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INTRODUCTION

The issues highlighted in this report expose the Care Quality Commission (CQC) not only to be an ineffective regulator but also demonstrate the culture of “self-preservation at any price” which is ingrained in this organisation. This has resulted firstly in the public being provided with misleading information about care homes, but what is even more concerning is the poor care that has resulted in so many vulnerable people suffering abuse and neglect which could and should have been avoided.

The facts and the evidence that support this are revealed in a chain of events that started as far back as November 2010 when the CQC issued a press statement implying they had closed dozens of poor care homes and care agencies. A joint investigation by Compassion in Care and Private Eye exposed this CQC statement to be untrue. This was only the beginning.

PRIVATE EYE (Issue1274) Oct-Nov 2010

NEVER MIND THE QUALITY:
A joint investigation by the Eye and CIC reveal that a list of homes said to have been closed by the CQC as a result of their tough new inspection regime in fact were open.

- Some with a long history of poor care, including Hillcrest Avon Park were still open under the same ownership but with their history deleted from CQC’s website.
- Some had been renamed but were still under the same ownership or family.
- Two had been rated “Good” at the time they closed because the owners were arrested for people trafficking.
- Some had not been closed at all but had changed their care category.
- Some were rated “Good” and were shocked to discover they were on the list.

The CQC had issued this list as part of their media drive and it received widespread publicity at the time.

PRIVATE EYE (Issue 1275 ) 25 Nov 2010

CQC NO EVIL
John McDonnell MP asks Parliamentary questions as a result of the story.
CQC continue to deny the facts.

PRIVATE EYE (Issue 1276 ) Nov – 9 Dec 2010

OPEN AND SHUT CASES
CQC still fail to provide us with evidence to support their claims of home closures which had attracted widespread publicity 8 weeks ago.

PRIVATE EYE (Issue 1277) 10-23 Dec 2010
CLOSING RANKS
Finally CQC concede that the investigation by Private Eye and Compassion In Care is correct but make no apology for the inaccurate information they issued which was clearly intended to mislead both the public and Parliament.

PRIVATE EYE (Issue 1283) 4-17 March 2011
TRIGGER CRAPPY
Compassion in Care has uncovered serious anomalies in CQC’s new registration process which call into question not only how it protects those in care homes but also the information given to the public. Mrs Chubb has uncovered 763 homes registered, most with their histories deleted, including those with what she rates as “Dire” histories - ie the worst of the worst.

PRIVATE EYE (Issue 1284) March 2011
NO MINISTER
Paul Burstow MP thinks the public can ask for the inspection reports which they do not know exist.

PRIVATE EYE (Issue 1293) July -August 2011
GREAT SCOTT
More abuse and suffering exposed whilst CQC publish how poor homes rate themselves - “Good” of course.

PRIVATE EYE (Issue 1298) Sept-Oct 2011
SOUTHERN DROSS
More suffering endured by vulnerable people whilst the Government continue presume the CQC are an effective regulator.

PRIVATE EYE (Issue 1301) Nov 2011
DROSS HOUSES
Compassion In Care’s Freedom of Information (FOI) request reveals why CQC did not act, behind the scenes legal correspondence showed negotiations were taking place.

PRIVATE EYE (Issue 1322) Sept 2012
ASLEEP ON THE JOB
How Eileen Chubb raised the alarm on a care home Ashwood Care Centre in 2009 and told CQC “Drugs are being used as a weapon to abuse” and three
years later widespread medication abuse is exposed at Harrow Crown Court. CQC had failed to heed the earlier warnings.

PRIVATE EYE (Issue 1323) Sept 2012
GOING SOON
The CQC ignored numerous concerns about poor care from Eileen Chubb on behalf of relatives and Whistle-blowers who contacted the charity.

PRIVATE EYE (Issue 1327) November 2012
A SORE SUBJECT
Edna’s Law campaign gains support after more and more cases contact our helpline and raise concerns that vulnerable people are suffering because whistle-blowers were ignored by the CQC.

PRIVATE EYE (Issue 1336) March 2013
COURT NAPPING AGAIN
More suffering while we wait for CQC to be held to account.

PRIVATE EYE (Issue 1337) April 2013
NEW HOME OLD PROBLEM
The public are denied access to information about bad homes.

PRIVATE EYE (Issue 1342) June 2013
SOFTENING THE BLOW
Compassion In Care’s evidence from 1500 whistle-blowers whose concerns were ignored.

PRIVATE EYE (Issue 1374) September 2014
Whistle-blowers to protest in Parliament Square in support of Edna’s Law, including Panorama Old Deanery whistle-blower, Karis Le Winton, whose concerns of abuse were ignored by all the authorities to whom she and colleagues had reported.

PRIVATE EYE (Issue 1377) Oct 2014
CQC AT BREAKING POINT
More suffering whilst whistle-blowers ignored by CQC.

PRIVATE EYE (Issue 1402) Oct 2015
Families banned from visiting their loved ones for raising concerns. Compassion In Care writes to the Minister.

PRIVATE EYE (Issue 1405) November 2015
**SLEEPING WATCHDOG**
Compassion in Care finds homes with a history of poor care registered as new. CQC Andrea Sutcliffe says they “are confident homes not improving will not go un-noticed”.

**PRIVATE EYE (Issue 1407) Dec 2015. Unfit for purpose**
Compassion in Care report on homes which I rate “Dire” being registered as new and their records buried.

**PRIVATE EYE (Issue 1409) January 2016. ASLEEP AT THE SWITCH**
More suffering whilst bad homes protected.

**PRIVATE EYE (Issue 1411) February 2016 Epic fail**
The CQC press sing their own praises with another list or two of care homes inspected, or alleged to have been inspected.

**THE JOURNAL OF DEMENTIA CARE December 2014**
Dementia Congress opens with discussion: “Is it only the media that gets action to stop poor care?”

NO says Andrea Sutcliffe Chief Inspector of Adult Social Care at CQC: “After exposing abuse the news agenda often rolls on to other topics, in October we will be rolling out our strengthened way of inspecting services. The media can expose abuse but for sustainable action a system-wide approach is needed.”

YES says Eileen Chubb, Founder & Director of Compassion in Care: “Since The Panorama programme about The Old Deanery over 900 whistle-blowers have contacted us and we asked them them: Had reporting the abuse to the authorities stopped that abuse? In every single case the answer was No. The media help me save lives every day”.

