

**Tales of the Un-Inspected**  
**Home Number 54**  
**By Eileen Chubb**  
(This Report Is the Copyright of Eileen Chubb)

**I Looked at the inspection history of.....Home Number 54 and these are my conclusions,**

**Introduction.**

**This home is owned by the same company as homes 33, 36, 41, 48, 49 and 50.**

INSPECTION REPORT DATED 28<sup>TH</sup> AND 30<sup>TH</sup> OF AUGUST 2007.

THE REPORT. The home has suitable medication procedures in place. We looked at three care plans and as at the 2006 inspection these were found to contain variable information. One care plan said a resident needed staff to sit with them to encourage them to eat but there was no record this was carried out. In another a resident was identified at risk of pressure sores but nothing was recorded as to how this was being carried out. A third resident needed one to one care as they were bedridden but there was no evidence of this.

**My Comments, Medication procedures are inspected but not the medication. Three care plans were checked and three care plans were found wanting and this has been an ongoing problem for at least a year. This information tells me there are serious problems.**

THE REPORT. There is four staff on duty to care for 40 residents half of whom have dementia. The manager has left and the deputy manager is running the home as well as being one of the four care staff on duty.

**My Comments, 40 residents and 4 staff one of whom is supposed to be managing the home that is one member of staff to every ten residents. The company that owns this home makes millions in profit and this is how it runs a home that has highly dependent residents, some of whom are identified as needing one to one care. Caring for that many residents with that number of staff is impossible. The inspectors who describe staffing levels as insufficient want to try and get ten highly dependent**

**residents up, washed, dressed and keep going at that pace for 8 hours a day every day. The deputy manager is expected to do this and manage the home and on the day of the inspection had also worked the previous night shift. This company would be more fitted to running a Workhouse than a care home and what it expects from its staff would not be out of place in a Dickens novel. The fact that even basic care is provided to residents some of the time is cause to commend the staffs who manages to provide it against all the odds. As for the inspectors they carry on inspecting oblivious to facts.**

THE REPORT. There are no activities at present.

**My Comments, The fact there were no activities did not stop the inspectors grading activities as adequate.**

THE REPORT, The dishwasher had been broken for six weeks and care staff were washing up by hand. Plastic cups were given to residents who could not grip them. Many parts of the home were Mal-odorous.

**My Comments, Mal odorous is the regulators preferred description of what I know as the stench of neglect. For every second care staff are washing dishes they are not caring for residents.**

THE REPORT. Residents and relatives said now that the previous manager had left they felt they could raise concerns.

**My Comments, The report says that one family who raised concerns about lack of care had persisted with their complaint and the company responded the key word is persisted. This is a company that sees complaints as something to be contained rather than responded to. In this case two staff were dismissed for poor practice so it was serious enough to warrant action being taken without a family having to persistently raise concerns before anything was done.**

THE REPORT. Many bathrooms were dirty and in one the hot water thermometer was broken and staff had not noticed. Many call bells were tied up out of reach.

**My Comments, Call bells are out of reach because they would keep ringing, as for the staff not noticing a broken thermometer, I very much**

**doubt they would have time to bath residents, with that many staff per resident they would be lucky to be washed never mind bathed.**

THE REPORT, the Company's area manager said she visit's the home three times a week.

**My Comments, No defense of ignorance can be pleaded then.**

**21 Grades are judged of which, 9 are Fully Met, 11 are Minor Shortfalls and 1 is a Major Shortfall. 16 requirements are made.**

INSPECTION REPORT 17<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY AND 19<sup>TH</sup> OF FEBRUARY 2008  
(5 Months Later)

THE REPORT. Medication procedures are in place. Care plans provide poor information. Some of the boxes requiring a yes or no answer have not been completed. Some relatives visit daily to assist with care. The new manager is not working as a carer.

**My Comments, The relatives assisting with care is seen as evidence of the home encouraging family involvement and not as an indication that care is in scant supply. No audit of medication just a look at the bits of paper that say all is well.**

THE REPORT. The manager responds to concerns and is open and approachable to staff. The new manager has all the required qualifications and experience. Two staff approached us with issues that were causing them concern. Following discussions it was agreed it would be reported to the operations manager of the company who referred the issues as adult safeguarding alerts.

**My Comments, There are four staff on duty and half of those staff raises concerns of a serious nature relating to residents care. But these issues are raised with the inspector and not with the homes approachable manager. The inspectors conclude staff needs training to report issues to the correct person. It is not the staff who need training it's the inspectors who firstly revealed the identities of staff making protected disclosures, secondly failed to grasp that staff could either not go management with concerns or had done so and been ignored, and finally as these staff had made disclosures to the regulator directly then that**

**regulator owned them a duty of care as whistle-blowers to at least check they were not subjected to any detriment. However the inspectors are more concerned with staff not burdening them with information of poor care and their tone implies the staff are at fault as they are considered in need of training.**

**The Home is graded One Star Adequate.**

INSPECTION REPORT DATED 22<sup>ND</sup> OF DECEMBER 2008.  
**(10 Months Later)**

THE REPORT. We have reviewed our practice when making requirements to improve national standards, some requirements from previous inspection reports have been deleted or carried forward as good practice recommendations. But this is only considered when residents are not being put at significant risk of harm.

**My Comments, I call this the CQC killer clause, its used every time inspectors want to upgrade a care homes Star Rating but two things stand in their way, Previous unmet legal requirements and a lack of evidence other than the AQAA. So by deleting inconvenient evidence the inspectors can believe what the home grades itself.**

**The proviso of the clause (When residents are not being put at significant harm) says it all as it concedes that residents are put at risk of harm by a regulator deleting the requirements of the law, but the degree of harm has to be significant to stop it happening and that is why I call it the killer clause because it results in the suffering and deaths of defenseless elderly people in an unregulated care industry.**

THE REPORT. We looked at four care plans which are improved but required updating and for accurate information. Medication is now audited by the company and is kept under review and now concerns are referred to the correct professional.

**My Comments, Still no audit of medication.**

THE REPORT. Staffing is good but not a great deal of staff interaction with residents. Activities are good; relatives said there were not enough outings or activities since the activities organizer left.

**My Comments, The AQAA said they were good so they must be.**

**The requirements from the last inspections are deleted and the home is graded 2 Star Good.**

**VIRTUAL INSPECTION REPORT DATED 19<sup>TH</sup> OF NOVEMBER 2009.  
(11 Months Later)**

**The Home is not inspected as the AQAA states how wonderful it is.**

**The home remains 2 Star Good and as such may not be inspected for years unless concerns are raised but by then the damage will have been done.**

**Eileen Chubb**