

**Tales of the Un-Inspected
Home 71
By Eileen Chubb © 2010**

I Firstly looked at the inspection history of this home and found it had been wiped from the CQC data base, as this home.....is among those listed as closed due to enforcement action it must have a history of poor care, what that history was is not being made available to the public.

Listed below is the information I have taken from the inspection report dated, 10th of March 2010. My comments on each finding are in bold text.

1. Conditions of registration, there are 27 places for people over 45, that the home accommodates no more than 24 people, that there are no further people admitted to the home.

Firstly elderly people with dementia and younger people in their forties with mental illness being mixed is a real risk, not only is it unfair to the younger group, it is my experience there is a real risk to an older person with dementia whose behavior could easily result in a younger person with mental health needs such as schizophrenia lashing out and causing serious injuries to the older person.

Secondly I have never known a home to have a registration condition of not admitting any further people.

2. Date of last inspection. **This is left blank which implies this is the first inspection.**

3. Page 8, This is the first key inspection of the service since xxxx registered as the provider in November 09, however we carried out a random inspection in December 09 to look at areas where people might be at risk. Since then the home has improved its risk assessments.

This home is presented as a new service registered in November and four weeks later a random inspection is carried out as people are considered to be at risk, this says something is very wrong.

4, Page 8, what could the home do better? Risk assessments. **It is hard to reconcile the fact that a random inspection was carried out as residents are considered at risk, but that the home has improved its assessment**

paperwork since then, when the heading just under it states the home needs to improve its assessment paperwork.

5. The homes statement of purpose was not up to date which might give people inaccurate information, for example it stated the owners of the home were Ms. JJ and Ms. LR, when in fact the home is owned by a LTD company called xxxx. **The CQC are worried about people receiving inaccurate information about the home changing ownership, this is perverse when company xxxx is owned by the same Ms. JJ and Ms. LR. This information is contained in the choice of home section of the report, which judges amongst other things if, people have been given, full, clear, accurate and up to date information before moving into the home. The standards are judged to have been fully met for this section.**

6. Healthcare is adequate, in general the home identified risks to people. However we saw one person suffered injury due to a fall and the risk assessment was not updated to include actions to stop further falls. **The paperwork is ok until something real happens that puts it to the test.**

7. One person was extremely underweight and they should be weighed every two weeks but were not weighed in the last three weeks, it stated the district nurse will be informed but nothing about this was recorded. We looked at this persons food chart and this had no entries staff said these were filled in at the end of the day. This is not good practice we have written to the home requesting urgent action be taken. We spoke to the responsible person Ms. LR about care plans being updated. **Three requirements are made about food intake and risk of malnutrition being identified and acted on, one requirement about falls risk assessments is made. The responsible person Ms. LR is referred to.**

8. Activities are adequate. **Evidence, the AQAA and a bit of paper on wall.**

9. Ms. LR told us menus are drawn up taking into account peoples preferences and nutritional requirements. **The food listed for several days was fish fingers or sausages, corn beef and bubble and squeak, bacon and egg as the main meal, with supper listed as ham or egg sandwiches or bread and jam, known as cost cutting cheap rubbish to you and me but considered adequate in a care home.**

10. The home is good at handling complaints. **The evidence? The home**

said it would handle complaints week but have not had any. It also States in this section that they, the regulator have received no complaints since the homes registration, this implies there were complaints prior to the ownership scam. The public are not given this information.

11. There was a recommendation made in December that staff attends training in the management of behaviors that pose a risk to themselves or others and some staff have completed this training and others will in the future. **The inspectors have information there was a risk but the public are not being told what the risk is.**

12. There have been many improvements made in this home, most of which are referred to in this report. There is still work to be done to ensure needs are met. There was no evidence people at the home had been informed of the provider's future plans for the home. **What the provider's future plans are we are not told but a member of staff told inspectors they clearly could see issues with meeting the needs of younger people with mental health issues and older people and suggested they could be accommodated in different parts of the home? This care worker is telling inspectors there is a big problem but the care worker is the only one willing to raise it.**

Why has a home with a past history of poor care being allowed to re-register with a clean slate?

Why in spite every alarm bell sounding is this home registered to care for two very different groups when it is obvious this poses a real risk?

Why are the same owners allowed to mislead the public by registering the home as a different company when it is just sham?

Why is the regulator colluding with this sham?

Why is the home on the CQC list of homes closed by them as being too poor, good enough to continue its business?