Special thank you to Private Eye for their “sustainable action and system-wide approach”.
Please note that the following homes are just a small selection from Compassion In Care’s work archive:

**AVON PARK CARE VILLAGE**

The consequences of allowing bad homes to register as a new provider is best demonstrated by looking closely one of those homes CQC stated they had closed in 2010.

Hillcrest is one of three units in Avon Park Care Village. The other two units are Alexander Heights and Fountain Place. Hillcrest was one of those homes that was so bad it should have been closed and indeed the CQC claimed they had closed it. However it remained open and registered as a new home but to the same owner and its history was wiped from the system. As a result of the Private Eye publicity CQC restored the missing reports but since that time they have been deleted yet again.

The three units at Avon Park are detailed on the Compassion in Care website in the section *Tales of The UN-Inspected* where they are numbered as follows:

- Alexander Heights Home 85
- Fountain Place Home 86
- Hillcrest Home 75

There are also updates on the above homes.

Below we name just some of the appalling conditions people were living in on this site as far back as 2007, when an inspector referred to the fact that the home already had a long history of poor care and non-compliance.

The fees the home charged were extortionately high for that time but despite this people were expected to pay extra on top for basic care such as helping people to eat and drink so families had to pay members of staff from a care agency to carry out these tasks -the care agency in question was also owned by the same company.

**Some of the issues consistently highlighted in CQC inspection reports for years:**

- The home was constantly short of staff.
- The manager often had to carry out care tasks.
Many residents were left unattended in the main lounge for long periods.

Staff told the regulator ie CQC they tried to get residents up before 11.30 but said they could not provide care to everyone until lunchtime.

The CQC inspectors witnessed one resident dressed in their night clothes coming out into the corridor looking for help throughout the morning.

Staff were seen struggling to feed residents, serve lunch, clear tables and do the medication.

Staff were trying to feed more than one person at a time.

Throughout the inspection residents were seen in need of assistance.

People were being left in their rooms without any personal care, food or drink for long periods of time and this was a daily event.

Care plans noted one person was at high risk of pressure sores, one entry noted “skin red” and a subsequent entry stated “skin broken” but no medical assistance was sought.

Comments in care plans included “X would not go to bed when told” and “X is co-operating today.” which revealed staff attitudes.

The home was dirty and poorly maintained throughout with clinical waste being stored in the bathrooms, kitchen doors hanging off, kitchen work surfaces were stained and dirty, and many carpets were worn and badly stained.

Many bedrooms were sparse with worn out furniture, and were dirty and dusty.

Many toilets were heavily stained with dirt and faeces. Cupboards had missing handles. Piles of rubbish were stacked up outside.

CQC Inspection September 2008 documents the following:
• There are not enough staff to care for residents. Some staff are working from 8am to 8pm seven days a week. The manager is often counted among the five care staff on duty.

• Staff were brave enough to tell the inspector that some residents who needed the assistance of two staff were not cared for properly.

• Appropriate and sufficient staff interaction with residents did not take place. One staff member was seen trying to comfort a distressed resident but was called away leaving the person sobbing.

• Two residents were seen arguing and a cleaner was the only staff member in the vicinity who tried to intervene.

• At mealtimes there were barely enough staff to provide the assistance residents needed so many people were seen left unattended.

• One relative tells the inspectors they are paying for an agency staff to feed their relative.

• It is noted that the home is very poor at handling complaints, yet when relatives raise concerns about lack of staff with the regulator, the regulator asks the home to investigate itself.

• People are again seen left in bed till midday with no care, no food or drink, laying on dirty sheets in a dirty room with no access to call bells.

• Carpets are stained and dirty.

• Armchairs had dirt on them.

• Toilets had brown stains, drip marks and brown particles on the seats.

• The sluice room was foul-smelling and heavily stained with brown smears, a mop head stored there had brown stains and brown particles.

• Other areas had mops and buckets stored which were also stained and covered in brown particles. A hairbrush stored in the sluice room had a quantity of grey hair in it.

• One resident dressed in night-clothes tried to leave his room at frequent intervals and when staff were asked about this gentleman they said he liked to stay in bed all day.
The inspector is clearly doing their best and takes all of this evidence to the enforcement team but no action is taken.

At the next inspection in 2009 the same issues are noted yet again. For years people in this home have been living in squalor without proper care, left in bed with no way of calling for help, hungry, thirsty and without human contact and in spite of this being known by the CQC the situation continues.

Threats of enforcement action continue to be made but never acted upon. Six months later the home is rated “one star - Adequate” instead of zero stars despite evidence that contradicts the home had improved. This evidence included:

- Two residents had been admitted to the home but had not been fully assessed.

- Relatives are still paying staff to feed their relatives.

- The home said staffing levels had been increased but staff say they are only able to do more with residents now because there are fewer residents due to room vacancies.

- Inspectors say there were more staff on duty on the day of inspection however this is contradicted by a staff member saying she had been sent from another unit in the home. Because only one unit was inspected on a visit the staff were moved to the unit being inspected.

- Staff files were checked and only one new member of staff had been employed in a non-care role, so how can staffing levels have been improved when there are no more staff employed?

- There have been major safeguarding investigations but what these investigations related to is kept secret as usual. In fact the whole report is a desperate attempt to find improvement where no improvement exists in order to justify keeping a home open that should have been closed years ago. Unfortunately this action will result in further abuse, neglect and squalor.

This home was on the list of those alleged to have been closed by the self-styled “robust” regulator CQC, however in fact the home had been allowed simply to re-register with a slightly different name, the same owner, the same staff or lack of staff, and the same culture which continued unchecked.
When I visited this home with the BBC in 2010 shortly after it had been given a clean slate by the CQC, I asked the manager if it was a new home as there were no previous inspection reports on the CQC website. I was told “No, it’s always been the same owner, they just re-register every now and again. Everybody does it.”

Since that time all three units have had such issues as:

- Whistle-blowers reporting widespread abuse including sexual assaults by a member of staff, which with other concerns of serious abuse was never reported to the authorities by the provider. Staff had to risk their jobs to take this information to the CQC.

- Staff using excessive force on people as a matter of routine.

- People were left neglected and calling for help hour after hour. The situation was so bad that even a window cleaner heard the calls for help and came in to investigate.

