

**Tales of The Un-inspected**  
**Home Number 36.**  
**By Eileen Chubb**  
(This report is the Copyright of Eileen Chubb)

**Dear Mr Brown,**

**I have looked at the inspection history for..... home 36,  
These are my findings.**

**As a result of my investigation I discovered that 4 inspection reports for this home were not made available to the public, reports which related to serious medication issues and these reports being kept secret is surely not in the public interest. I have tried to obtain these reports and been refused them, I would have expected this had I been asking the security services for access to sensitive information but I am asking for inspection reports on a care home.**

**For this report I have decided to focus on medication as such efforts have been made to conceal this aspect.**

C.S.C.I Inspection report dated 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> of June 2008.

The report states that there have been improvements in medication management, now medications are being accurately administered in accordance with what is prescribed, there are some medications that are not been recorded as received by the home.

**My Comments, There has obviously been an on-going problem with medication but what the problem was is not mentioned, I looked back at the previous inspection report and found that the medication problems included not recording medication, medication being given that did not tally with what was prescribed. That is more than a shortfall it is a criminal offence. There is a clear pattern emerging of making excuses for this home rather than dealing with the issues. No pharmacy inspection is recommended, it is graded adequate and left until the next inspection.**

The home is graded **1 Star Adequate.**

CSCI Inspection dated 9<sup>th</sup> of February 2009.  
**(8 months later)**

The report states, the home assured the inspector that surveys had been sent out to relatives, staff, residents and healthcare professionals but notes only one came back.

**My Comments, every year for three years these surveys have been sent out but none came back, there is clearly something wrong, this should be followed up by checking who was allegedly sent them, however it is just noted.**

The report states, since the last inspection 4 random inspections have been carried out, a statutory notice was issued in relation to medication management and the home is considered to have addressed the issues. There have been 12 complaints and five adult safeguarding issues.

**My Comments, this information should be disclosed in full, it is barely touched upon other than saying the home was complying, yet out of 48 residents with multiply medications the stocks of only three medications were checked and were deemed sufficient evidence to presume all medication was in order.**

**The last inspection presumed the same but it consequently is shown this was not true as emergency inspections had to be taken. Whilst this information is withheld from public scrutiny, it is clear that residents have suffered.**

The report states the home has filled in all the paperwork needed to ensure residents are safe.

**My Comments, All the paperwork has the right words written, weather that is the truth is another thing, the inspector has the sense to check the residents weights, the paperwork was not accurate but the inspector has not the sense to see that if one lot of paperwork was not reflecting the truth, the rest could be the same. The action taken? It was discussed with the homes manager how important recording weight was when drastic weight loss is discovered to have occurred. In short time should have been spent on weighing residents and not on forging care plans. This issue falls under healthcare.**

**The inspection of June 2008 graded this home as I STAR, adequate but**

**this inspection grades the home 2 STAR GOOD.**

**I looked at the scores between each inspection and found little difference, each grade is given under different headings, in case you are not familiar with your legislation I have laid it out below and how the scores are graded in respect of this home.**

<b>INSPECTION 2008.</b>	<b>Grade.</b>
<b>Choice of home</b>	<b>(Good)</b>
<b>Health and Personal Care</b>	<b>(Adequate)</b>
<b>Daily life, Social Activities</b>	<b>(Good)</b>
<b>Complaints, Protection</b>	<b>(Good)</b>
<b>Environment</b>	<b>(Good)</b>
<b>Staffing</b>	<b>(Good)</b>
<b>Management, Administration</b>	<b>(Good)</b>

**Overall Grade Awarded 1 STAR**

**INSPECTION 2009**

<b>Choice of home</b>	<b>(Good)</b>
<b>Health and Personal Care</b>	<b>(Good)</b>
<b>Daily Life, Social Activities</b>	<b>(Good)</b>
<b>Complaints, Protection</b>	<b>(Good)</b>
<b>Environment</b>	<b>(Good)</b>
<b>Staffing</b>	<b>(Good)</b>
<b>Management, Administration</b>	<b>(Good)</b>

**Overall Grade Awarded 2 STAR**

**This of course is glaringly inconsistent, and considering all the issues in this home they would have to do nothing different to reach the highest award of excellence 3 STARS. When you consider healthcare was the area upgraded it is hard to reconcile with the fact that medication issues warrant emergency measures being put in place in spite the last inspection failing to identify the major failings, that medication is given a cursory glance on this inspection, and that there was evidence the care plans contained false information, and that all these things come under the heading, Healthcare, and that is the heading that resulted in the home being upgraded to 2 STARS.**

**The reports states that the company which owns the home is working in partnership with the charity, Action on Elder Abuse throughout all their care homes and that residents and relatives will have a specific contact number to raise any concerns, This is a home where relatives, staff, residents and healthcare professionals have felt unable to send back their views on the CSCI surveys. The two dignity guardians in the home included. The Shield they hide behind should not be protecting such companies. What are you going to do about this?**

**Eileen Chubb**