

Tales of the Un-Inspected

Home Number 92

By Eileen Chubb

(This Report is The Copyright of Eileen Chubb 2011)

This home is owned by the same company as homes, 33, 36, 41, 48, 49, 50, 54, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 70, 71, 72, 82, 84, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91. Please see the Archive section for all the reports.

This home is listed as good on the CQC web site, it is stated that this judge was made when it was inspected on 4th of February 2007. That is a period of 4 years without an inspection.

However I did manage to obtain three inspection reports for this home from a source other than the CQC.

The first report is April 2007, listed below is some of the information of most concern to me,

All 50 residents were sent a survey but only 4 were returned. The regulator was contacted directly about staff working for long periods of time, the regulator asked the home to investigate. The manager said he held an open day each week to meet relatives, people spoken to were not aware of this initiative. Only staff would have raised a concern about working excessive hours and therefore it should have been investigated by the regulator and not the home. Only 4 surveys returned out of 50 say this is not a home that encourages people to give their opinion on how they are cared for.

The medication failures are as dire as it gets, MAR sheets had gaps, and correction fluid was used to hide what and how much medication was being given. A handwritten entry on a medication sheet for a resident did not match with what drugs the resident was prescribed.

Pressure sores were not recorded correctly.

Resident's financial records were poorly kept with some resident's money being lent to other residents.

2 of the 4 relatives asked about staffing levels felt there was not enough

staff.

The next inspection report is dated April 2008.

The inspection lasted four hours and the main body of evidence relied on is the homes self-assessment, AQAA.

The AQAA says the home is good at providing information to residents, 3 residents were asked if they had the required information and said no.

Medication is not checked just the policies and procedures which were not followed before.

The home has received 19 complaints and the regulator has received one anonymous complaint. No information is given on what they were about or if they were upheld.

The home is not inspected again apart from an Annual Service Review which does not involve an inspection just any new information about the home.

Only 1 of the 15 surveys was returned. Which is cause for concern? It is also stated that the home has received 10 complaints in the last year and that none were upheld.

What is of most concern is that the home has made 1 Safeguarding referral. But two separate Safeguarding investigations have been carried out by the Local Authority. These issues were so serious that two members of staff have been put on the POVA list. Which is a register of known abusers, yet throughout this time the regulator did not make a single visit to the home and furthermore states that no inspection is required for yet another year.

I can see why the CQC would prefer not to mention the last four years of this homes inspection history, it is not just the homes reputation that would be damaged.

Eileen Chubb