The CQC have heard the calls for help from this home for many years and have not been troubled at all.

CQC in its public relations drive to portray itself as a robust regulator recently issued a press statement to the local media which proudly announced CQC had failed this home and had told it to improve standards. The public are misled, the evidence of years of suffering is concealed and the CQC look good. I have to conclude that the only elements of CQC that are effective are their press office and public relations unit.

The last inspection at Hillcrest in January 2015 noted that concerns had been raised when all three units had been inspected on the same day. The January 2015 inspection report for Hillcrest was published however no reports were published for Alexander Heights and the Fountains care homes. According to the CQC web site page Alexander Heights and Fountain Place were last inspected in 2014 when each of these units failed the same two out of the five core standards. However The CQC Issued two press statements in 2015 listing inspection reports published for these two homes recent inspections.

WHAT ARE THE CONSEQUENCES?

Could what happened at Hillcrest happen in other homes? Yes it can and we have discovered it has happened across the country and in so many homes it would take hundreds of pages to list all the suffering. I have
detailed below two further homes to demonstrate what happens when bad homes are allowed to register as new. I then list all those providers involved.

I am not saying all the homes in each company are bad but when a company registers as new then the following issues arise:
1. Some of the providers register with a slightly different company name and all the previous inspection history is archived with a link to this history on the new page stating “The provider of this service has changed” with a link to “Old Provider” The public are unlikely to look at inspection reports that relate to a home’s previous owner and therefore only look at any new reports, if there are any new ones available. Sometimes there is more than one “old provider” link, which make things more confusing. This results in people not having all the information they need in order to judge if a home is suitable for a loved one.

2. Some providers are registered as new with no history at all and only the most determined journalist is likely to track down the missing reports.

3. When the public are told a home is a “New” home they are very likely to conclude this means a genuinely new home. Likewise when a home is listed as “The provider of this service has changed” the public are likely to conclude the provider of the service genuinely has changed.

4. Good homes owned by such a company (some companies do have good and bad homes) have their years of good inspection history archived or deleted, which is demoralising for them and makes it even more difficult for the public to identify good from bad.

5. The very worst homes continue to be bad and are protected by the entire process of re-registration which is a strategy they exploit and is well known within the care industry as so many do it with the full approval of the CQC.

6. The “yo-yo” homes ie those which have continually swung from bad to good over years continue this pattern and if the first inspection report is good under the allegedly new provider then by the time it swings back to bad someone may well have placed a loved one in the home, trusting the good rating and unaware of the past history.

7. All the alarm bells that have rung but have been ignored are highlighted throughout all the worst homes archived or where past reports have been deleted. Good staff have risked their jobs to whistle-blow about specific issues of concern only to have those concerns contradicted by the CQC or not investigated at all, only to see year after year the same concerns raised again and again by different staff who are unaware that the risk they are taking will be
in vain, the whistle-blowers’ courage and integrity to speak out alas being met with incompetent and complacent investigations. People with loved ones in a home have reported concerns in vain and have been threatened with eviction of their loved ones or banned from visiting them.

8. When you see for example three consecutively bad reports for a home you may well conclude that CQC would use the full extent of their power to take action against a home. However what if the home had re-registered as a new home and its history been archived and in total the home had ten years of the most appalling reports? Then the question that should be asked is “Why did the CQC not act earlier?”

9. If a home is really new or is really a different provider there is no way to tell other than doing the work of a determined journalist. Why should we have to investigate on behalf of the public every single piece of information given by the CQC whose role it is to provide clear, accurate and truthful information and which is publicly funded?

10. Why is it that Compassion in Care a tiny charity with a minuscule budget of £8000 a year has repeatedly and exclusively exposed these issues? We have never and will never take money from any care industry or government source. This has made us very different, very effective and very controversial for our dedication to telling the truth whether it is convenient or not for the care industry, or other charities, the CQC or the Government. Perhaps part of the problem is that those who profess to serve the vulnerable have a conflict of interest that results in them only serving themselves. We are not a provider. We are a campaigning, radical and effective charity that does what it says on the tin. We cut through the dishonesty, complacency, denial and lack of common sense that permeates this predominately publicly funded sector.

11. When a home registers as new it is automatically given a longer period without being inspected, therefore if it is a former bad home the bad care will continue for a longer period before it is spotted.

**METHODIST CARE HOMES**

**EXAMPLE HOME: CHURCHFIELD PARK NG73DP**

Registered 3 Times:
1. Trinity Care Ltd
2. Methodist Care Homes Ltd
3. Methodist Care Homes Ltd
NB: Inspection records start with one inspection report for Trinity Care Ltd which is poor, but the suffering may have pre-dated this report.
CQC INSPECTION JUNE 2011.
OWNER TRINITY CARE LTD.
REGISTRATION ONE.

Page 2. There is reference to previous visits but no reports available. Not all people feel safe in the home.

Page 7 Involving and respecting people: Not Met.
One person says they have relatives and residents’ meetings about menus,
My view: Only menus are considered convenient as a subject for such meetings.

Page 9. A person tells inspectors they are left to wait for care and wet themselves everyday whilst waiting for help. They say staff are going to put her in a chair with a waterproof cover to protect the chair.
My view: There is consideration given to protecting the chair but the person’s skin and clothes will be left wet, the skin will become red and sore, may result in urine burns or worse. This is not just about dignity, it is about deliberate neglect resulting in physical harm.

Most people in homes will not say what is happening for fear of reprisals, many can not say due to dementia. The inspector decides the manager should investigate, which is incredible.

Page 8. A staff member tells the inspector that they are concerned about the attitude and competence of some staff.
My view: Barely into the report yet and one resident risks reporting the serious neglect she endures and a staff member blows the whistle risking her job in doing so - was the risk worth it? No. The resident’s suffering is referred to the manager and the issues raised by the whistle-blower result in the inspector looking at the last quality assurance audit, which says “some issues were identified about staff competence” and leaves it at that. Staff competence is about training, staff attitude is not and can mean there are staff who are not suitable to work in care.

My view: Care plans and health checks are considered met, but a staff member says care plans could be better. Yet it is also noted that a large number of people were losing weight.

A resident says they do not feel safe as have lost the key to their room and had belongings stolen.

