFFECTIVE	FAILED	INADEQUATE
CARING	FAILED	INADEQUATE

RESPONSIVE FAILED INADEQUATE
WELL LED FAILED INADEQUATE

**INSPECTION 5. (Old system) MAY 2014
 FAILED ONE OF 7**

INSPECTION 6. OCTOBER 2013 FAILED 3 OF 4

INSPECTION 7. MAY 2013 FAILED 2 OF 5

INSPECTION 8. MAY 2012 PASSED COMPLIANT.

This home has consistently failed since 2012, a period of 5 years.

I bet that based on the form that this home is unlikely to be safe, effective caring, responsive or well led.

HOME 3. MONMOUTH CARE HOME

IPSWICH 1P2 8RS

Number of people 153

Previous Owner	BUPA Care Homes (CFH) Ltd	A company owned by BUPA
Current Owner	BUPA Care Homes Ltd	A company owned by BUPA

The CQC web site for this home states

“CQC have not inspected this service yet”

“This service was registered on 31st January 2017. New services are assessed to check they are likely to be:

SAFE
EFFECTIVE
CARING
RESPONSIVE
WELL LED”

MONMOUTH COURT INSPECTION 1 DECEMBER 2016 (one month prior to CQC assessment that the likelihood is that this home is compliant)

SAFE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
EFFECTIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
CARING	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
RESPONSIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
WELL LED	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT

INSPECTION 2. DECEMBER 2015

SAFE	FAILED	INADEQUATE
EFFECTIVE	FAILED	INADEQUATE
CARING	FAILED	INADEQUATE
RESPONSIVE	FAILED	INADEQUATE
WELL LED	FAILED	INADEQUATE

INSPECTION 3. FEBRUARY 2015

SAFE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
EFFECTIVE	PASS	GOOD
CARING	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
RESPONSIVE	PASS	GOOD
WELL LED	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT

INSPECTION 4. JANUARY 2014 (Old system) | STANDARD CHECKED, MET

INSPECTION 5. OCTOBER 2013 3 STANDARDS CHECKED, 2 FAILED

INSPECTION 6. MAY 2013 6 STANDARDS CHECKED, 3 FAILED

INSPECTION 7. APRIL 2012 ONLY 1 STANDARD CHECKED, MET

INSPECTION 8. 2012 NOT COMPLIANT WITH ONE STANDARD

INSPECTION 9. AUGUST 2011 in response to concerns: FAILED

INSPECTION 10. In response to concerns: COMPLIANT.

The last time this home was meeting all the standards was six years ago.

I bet that based on the form that this home is unlikely to be, safe, effective caring, responsive or well led.

HOME 4. ST NICHOLAS

BOOTLE L30 2RG

Number of Residents: 176

The CQC website for this home states

“CQC have not inspected this service yet”

“This service was registered on August 4th 2017. New services are assessed to check they are likely to be

**SAFE
EFFECTIVE
CARING
RESPONSIVE
WELL LED”**

St Nicholas Inspection History

INSPECTION 1. MARCH 2017 (5 months before new re-registration)

SAFE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
EFFECTIVE	PASS	GOOD
CARING	PASS	GOOD
RESPONSIVE	PASS	GOOD
WELL LED	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT

INSPECTION 2. AUGUST 2016

SAFE	FAILED	INADEQUATE
EFFECTIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
CARING	PASS	GOOD
RESPONSIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT

WELL LED FAILED REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT

INSPECTION 3. FEBRUARY 2016

SAFE	FAILED	INADEQUATE
EFFECTIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
CARING	PASSED	GOOD
RESPONSIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
WELL LED	FAILED	INADEQUATE

**INSPECTION 4. JULY 2015
3 STANDARDS CHECKED**

SAFE	FAILED	INADEQUATE
CARING	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
RESPONSIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT

INSPECTION 5. JANUARY 2017

SAFE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
EFFECTIVE	PASSED	GOOD
CARING	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
RESPONSIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
WELL LED	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT

**INSPECTION 6. OCTOBER 2014 (Old system)
5 STANDARDS CHECKED
1 MET**

**ENFORCEMENT
ENFORCEMENT
ENFORCEMENT
ENFORCEMENT**

INSPECTION 7. MAY 2014 5 STANDARDS CHECKED, 2 FAILED, 2 MET

INSPECTION 8. MARCH 2014 6 STANDARDS CHECKED, 2 FAILED, 3 MET

INSPECTION 9. MARCH 2014 6 CHECKED, 3 FAILED

INSPECTION 10. JANUARY 2013, the last compliant - but not for long

HOME 5 WEST RIDINGS

Loft House Wakefield WF3 3JX

Please see [Tales of the Uninspected Home Number 42](#)

Number of Residents: 180

The CQC web site for this home states

“CQC have not inspected this service yet”

“This service was registered in January 2017. New services are assessed to check they are likely to be

**SAFE
EFFECTIVE
CARING
RESPONSIVE
WELL LED”**

WEST RIDINGS Inspection history:

Inspection 1. NOVEMBER 2016 (two months prior to registration assessment that the home is likely to be compliant)

SAFE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
EFFECTIVE	PASS	GOOD
CARING	PASS	GOOD
RESPONSIVE	PASS	GOOD
WELL LED	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT

INSPECTION 2. JUNE 2016

SAFE	FAILED	INADEQUATE
EFFECTIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
CARING	PASS	GOOD
RESPONSIVE	FAILED	INADEQUATE
WELL LED	FAILED	INADEQUATE

INSPECTION 3. NOVEMBER 2015

SAFE	FAILED	INADEQUATE
-------------	---------------	-------------------

EFFECTIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
CARING	PASS	GOOD
RESPONSIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
WELL LED	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT

