

**Tales of the Un-Inspected**  
**Home Number 95**  
**By Eileen Chubb**  
(Copyright 2011)

**Firstly I looked at the inspection report for August 2007 and found the following,**

**Residents known to be at high risk of getting pressure sores were seen without any equipment to relieve pressure.**

**Care plans were poorly written and many residents had their needs neglected, examples of this were a diabetic who required hospital treatment twice due to poor care at the home. Another resident who had a wound, with no record of the dressing being changed for two months.**

**Medication is found to be a total shambles with no audit trail of what came into the home or was sent back, in one month's medication sheets there were 76 doses of medication unaccounted for. There was large stockpiles of drugs found stacked up so high that staff had to climb on top of a sink to reach the top. Mar sheets had the GP instructions crossed out by staff and handwritten entries changing the dose. Drugs were being used that had no labels stating what the medication was or who it was prescribed for.**

**The home is found to be dirty, with old food debris on armchairs and the floor. The tables and chairs in the dining room are dirty and there were bloodstains on the dining room wall. Dustbins are overflowing including those in the kitchen. Three cats were walking around and had access to the kitchen area; one cat had an open wound on its head which was bloodstained.**

**The home was shabby and in need of refurbishment and cleaning.**

**Staff recruitment files were checked and found to be missing, the company area manager said this information would be at head office but it was not found. Two casual workers said to be from another of the**

**company's homes had no paperwork at all and the area manager assured the inspector they would not work in the home again.**

**Several relatives and residents said there were not enough staff and call bells went unanswered for long periods of time.**

**Fire safety and staff training is also poor.**

**22 Standards are judged of which, 5 are fully met, 12 are Minor shortfalls, 4 are Major shortfalls and 1 is excellent and exceeds all requirements and that one relates to staff recruitment.**

**The next inspection takes place 4 months later in December 2007,**

**Inspectors looked at three care plans and found no records of care provided; residents with complex health conditions such as diabetes had no care plans.**

**Relatives and residents were sent surveys but none were returned.**

**Medication is still a shambles with MAR sheets altered, no clear audit trail, labels changed or removed from bottles being used. Medication unaccounted for or being used for residents other than for whom it was prescribed.**

**Most residents are staying in their bedrooms all day, which is always a concern to me.**

**Some staff has been trained in what abuse should be reported but have not been told who to report to. Other staff training is not up to date.**

**The home is said to be cleaner but still shabby with heavily stained carpets and furniture.**

**The inspector makes a judgment that staffing levels appear adequate according to the Rota but it was difficult to find staff during the inspection. Concerns have been raised that staff hours are due to be reduced further and cleaning hours have been halved.**

**Recruitment records for two members of staff were checked, one for a nurse that started work three weeks earlier and had no CRB check or**

**induction record. The other record was for a carer who started work the day of the inspection and who did not have the two required references but had a POVA first check. The manager said they would be supervised until their full security checks arrived.**

**Events that should be reported by the home were not.  
Fire safety places residents at risk.**

**22 Standards are judged of which, 10 are Fully Met, 10 Almost Met, 1 is a Major Shortfall, and 1 is excellent, the one considered excellent relates again to staff recruitment.**

**The Last Inspection report for this home is dated 28<sup>th</sup> of July 2008.**

**Two care plans were checked, one was only partially completed so staff were not aware of this resident's needs. The other had pre-printed information that was general and contained other information that was not factually correct.**

**Medication was not checked on this inspection but some of the MAR sheets were looked at and had some gaps. Given this homes past I find it incredible that medication stocks were not even given a spot check.**

**Residents are said by the manager to prefer to stay in their rooms all day; however the residents themselves were not asked.**

**Numerous complaints have been made about the home being dirty.**

**There was little evidence of staff training, the manager said staff had training in safeguarding but when a nurse and carer were asked they were not sure what the procedures were for safeguarding and whistle-blowing.**

**The home has been decorated and refurbished but the furniture and new carpets had food debris and dirt on them.**

**A member of staff wrote to the regulator saying staffing levels were so low they could not care for residents, the staff member provided full times and dates. This staff member is ignored as the manager says there is enough staff.**

**There is a new manager who inspectors say is from another of the companies homes and is qualified and experienced in their view, but who cannot provide evidence that staff have been trained, has failed to report incidents, who has not addressed complaints and whose staff went outside the home to raise concerns.**

**Two staff recruitment files are checked and found to be in order so that at least has improved.**

**In all 21 standards are judged, 12 are Fully Met, 9 Almost Met, among those judged minor shortfalls is staff recruitment.**

**The Home is rated 1 Star Adequate, which is far too generous given the evidence.**

**This home has not been inspected for two years and seven months but is listed today on the CQC web site as a GOOD home based on the last inspection report (the one above) which gave an ADEQUATE rating. The CQC allege to provide trustworthy information, however the public are being misled.**

**Eileen Chubb**