**My view:** Incredibly the inspector takes no action even to report these criminal acts, ignores the person’s concerns that their valuables have not been replaced by the home, and just asks the manager to replace the key.

The report goes on to say all staff were trained in safeguarding and one incident of a fall occurred during the inspection and was reported, but two staff when asked about safeguarding, said they would investigate any incidents themselves. The report refers to a number of safeguarding investigations in progress relating to serious injuries sustained from falls.

**Page 15. Support workers: Not Met. Major concerns.**
The Manager says she does supervisions with the same staff but the problems continue. Various care records are checked and the inspector concludes the care needed is documented.

**My view:** Just because a care plan documents what care is needed means nothing. The CQC say they have seen one person who was at risk of malnutrition, who had seen the dietician and had a plan of care but this person was observed without help to eat at lunchtime. The inspector asks the manager to take action but this person could starve meanwhile.

**PAGE 17 Assessing Quality of service: Not Met. Moderate concerns.**
**My view:** There is a history of problems. Compliance actions are the only result.

**THE HOME IS THEN REGISTERED TO METHODIST CARE HOMES LTD and all previous reports archived.**

**CQC Inspection 5th January 2012:**
**Involving and respecting people: Not Compliant.**
Some staff were observed to be very good, other staff not so good.
A resident says they have to wait up to half an hour for help as staff are very busy.
Some staff are observed being snappy and impatient with residents.

**My view:** There are clearly not enough staff to meet residents needs, some staff may not be suitable to work in care. This area is said to have improved to minor concern rating.

**Care and welfare: Not compliant.**
Care plans were not detailed enough. Example: a person with diabetes was not receiving the correct monitoring. Activities had improved.
My view: As Methodist Care Homes is registered as a new provider, leeway is often given to allow time for improvements, and ratings are often more optimistic. On this occasion Methodist Homes is a new provider and I have no objection to this approach if the leeway results in improved care in time.

Safeguarding from abuse: Compliant.
Staff have received training. There have been no safeguarding incidents.
My view: An over-optimistic conclusion given that there have been no safeguarding incidents reported so how such incidents would be handled can only be presumed.
Supporting Staff: Compliant.
There were supervisions of staff but one manager’s records were exactly the same for all the staff supervisions. Staff records for supervision were not adequate.
The planned staff training programme is comprehensive.
My view: Some staff were seen to be snappy and inpatient with residents on the day of the inspection, which shows that some staff have an ingrained culture. Staff supervisions are a paperwork exercise and not addressing anything but the CQC's need for paperwork.

Assessing & monitoring quality: Compliant.
There was significant improvement in the furnishings and equipment and more planned.
My View: When a home has been run for many years by a bad provider there is often a honeymoon period when a new provider takes over. However the problem staff are still a problem and as one good staff member said, whether the care is good depends who is working that day. This tells me something is very wrong.

CQC INSPECTION 17th October 2012 (9 Months Later)

My view: A number of people had suffered serious harm as a result of pressure sores. Care staff had repeatedly raised concerns with the nurses to avoid the harm being done but their concerns were ignored.

Whilst the CQC state at the front of the report that this was a routine inspection it is not until page 7 that we see the information that numerous concerns had been raised about the lack of care in the home by the Local Authority, and the CQC react with an inspection after the harm has been done.
People were observed without pressure relief equipment or with faulty equipment. All the care staff interviewed had raised numerous concerns repeatedly about pressure care but their concerns were ignored. One of these staff appears to have gone to the local authority and reported this.

Many people had very high needs. People were not getting enough to eat and drink. People were seen with food left in front of them and given no help to eat it. Another person was left at the table slumped in a wheelchair with a bowl of cold congealed porridge on the table in front of them.

This is the last inspection report and then the public are told the home has a different owner. The history is archived and most people would not look at who owned the home before. They form a judgement in choosing a home for a loved based on what CQC tell them about the new owner.

The main thrust of CQC's reaction to the appalling state of the home is to try and justify their last inspection. But their last inspection only failed two standards and for what they then concluded had been minor concerns. Even though there was clear evidence of staff shortages last time the standard on staffing was not inspected. This time it is inspected and fails. One member of staff said she had repeatedly raised concerns with the provider who only paid lip service. The only standard CQC judge as being met is Complaints.

REGISTRATION THREE
NEW OWNER METHODIST CARE HOMES LTD

CQC Inspection: Over 3 days, November 9th
October 29th and 30th 2013

Despite the last appalling report, the home is not inspected again for a year as it is treated as a new service. When it is inspected it is as disgusting as before, and fails all six standards and has enforcement action taken on safeguarding people from abuse.

Some of the observations:
- One person said his feet were cold but he had no socks as they were lost in the laundry.
Another person was left sitting in the lounge and said she was cold and hungry. When staff were asked why she had no food at 1.40 some was brought to her.

Pressure and wound care was poor.

Some staff said they would not report abuse but would speak to the abuser.

A resident said some staff mistreated them. This was reported to safeguarding.

An agency volunteer reported an incident they had witnessed. This was referred to safeguarding.

Restraint was being used daily by some staff which put people at risk.

A sharps container overflowing with razor blades was found in the linen cupboard and more razor blades were found in a bathroom.

There were building works on the top floor of the home.

Hoist slings, pressure mattresses and pumps littered a storeroom floor.

In one dining room one care worker was helping a person to eat and was very kind. Someone else was calling out “come and help me”.

There was clearly not enough staff. Four staff said there were not enough staff with sometimes only one care worker on a floor and sometimes only two, leaving one alone at break times, but the manager said there was enough staff.

One person had fallen ten times in a month. Some of the accident reports were not filled in correctly.

CQC Inspection 18th October 2013
Only one standard is checked. Medication: enforcement action taken.
REPORT IS NOT PUBLISHED FOR SIX MONTHS (IN APRIL 2014)

CQC Inspection 27th 2013.
Only the medication standard is checked and is rated as being met. This report is published in January 2014, three months before the above bad report. The public would know about the report on medication that is positive three months before the negative report is available to the public.
CQC Inspection 27th February and 7th March 2014
Three standards checked and three standards failed.

Summary:
- People are not protected from abuse.
- Records are not accurate.
- Care and treatment placed people at risk.
- Falls are not recorded correctly.
- Dangerous moving and handling.
- Some people were at risk of choking.
- Three people have been illegally deprived of their liberty.
- A whistle-blower reported to CQC that not all abuse was dealt with.
- Compliance actions are made again.