INSPECTION 4. OCTOBER 2015

SAFE	FAILED	NO SCORE
EFFECTIVE	NOT INSPECTED	
CARING	NOT INSPECTED	
RESPONSIVE	NOT INSPECTED	
WELL LED	FAILED	NO SCORE

INSPECTION 5. JANUARY 2015

SAFE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
EFFECTIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
CARING	PASS	GOOD
RESPONSIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
WELL LED	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT

INSPECTION 6. JULY 2014 (OLD SYSTEM)
INSPECTED 6 STANDARDS, PASSED 5, FAILED 1

INSPECTION 7. APRIL 2014
INSPECTED 5 STANDARDS, FAILED 2, PASSED 3

INSPECTION 8. OCTOBER 2013
INSPECTED 6 STANDARDS, FAILED 5, PASSED 1

INSPECTION 9. APRIL 2013 FIRST TIME COMPLIANT
INSPECTED 3 STANDARDS, PASSED 3

INSPECTION 10. MAY 2012 COMPLIANT

INSPECTION 11. JANUARY 2012 FAILED

INSPECTION 12. JANUARY 2011 FAILED

Group Two homes are those that have been inspected **since** being re-registered. What I want to emphasise with this group is the period of time **between** being re-registered and up to the first inspection because in this gap period the only information available to the public will have been the “Not inspected yet” page providing the same misleading statement by the CQC, that the home **is likely to be Safe, Effective, Caring, Responsive and Well Led** when in fact the last inspection had contradicted this and a subsequent inspection validated that contradiction.

COLDSPRINGS PARK

CA11 8EY

Number of Residents 60

The last old inspection, under old provider BUPA: SEPTEMBER 2016

SAFE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
EFFECTIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
CARING	PASSED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
RESPONSIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
WELL LED	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT

The second to last old inspection 2, under old provider BUPA: MAY 2016

SAFE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
EFFECTIVE	FAILED	INADEQUATE
CARING	NOT INSPECTED	
RESPONSIVE	NOT INSPECTED	
WELL LED	FAILED	INADEQUATE

The first new inspection under new provider BUPA: JUNE 2017

SAFE	FAILED	INADEQUATE
EFFECTIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
CARING	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
RESPONSIVE	FAILED	INADEQUATE
WELL LED	FAILED	INADEQUATE

During the six month gap the public are told the home is likely to be meeting all the standards.

ROWAN GARTH

L6 OAE

PEOPLE 150

The last old inspection under the old provider BUPA: DECEMBER 2016

SAFE	FAILED	INADEQUATE
EFFECTIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
CARING	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
RESPONSIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
WELL LED	FAILED	INADEQUATE

The first new inspection under the new provider BUPA: JUNE 2017

SAFE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
EFFECTIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
CARING	PASSED	GOOD
RESPONSIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
WELL LED	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT

During the month gap the public are told the home is likely to be meeting all five standards.

NETHERTON GREEN

DY2 9LY

Number of Residents:120

SEE BTS3 AND TALES OF UNINSPECTED

The first new inspection under new provider BUPA: MARCH 2017
(but not published until June).

SAFE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
EFFECTIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
CARING	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
RESPONSIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
WELL LED	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT

The last old inspection under old provider BUPA: **JANUARY 2016**

SAFE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
EFFECTIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
CARING	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
RESPONSIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
WELL LED	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT

During the six month gap in between the inspections the public are told the home is likely to be meeting all five standards.

OAKWOOD HOUSE

RH13 5NR

Number of Residents: 50

The first new inspection under new provider BUPA: **JUNE 2017**

SAFE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
EFFECTIVE	PASSED	GOOD
CARING	PASSED	GOOD
RESPONSIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
WELL LED	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT

The last old inspection under old provider BUPA: **FEBRUARY 2016**

SAFE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
EFFECTIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
CARING	PASSED	GOOD
RESPNSIVE	PASSED	GOOD
WELL LED	PASSED	GOOD

During the six month gap the public are told by the CQC that the home is likely to be meeting the standards.

RINGWAY MEWS

M22 4RY

Number of Residents: 140

The first new inspection under new provider BUPA: JUNE 2017

SAFE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
EFFECTIVE	PASSED	GOOD
CARING	PASSED	GOOD
RESPONSIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
WELL LED	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT

The last old inspection under old provider BUPA: JUNE 2016

SAFE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
EFFECTIVE	PASSED	GOOD
CARING	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
RESPONSIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
WELL LED	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT

The gap in between these inspections is six months during which time the CQC told the public the home is likely to be meeting all five standards.

SALTHOUSE HAVEN

8UH 9FH

Number of Residents: 150

The first new inspection under the new provider BUPA: JUNE 2017

SAFE	PASSED	GOOD
EFFECTIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
CARING	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
RESPONSIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
WELL LED	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT

The last old inspection under the old provider BUPA: DECEMBER 2016

SAFE	FAILED	INADEQUATE
EFFECTIVE	FAILED	INADEQUATE
CARING	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
RESPONSIVE	FAILED	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT
WELL LED	FAILED	INADEQUATE

The gap between inspections is six months. The public are told by the CQC that the home is likely to meet all five standards.

Summery

CQC will re – register over a hundred BUPA Homes to HC1 and again the misleading registration page stating this is a new home and whole “Likely Lie” will start all over again. It will be interesting to see how CQC differentiate between a new owner that is not new at all and a new owner that is new. The public are being misled and at a time when it is more important than ever to have the full picture about a care home.

I sincerely hope I am wrong but looking at the situation with HC1 I foresee the suffering levels I witnessed in Southern Cross Homes starting all over again.

Eileen Chubb
Founder & Director of Compassion In Care

