

Tales of the Un-Inspected
Home Number 94
By Eileen Chubb
(This Report is The Copyright of Eileen Chubb)

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, 92, 93.

The regulator CQC recently required all care homes to register with them and if a home met the requirements they would be licensed to operate. However this home had a zero star poor rating but still managed to meet the new essential standards required to be licensed.

This home was inspected in February 2010, the regulator was aware of the following issues,

Two years earlier the home was noted to have such low staffing levels residents were considered at risk and a requirement was made but two years later nothing has changed. This is a situation that can only result in neglect. There is clearly a core of good staff doing their best but the home has not been able to keep a manager for long and the company has not supported staff which will result in low morale and in time good staff will leave and the company will attract the type of staff it deserves.

As a result of the staffing levels the care of residents has suffered in every area and the home is in crisis, the home is not recording or dealing with complaints, things are so bad the regulator has received numerous anonymous complaints about abuse and neglect. There have been 15 Safeguarding referrals of a serious nature and the police are involved.

The home is said to be stark and shabby and dirty and care staff were expected to carry out laundry and cleaning duties. New staff did not have all the correct paperwork such as references and CRB checks.

Pages of requirements are made and the home is rated zero star poor.

The home is inspected again 8 weeks later, in April 2010.

The report states the majority of requirements have been met with only two outstanding, however the killer clause is used to delete or downgrade requirements which is not the same as meeting them.

The regulator accepts the word of the manager that staffing levels have been increased but there is very little evidence to support improvement. It is clear that inspectors want to upgrade this home from the Zero Star rating and state every area has improved but provides scant evidence to support this. The home remains Zero star because shortly after the inspection the Local Council is told more abuse of residents has taken place which was not reported correctly by the home.

The home is inspected again three months in July 2010, My main concern is that the report contains the information that a number of staff have left. The main focus of the inspection is medication as inspectors have received concerns about this. However there is a clearly a reluctance to accept these concerns as despite finding medication unaccounted for and that stocks did not tally, inspectors praised the home for its regular medication audits whilst ignoring the fact these audits failed to note anything wrong. The home is said to have now met all requirements and only one new one is made so the intent is to upgrade.

The home is registered and licensed by the regulator and the next inspection report is dated 23rd of November 2011,

It notes the following,

Residents with complex needs were not taking those needs met.

A resident with sore infected eyes had no care.

A resident with a chest infection and who was unwell was not attended to and night staff were concerned and requested a GP but this was not acted on.

One resident had dirty soiled hands and nails, were unshaven, had very sore infected eyes and were disorientated, unwell and coughing.

Another resident was found sat in a lounge shivering, had a short sleeve jumper and no socks, were dirty and unwashed and unkempt. Their nails were broken and dirty and cold to touch.

Another person was dirty and wet and had a strong smell of urine, their trousers were open and they looked unkempt.

Day staff said night staff should have washed people; one resident was washed and changed into wet clothing. Other staff said they had been outside having a cigarette

People have not been protected from abuse.

Resident's rooms were found to smell badly of urine, one room was said to have flooded and was occupied but no fit.

There is not enough staff to care for the most vulnerable and senior staff are said to not pull their weight. Residents were not safe from harm.

Staff are not trained and there are not enough staff, the company has not supported staff.

There were systematic failures and the provider has failed to take action.

In spite of so much suffering the home is not considered bad enough for enforcement action, just compliance action.

13 days later inspectors consider all the requirements met, which is just not possible. The company has brought in temporary staff and management but the problems are too serious and have gone on for way too long. The regulator should never have licensed this home and vulnerable residents have suffered as a result. The company that owns this home has recently announced its closure, not because it has failed to comply with requirements but because it's only a matter of time before the shambles starts again.

Eileen Chubb