CQC Inspection Report June 2014
This is like hundreds of other reports which are missing from the CQC website and the full reports cannot be read or downloaded. All that is available is a summary report that can be viewed only online, one page at a time which is time consuming and totally unacceptable as many people may wish to print out eg at a library, to read at home.

Quality checking system: Met.
No information in the eight lines given indicates how quality checking is done.

Records: Not met.
Just over a page of information, repeating the same issues which have always been the problem.
Staffing: Met the standard.
Need to see full report which is not available.

Environment: Met.
Need to see full report which is not available.

Safeguarded from abuse: Standard met.
Need to see full report which is not available.

Meeting care needs: Not met.
Pressure care and other records are not accurate.

One person seen shouting and distressed at a table. Staff were asked about this and said the person is on “one to one” care but the carer has gone to see to other
people. So how can the staffing standard have been met when clearly there are not enough staff to meet needs? This is a total contradiction and typical of CQC inspections. Pressure care and other records are not accurate.

Treating people respectfully: Standard met.
In spite of witnessing an incident where a person was not treated with respect.

In total ten pages of scant, flawed and contradictory information reporting the first inspection of the CQC’s allegedly tough new regime.

CQC inspection March 2015 (the last available on website)
Failed three out of five standards. Overall requires improvement.
Now back to:
- Medications failures.
- Quality checks were not completed.
- Some arrangements did not protect residents’ legal rights.
- Scant evidence throughout the 12 pages.
- For example the manager said all complaints were dealt with correctly but could not locate the records, this is one of the two areas judged compliant.

HOMES WHICH CQC SAY ARE NEW OR UNDER NEW OWNERSHIP...

ROSE BRAE
This home appeared on the CQC web-site in January 2016 as one of the homes they had rated Inadequate. Was this evidence of CQC being a robust regulator? Or was this a home CQC knew had been poor in the past?

Here is what was known about Rose Brae and what action was taken:

CQC Report 30th April 2009
This is the first available report on this care home.
The Registered Owners are listed as Mr Shaid Hussain and Mrs Zulqarmain Hussain.
The Hussain family have always owned the home.

Page 7. The CQC sent questionnaires to the home for staff to complete but none were returned.
Page 8. States the following shortfalls have improved since the last inspection (for which no report is available so the public cannot compare):

- Staffing levels now allow residents’ needs to be met.
- Employment checks are now done.
- Care plans now contain information about what help people need.
- Staff training has now improved and staff know what to do if they witness abuse.

So this home had a previous history. At this point, the above shortfalls are serious and will have had a major impact on the care provided in the past.

Page 9. This lists things the home now does better:

- Activities.
- Quality assurance.
- There should be menus available so people know the choice of meals.
- The home should keep accurate records of staff training.
- Staff meetings should be held so that staff have the opportunity of expressing their views about the care provided.

The home is rated “Two stars - Good”.

CQC Report March 2012 (2 Years and 11 Months Later)

Nearly 3 years without an inspection.

Page 2 states that this inspection is only being carried out because the CQC had become aware of concerns. Those concerns are listed as:

- Respecting and involving people.
- The care and welfare of people.
- Meeting nutritional needs.
- Staffing.
- Supporting staff.
- Complaints.

The same general shortfalls that were referred to as an issue in 2008.

Page 3. One resident said he did not always get enough to eat but he didn't like to say anything.

Page 6. As with all CQC reports for this time period there is a solid block of dark purple ink which would deter many people from printing these reports.
Page 8. States that there is a lethargic atmosphere and a notable lack of stimulation or activities, an issue raised in the previous inspection report nearly 3 years ago. This area is rated non-compliant.

Page 10. This is the first reference to who had raised concerns about the home and states the CQC received information from a member of the public who had expressed concerns about the care of people living in the home. This person said people were put at risk because some staff were not able to use the hoist and there were concerns that staff were not always made aware of people's care needs.

CQC decides this area is Compliant. The evidence claimed for this is that the home had not written down any incidents or accidents with the hoist and the staff said they knew how to use the hoist however this was not considered in terms of were there enough staff available to use the hoist safely at all times?

Page 12. Nutrition:
- One person was left sitting at the dining table with the remains of their breakfast in front of them for more than an hour.
- There were no drinks available in the private bedrooms.
- People remained in their wheelchairs at mealtimes.
- The cutlery provided was plastic and cheap.

Page 13 states a member of the public had contacted the CQC in November 2011 and they also received concerns from a dietician who was visiting the home.

- The food was said to be of poor quality, people did not have a choice of meals and the food and drinks were often cold.
- The cook said she did not have enough time to do the cooking, washing up and food ordering and would like to have had more hours allocated.
- The environmental health officer was taking enforcement action against the home for outstanding issues.

This area is judged Non-compliant.

Page 14 states the CQC said they had been informed there were not five staff but the CQC decided to look at the rotas and accept them as accurate because the manager says there are always five staff. CQC judged this area Compliant.

Page 17 Complaints:
This states that a member of the public contacted CQC after raising concerns at the home with the manager but to no avail. CQC look at the complaints log which shows there have been three complaints since 2010 and they were full records of what action being taken. This area is judged compliant.

However when a member of the public contacts the CQC there has to be a good reason for doing this. Relatives often fear to complain in case their loved one suffers retribution and it is simply not credible that this home deals with complaints correctly. All of the issues highlighted in this report have been a recurring theme in the past. It is clearly a home where relatives’ views are not considered and where staff do not return surveys to CQC. This says indicates there is something very wrong and that people are not able to raise issues. It is also stated that the home advertised two relatives’ meetings but nobody turned up and that is just accepted by the CQC without question.

CQC Report April 2013. (1 Year 1 month later )
Page two, states the home is owned by Rose Brae Partnership and the CQC list this report from 2013 in the new re-registered section for this home. Companies House records however refer to Mrs Hussain and Mr Hussain being the only directors of this care home from the outset to the present day. This report is listed on the CQC website as the first report of the allegedly new provider.

Page 6 states that not all the people in the home are able to describe their care due to dementia.

Page 8 reports the following comments from residents:
“The call system is not all that good it takes them ages to come.”
“Staff do not like you to call, they don't like being interrupted.”
Another person said “They want to get you out of bed in the morning as fast as they can”.
All these issues do not affect CQC's judgement of Compliant.

