

Tales Of The Un-Inspected
Home 120
By Eileen Chubb
(Copyright November 2012)

This home is owned by the same company as home 119.

The majority of information used in this report is not publicly available and was obtained via a Freedom of Information request. The regulator CQC have published one inspection report for this home.

I have serious concerns as a result of what I have discovered these concerns relate to the home, the Local Authority and the Regulator CQC.

The Home.

A new company took over this home in the autumn of 2011, the information I obtained shows that, For a period of 2 Yrs and 6 Months prior to being taken over there were 6 Safeguarding referrals from the home, 5 of which required no investigation. I have always found that homes tend to refer things that do not reflect too badly on them and I therefore always look at referrals from outside a home as they give a true picture of any concerns. For the two and half year period there was 2 Outside referrals.

In a seven month period since the new company took over there have been 6 safeguarding referrals from the home 3 of which required no investigation. There have been 5 Safeguarding referrals from outside the home in the same seven month period.

The CQC inspect the home on April 16th 2012 and publish a report of this visit in May 2012.

The first standard inspected found that people were not treated with respect and staff say things like, open your mouth, or sit down when speaking to residents. People are restrained without documents approving the restraint. This area is judged non-compliant and having a moderate impact.

The next section inspected is care and welfare. The information in care plans was not consistent as inspectors think staff had not followed the

care plan for a person at risk of falls who fell in front of the inspector. This section was judged non-compliant with moderate impact.

The next section is safeguarding. This relates to the home reporting abuse. The report states one resident had recently been seriously assaulted another and this had not been written in the care plan. The Inspector states seeing this same resident left unattended by staff throughout the day. It is clear there are not enough staff to care for residents yet inspectors seem to think there is time to write and read care plans.

This is judged non-compliant with moderate impact.

The next is safety of premises, this area is judged non-compliant with moderate impact.

The next section is staffing, finally it is stated there are not enough staff. The report states on page 16 that the Local Authority Safeguarding team raised concerns in March after one incident where a resident was seriously assaulted by another. The CQC state the staffing levels remain the same. This section is judged non-compliant with moderate impact.

The last section relates to how well the company monitor any problems in the home and act on them. The inspector says the company have an excellent monitoring tool for assessing any problems and acting on them. This section is judged fully compliant in spite of all the failures not acted on.

This is bad enough but what I discovered from the other information obtained raises concerns that every single protection for the vulnerable is worthless.

The local Authority are aware in March 2012 that a vulnerable person has been seriously hurt by another resident and are fully aware there are not enough staff to keep people safe. The Company and the CQC are also fully aware of the risk of further harm if the situation remains unchanged.

15 days later a resident is taken to hospital and the hospital report that there is evidence of sexual abuse and neglect. Safeguarding conclude they cannot determine how this could have happened.

10 days later another victim of neglect is reported and this time

safeguarding uphold the allegation.

Two months later, two further reports are made from outside the home of two residents being physically abused. Both partially upheld.

The authorities knew people were at risk, the company knew and still more vulnerable suffered because no one acted.

Eileen Chubb