

Tales of the Un-Inspected

Home Number 76

By Eileen Chubb

(This Report Is the Copyright of Eileen Chubb)

In October 2009 a 78 Year old female resident died, her death sparked a police investigation. Subsequently the local council placed an embargo on this home after a high number of safeguarding issues were reported by visiting healthcare professionals. Due to such extensive and serious concerns the local authority removed all residents from the home. The CQC cannot claim to have played any part in closing this home; this is just another example of vulnerable elderly people being failed by this regulator. I looked at the inspection history of this home in order to see if there were warning signs.

In September 2007 the home was inspected and it was noted that most of the residents had Dementia, however the home was not registered to care for people with Dementia, so the staffing levels would not have been based on the needs of the residents. This would seriously impact on all areas of care. It is also noted that care plans, risk assessments and medication are all areas of concern. It is also noted that residents were struggling to eat and drink but there were not enough staff to provide help. A large amount of staff are noted to have left. Requirements are made again as they were the year before. This report is before the star rating system but would be considered good as of the 32 standards judged, 22 were fully met and 10 were minor shortfalls. None were considered a major shortfall.

This is incredible given people were observed to be without the most basic care.

The next inspection report is dated August 2008, 9 months later. This report states the home is being monitored by the Local Authority. It is also stated that a legal notice was served on the home requiring the manager to be registered but that it was later withdrawn as this was done. No action is taken in respect of the years of failures to meet outstanding requirements,

Medication is again found to place residents at risk, controlled drugs were not recorded correctly, medication was not checked into the home and amounts did not tally, MAR sheets had handwritten instructions which were not signed for. No records were kept of drugs returned or

destroyed. Dosages had been altered and nurses were unable to say who had authorized the dose. Care plans did not reflect care given.

Risk assessments were not completed correctly. The regulator had received a complaint about the home and the way complaints were dealt with. The homes assurances were accepted.

Half the staff in the home who replied to surveys told the regulator that there was never enough staff to care for residents, the home is asked to look into these concerns and no requirement is made. Staff recruitment files do not contain the relevant documentation; nurse's qualifications were not checked. Three outstanding requirements are made again. The home is graded 1 Star adequate.

The next inspection takes place 1 year later in August 2009.

The local authority is concerned enough to monitor the home more thoroughly than the regulator. The local authority's clinical review of the home found so many areas of concern that even the CQC have to acknowledge them and grade the home Zero star. However the only action CQC take is to send a warning letter to the home and tell them they will continue to monitor them. The concerns raised are the same as listed for years. By now the warning signs are screaming, the number of safeguarding reports has risen and CQC are being informed of all the things wrong. As the result of three safeguarding investigations into neglect further matters come to light which resulted in 7 further investigations taking place all relating to issues of neglect. The AQAA filled in by the home states they made no safeguarding referrals, but to find something positive to note the CQC say they have not received any information that the home has not co-operated with the investigations, so that's alright then.

What is more concerning is the manager they insisted previously must be registered as fit to manage the home, is now registered with the CQC as fit to manage the home, only now CQC decide she is not fit after all. So despite having to downgrade the home to Zero Star, the inspectors judge the home to have met all outstanding requirements.

8 Weeks later a resident is dead and this sparks a police investigation.

5 months later the home is inspected again, well it's more of a reaction than an inspection, it notes all the concerns the local Authority inspections have raised, the high number of safeguarding incidents and other concerns raised with the local authority by both relatives, doctors and nurses visiting the home, by everyone but CQC. Now the CQC decide to consider enforcement action but whilst they are considering

what action in the form of how many management review meetings need to be held, the suffering of residents is so great that the Local Authority act and remove all residents from the home.

Eileen Chubb