Page 11. “The provider may find it useful to note that there was little evidence of the menu at the home of green nutrition in accordance with the Department of Health's recommended five portions of fruit and vegetables.” This area is judged Compliant.

Page 12. Safeguarding people from harm: Not meeting this standard.

- Three members of staff were spoken to and none of them demonstrate a clear understanding of what safeguarding meant or the types of any potential abuse.
Staff knew they had to report concerns to the manager but were unsure how to report concerns outside the home.

Staff spoken to said they had not received any safeguarding training, an issue as far back as 2008.


- Five staff files were checked and did not follow the recruitment process.
- References were not checked.
- Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) checks were out of date.
- Only two files contained a job description and a contract of employment.
- One person had submitted an application for a laundry assistant post but had been employed as a healthcare assistant.
- One file relating to an allegedly registered nurse was found to have no evidence that the provider had checked that the person was registered with the NMC and no evidence that a previous employer had been contacted for a reference.
- Two files had no evidence that the person’s proof of identity had been checked.

Three new staff members spoken to said they had a period of time shadowing but one staff member only had an induction lasting two days for working unsupervised. The induction checklist was completed in 2010 but the person’s application was dated 2003.

All of these issues had been raised in this care home previously.

Page 17. Monitoring service: Not meeting this standard.
Another list of the same failures as in previous reports.

Page 18 documents that the home has no formal system for logging complaints which is not what was said in 2009 when a member of the public said their complaints were ignored. The CQC did not uphold those concerns.
This home has been re-registered three times to the Hussains and no prior reports are given for 2009 so it is possible it may have been re-registered more than three times.

The home page for this care home is completely confusing with two links to previous seemingly different providers who turn out to be exactly the same providers. Bad reports have been archived and members of the public would actually think that three different owners had been in charge of this home however it had the same owners throughout. **In September 2014 the home’s reports are again archived and the home is re-registered again.**

**CQC report July 2014**

This home’s report is one of many for the 2014 period which are not available in full, only in summary form. They cannot be downloaded from the CQC website and had to be read online, a page at a time scrolling down each time to access the next page. This is something we have found in 80% of the homes we have looked at on the CQC website and it is completely unacceptable because this makes it very hard for members of the public to obtain enough reliable information about a care home.

The separate pages of this inspection report online contain insufficient information for me to form a judgement or indeed for the CQC to form a judgement. The 2013 report and all of the failures listed at that time cannot be checked in this next inspection.

From 2014 onwards the CQC’s confusing and difficult to use website has gone from bad to worse. In the cases of the many homes with multiple registrations to the same owners and multiple links to past reports archived, it needs the skill of the Bletchley Park code breakers to even access all of the reports or to understand who actually owns the home and how far back the previous record actually goes.

**THIRD REGISTRATION: Report 1 of 1**

**CQC Report published January 2016.**

This report is the first report of the allegedly new owners of this home, Mr and Mrs Hussain who have always owned the home and have always been dreadful at providing consistent standards of care. The same issues have come up again and again throughout CQC’s time as a regulator. This sorry history has been split into three lots of reports under three owners. If you could simply look back and draw a line through from this report to the first available report in 2009 questions may have been asked as to why CQC had not acted earlier. The question I ask is how can they register the home for the second time to the Hussains without checking that the Rose Brae Partnership is an actual
company registered at Companies House. This care home has always been owned by the same family from day one.

After the Southern Cross fiasco, we the public were told proper checks would be carried out on care home owners to assess their fitness to be a care provider but no such checks seem to have been carried out on this home’s owners. Or were the CQC aware when they registered the home three times and told the public it was a new service each time that it was still the same owner? If they were not aware, why did they not check it was actually a valid company registered at Companies House?

The next question I would ask is this: CQC say they will act when there is poor care in a home. Obviously if they take enforcement action on just one bad inspection the provider will have the right of appeal and it could be considered unreasonable. **If CQC were serious they could have acted on this home’s failings as far back as 2010 because sufficient warnings had been given for action to be taken to stop the poor care once and for all by closing the home. Instead CQC have chopped the evidence into three sections and told the public there are three separate owners. This says everything about how serious the CQC are about not tolerating poor care. Their tactic is “Hide the evidence and no one will know how long people have suffered”**.

This home is now in meltdown with an Inadequate rating and in special measures and announced proudly as such on the CQC website. Of course nobody would look beyond the fact that this home apparently had only one inspection report in its history and would presume that it is a new home. This sums up the CQC. Their legacy will be being notorious as the regulator who stood by at a time when there has been unprecedented suffering and abuse of vulnerable people.

This is a list of what was found in the last report January 2016

- Safeguarding incidents were not reported.
- Staff were unaware they needed to report.
- Staff had not received sufficient training.
- Staff recruitment records were poor.
- Criminal record checks had not been undertaken.
- Staff references in the majority were not verified.
● There were trailing electrical wires which were a trip hazard.

● There was not enough hot water and the windows were unsafe.

● Infection control was poor according to a recent NHS audit but not according to the previous CQC inspection which passed it as Compliant.

● Care plans are now back to being as poor as they were on several occasions in the past despite the last CQC inspection passing them as Compliant, especially when you consider the last CQC inspection was the first of the allegedly improved inspections regime.

● Risk assessments are back to being poor.

● Comments from residents and relatives are mixed. It is stated, yet as usual the CQC only print those that are positive and we are not told about the negative.

● Staffing levels again are not sufficient to meet the needs of residents.

● Medication was not checked in and out of the home so there was no audit trail and it was impossible to check if the correct amount of medication was left after each administration so there was an unsafe system for administering medication.

● There have been several incidents serious enough to need hospital treatment which were not reported to the CQC.

Now the CQC finally accept that the complaints procedure in the home is non-existent. People have suffered harm and the CQC have gone in to inspect the home after receiving information about three people and their lack of care.

The detailed reports above are an example of the why we are so concerned about the CQC actions - or lack of action.

COMPANY ONE:
IDEAL CARE HOMES

BRACKENFIELD HALL S12 4WU

REGISTRATION 1. IDEAL HOMES
Archived Reports: 2
    March 2012
    March 2013

REGISTRATION 2. IDEAL HOMES
    May 2014

REGISTRATION 3. IDEAL HOMES
Not inspected yet as a new service.

