

**Tales of the Un-Inspected**  
**Home Number 79**  
**By Eileen Chubb**  
(This Report Is the Copyright of Eileen Chubb 2010)

**Yet again the standards of poor care and worse that exist in a home are brought to the attention of CQC, it is only after people have suffered that CQC react and even then the favored approach is to give credibility to the sorry excuse of empty promises, otherwise known as the action plan, this amounts to a dire home telling the regulator what they want to hear.**

**This home was inspected in 2007, healthcare was judged to be good, and medication considered to be adequately managed. I find this incredible given that four peoples medication was checked and four peoples medication was found to be wrong, in addition stocks did not tally with the MAR sheets. People were given different amounts than that prescribed by the GP and there were excessive stocks. Liquid morphine which should have been kept in the controlled drugs cupboard was found in a trolley. Destroyed drugs were not accounted for.**

**The home is considered particularly good at meeting the needs of residents with dementia, is well maintained and clean throughout. The staffing levels and training are considered to be very good.**

**The Next inspection takes place in January 2008, 11 months later.**

**Medication is not checked but the homes audits are relied on. Complaints are also judged to be good in spite of relatives saying they were not sure how to complain. Staff were unaware of how to raise concerns outside the home; this tells me that raising concerns is not encouraged.**

**The home is considered to be well maintained, clean and decorated to a good standard.**

**Staff tells inspectors that they are often short of staff which makes things difficult; the home manager says this does not affect residents**

**care. The manager is believed.**

**The home is graded 2 Star Good.**

**This home is not inspected again for two years and six months and it is only inspected then because the Local Authority tells the regulator that they have serious concerns about the home. CQC are the last to know yet again that a home they graded as good is so poor concerns have been raised with the Local Authority.**

**As a result the regulator inspects and find the following, The home they previously judged to be clean and well maintained is now found to be devoid of any sensory stimulation for residents with dementia, is sparsely furnished, the cupboard for activity materials contained two old newspapers and a dried up piece of food. A resident with dementia was seen handling waste from a dustbin which contained used surgical gloves and soiled tissues. The home is dirty throughout. Walls were smeared with food stains.**

**The staffing levels and training of staff which was considered good previously is now found to be dire, most of the staff is not trained to care for residents with Dementia, and the staffing levels are set dangerously low and are not meeting the needs of residents. But to the staffs credit they tried to tell inspectors this two and half years ago but were not believed.**

**The medication is a total disaster as I would have expected given the past history of problems and the fact that it was not checked at the last inspection.**

**Residents have unexplained injuries, a resident fell a number of times as a result of the brakes on their bed not being applied.**

**What I found to be of most concern is that the inspectors note they could hear a resident calling for help in their room and had to intervene and get the manager who unlocked the door and found this resident very distressed, what inspectors are concerned with is that this person had no call bell to summon help but what concerns me is this person had been locked in their room, even if they had a call bell it is not likely it would be answered and how many more distressed and completely**

**neglected residents have been locked behind closed doors?**

**It is noted that people are not able to have drinks outside allocated times, but further on in the report it is mentioned that the drinks trolley was not taken around as there was no staff member available, given that the home is not providing the most basic care to sustain life I cannot see how this can be allowed to continue.**

**It remains Two Star.**

**It has to be inspected again 8 Days Later because the Local Authority tell the regulator further serious concerns have been raised.**

**A resident was seen to become agitated and distressed and walking around the lounge assaulting other residents, there were no staff to intervene.**

**People with wounds and other injuries had no record of such in their care plans. One resident who was not mobile was being dragged down a corridor by two staff.**

**The home is dirty and relatives spoken to said it often smelt of stale urine. One said they have to change their clothing after visiting the home, another relative said they bring a towel to sit on as all the chairs are so dirty.**

**The regulator leave the home as Two Star and say there are working with the company that owns the home to ensure an action plan is implemented.**

**Whilst the CQC negotiate with the care home things get so bad the Local Authority act and remove their residents from the home three months later. This is reported in the local paper along with the fact that another home owned by the same company had serious concerns raised about poor care in 2008, whilst this home was working on its action scam with the regulator somebody died as this all came to light at a recent coroner's inquest.**

**The regulator will no doubt claim it took action, however a two star home which was not inspected for two and a half years and resulted in vulnerable elderly people living in squalor, being persistently neglected**

**and locked behind closed doors without the basics to sustain life. This is not made up for by a regulator who being told there are serious problems deciding to do what it should have done in the first place.**

**Eileen Chubb**