Summary of Brackenfield Hall:
Whilst the 3 reports for this home are Compliant, the home since 2012 has been inspected only a total of three times, due to it repeatedly being treated as a new service and therefore not inspected to the same degree.

Not all these homes have a good past but all information is archived in a confusing maze of links to allegedly previous owners.

HATFIELD HOUSE DN7 6JQ

REGISTRATION 1. IDEAL HOMES.
Archived Reports: 2
    July 2012
    June 2013.
    Both Compliant.

REGISTRATION 2. IDEAL HOMES. CLEAN SLATE.
Archived Reports: 1
    October 2013.

Reference to two whistle-blowers and two major abuse investigations.
No information on whether the whistle-blowers are still employed or if any bullying has resulted, or if any abuse was found.

REGISTRATION 3. IDEAL HOMES. CLEAN SLATE.
Inspection June 2015 rates the home Good, but ignores clear evidence of staffing shortages. States also that there has been a bullying culture in the home in the past.

**Summary of Hatfield House.**

Only four inspections in a five year period and one of those only took place as a result of whistle-blowers reporting abuse to The Local Authority. The maze of links to previous owners (ie the same) allows information to be buried and the public are led to believe that three separate companies have owned this home. The whistle-blowers’ fate is not mentioned and any reference to their existence and their concerns about abuse are also buried when this information is archived.

**HERRIES LODGE S5 8TT**

**REGISTRATION 1. IDEAL HOMES**

Never inspected. Never inspected. The only information is a page saying: Registered on April 12th 2012. Ideal homes. New Service.

**REGISTRATION 2. IDEAL HOMES. CLEAN SLATE.**

Archived Reports: 2  
Oct 2013 in response to serious concerns people were at risk. May 2014 Compliant.

**REGISTRATION 3. IDEAL HOMES. CLEAN SLATE.**

Not inspected as a new owner.

**Summary of Herries Lodge:**

By re-registering three times as a new owner this home has only been inspected on just two occasions in a five year period and one of those inspections only took place as a result of CQC being informed of concerns. **So one single planned inspection in five years is the reward for this re-registration scam.**

**MILLVIEW BD2 4BN**

**REGISTRATION 1 IDEAL HOMES**

Archived Reports: 2  
Jan 2012 failed 2 of 5 standards.
May 2012 Compliant.

REGISTRATION 2. NEW OWNER IDEAL HOMES. CLEAN SLATE
Archived Report: 1
August 2013 Compliant.

REGISTRATION 3. NEW OWNER IDEAL HOMES. CLEAN SLATE
1 report:
    July 2015 Requires Improvement.

MONTROSE HALL WN5 9RB

REGISTRATION 1. IDEAL HOMES:
    July 2013 Compliant.

REGISTRATION 2. NEW OWNER IDEAL HOMES CLEAN SLATE
    Report 1
    August 2015 Requires Improvement.

Summary: Montrose could be a “yo-yo” home but not enough information to judge the trends. By the time there is enough information people will have suffered already.

OAK TREE LS8

REGISTRATION 1. IDEAL HOMES
Archived Reports: 3
    October 2012 Serious failures and ingrained poor care. Failed 3 of 5 standards.
    June 2013 Enforcement action taken on three standards.
    July 2013 (just weeks later) compliant.

REGISTRATION 2. NEW OWNER IDEAL HOMES. CLEAN SLATE
Archived Reports: 3
    November 2013 Failing.
    March 2014 Failing.
    June 2014 Full report missing from CQC website with summary available to read online only.
REGISTRATION 3. NEW OWNER IDEAL HOMES. CLEAN SLATE.
1 Report:
   April 2015 Requires improvements.

Summary of Oaktree Lodge:
One of the worst homes and seven inspections are carried out but the evidence is again hidden in a maze of links that people would not look at as they are told that the reports relate to the previous owner, and that leads to yet another previous owner.

The missing report can be viewed on line, but is confusing to understand as the first page asks five questions for example:
Is the home safe? There is no yes or no reply but only a paragraph of CQC jargon which people are expected to read and guess at the answer.

OAKWOOD GRANGE S71 4EZ

REGISTRATION 1. IDEAL HOMES
Archived Reports: 1
   September 2012 Compliant.

REGISTRATION 2. NEW OWNER IDEAL HOMES.
Archived Reports: 1
   June 2014 Summary online version only. Compliant.

REGISTRATION 3. NEW OWNER IDEAL HOME

PARK HALL ST2 OQS

REGISTRATION 1. IDEAL HOME
Archived Reports: 4
   May 2010 Compliant.
   November 2012 Failing. Staffing levels poor.
   March 2013 Compliant.
   December 2013 Compliant.

REGISTRATION 2. NEW OWNER IDEAL HOMES CLEAN SLATE
Not inspected yet.
Summary: 6 years and just 4 inspections.

SAVILE PARK HX1 3EA

REGISTRATION 1. IDEAL HOMES
Archived Reports: 2
   November 2012 compliant
   November 2013 compliant

REGISTRATION 2. NEW OWNER IDEAL HOMES CLEAN SLATE
Reports: 2
Only an on-line summary version but at least this inspector has answered the questions. People are at risk due to staffing levels.
   April 2015 Met all but one standard.

COMPANY ONE CONTINUED: IDEAL HOMES NUMBER ONE

BEAUMONT HALL LE4

REGISTRATION 1. IDEAL HOMES
Archived Reports: 2
   May 2013 Failed care and welfare.
   July 2013 Failed half of standards.

REGISTRATION 2. NEW OWNER IDEAL HOMES CLEAN SLATE
Reports: 3
   November 2013 Failed 2 of 4 standards checked
   February 2014 Compliant
   September 2014 In response to concerns. Full report is missing but summary seems to imply failed all.

BRINNINGTON HALL SK5 8HT

REGISTRATION 1
Archived Reports: 4
   July 2012 Compliant.
   April 2013 Serious failings in four standards.
   August 2013 Compliant.
   June 2014 Missing report, only online summary. Seems compliant.
REGISTRATION 2. NEW OWNER IDEAL HOMES. CLEAN SLATE
No reports up as New owner not inspected. Registered 23rd June 2015.

COPPICE LODGE NG5 7GS

REGISTRATION 1. IDEAL HOMES
Archived Reports: 2
March 2013 Enforcement action taken things are that bad.
April 2013 1 standard only checked and ticked off.

REGISTRATION 2. NEW OWNER IDEAL HOMES. CLEAN SLATE.
Reports: 4
August 2013 Serious failures across all standards.
November 2013 More suffering endured.
September 2014 Also missing full report. Scant information.
Seems failing still.

EBOR COURT YO26 6RJ

REGISTRATION 1. IDEAL HOMES
Archived Reports: 1
February 2015 Good.

REGISTRATION 2. OWNER IDEAL HOMES. CLEAN SLATE.

HAMBLETON GRANGE Y07 1QH

REGISTRATION 1. IDEAL HOMES
Archived Reports: 1

REGISTRATION 2. NEW OWNER IDEAL HOMES CLEAN SLATE.
Not inspected. New service. Registered August 2015.

NEWFIELD LODGE WF10 4BJ
REGISTRATION 1. IDEAL HOME
Never inspected. Registered July 12th 2012.

REGISTRATION 2. NEW OWNER IDEAL HOMES
Archived Reports: 3
   October 2013 Compliant
   Sept 2014 Scant information version seems compliant
   July 2015 Failing all but one standard.
       Staff and families report staffing levels are poor.

COMPANY ONE CONTINUED: IDEAL HOMES KIRKLEES LTD

FAIRWAY VIEW NG6 9LZ

REGISTRATION 1. IDEAL HOMES
Archived Reports: 3
   July 2012 Failing.
   March 2013 Compliant.
   March 2014 Compliant.

REGISTRATION 2. IDEAL HOMES KIRKLEES Ltd. CLEAN SLATE
Registered as new on 21st August 2015 so not inspected.

LARKHILL HALL L11 1ER

REGISTRATION 1. IDEAL HOMES
No reports. Never inspected. Registered September 2014.

REGISTRATION 2. NEW OWNER IDEAL HOMES KIRKLEES Ltd
Inspected once in December 2015 Compliant.

COMPANY TWO: REGAL CARE HOMES

THE PARK BECK TN38 0LG

REGISTRATION 1. REGAL CARE HOMES.
Archived Reports: 5
May 2009 2 Stars
December 2011 Failing all. Widespread neglect.
April 2012 Failing and people still suffering.
June 2012 Still failing.
July 2012 Compliant - in just 4 weeks?

REGISTRATION 2.
NEW OWNER REGAL CARE TRADING. CLEAN SLATE
May 2013 Compliant.
October 2015 Failing 3 standards. Requires improvement.

ALPINE CARE HOME TN13 3LH

REGISTRATION 1. REGAL CARE HOMES.
Archived Reports: 4
November 2009 2 Star
June 2010 1 Star
October 2011 Compliant with a “But”( Says compliant on page one but needs to do all these thing to remain compliant, which is contradictory)
March 2012 Compliant without a But (Truly compliant)

REGISTRATION 2. REGAL CARE TRADING. CLEAN SLATE.
February 2013 Almost Compliant. Failed one standard.
July 2013 Failed three standards.
November 2013 Compliant.
August 2014 Report missing. Scant version only. May be Compliant.
June 2015 Inadequate all areas. Harm already suffered.

ASHCROFT NURSING HOME CT9 2QE

REGISTRATION 1. REGAL CARE HOMES
Archived Reports: 9
June 2009 Zero Star Poor. Resulting in widespread suffering and neglect.
November 2009 Zero Star Poor.
February 2010 Zero Star Poor.
July 2010 Zero Star Poor.
January 2011 Compliant.
May 2011 Compliant with a but (ie not compliant)
November  2011  Failing all areas. Major concerns.
December  2011  Compliant
July  2011  Compliant.

REGISTRATION 2.  REGAL CARE TRADING  CLEAN SLATE
November 2012  Compliant.
October  2013  Failed two of six standards inspected.
January  2014  Compliant.
October  2014  Failed two standards. Requires improvement.
ASHLEY COURT KETTERING NN16 9QT

REGISTRATION 1.  REGAL CARE HOMES.
Archived Reports: 3
June  2010  3 Stars Excellent.
October  2011  Compliant.
August  2012  Compliant.

REGISTRATION 2.  REGAL CARE TRADING  CLEAN SLATE
September 2013 Compliant but failed medication.
May  2014  Compliant.
March  2015  Good.

BLAIR HOUSE TN38 OLF

REGISTRATION 1.  REGAL CARE HOMES
Archived Reports: 2
May  2009  1 Star Adequate
March  2012  Failing. Serious concerns about care.

REGISTRATION 2.  REGAL CARE TRADING  CLEAN SLATE
October  2012  Compliant.
September 2015  Failed 3 of 5. Requires Improvement.

BLENHEIM CARE HOME CO14 8QT

REGISTRATION 1.  REGAL CARE HOMES
Archived Reports: 3
May  2010  2 Stars Good.
May  2011  Failing all. Suffering and neglect has already caused harm.
September 2012  Compliant.

REGISTRATION 2. REGAL CARE TRADING  CLEAN SLATE
July 2013  Compliant.
June 2015  Good.

BRENALWOOD CO14 8HN

REGISTRATION 1. REGAL CARE HOMES
Archived Reports:  2
June 2009  1 Star Adequate.
May 2011  Compliant.

REGISTRATION 2. REGAL CARE TRADING  CLEAN SLATE.
March 2013  Failed half of standards checked.
July 2013  Compliant.
(As of January 2016 the last inspection of this home was July 2013)

CHENEY HOUSE 2NZ

REGISTRATION 1. REGAL CARE HOMES
Archived Reports:  4
May 2009  1 Star Adequate
May 2010  3 Star Excellent
January 2012  Compliant with a But
July 2012  Compliant without a But.

REGISTRATION 2. REGAL CARE TRADING  CLEAN SLATE.
Reports:  3
March 2013  Compliant.
December 2013  Compliant.
October 2015  Good.

HAWTHORN LODGE NG5 5LF

REGISTRATION 1. REGAL CARE HOMES
Archived Reports:  3
May 2009  Zero Star Poor.
September 2009  1 Star Adequate.
February 2011 Failing on hygiene and equipment.

REGISTRATION 2. REGAL CARE TRADING CLEAN SLATE
January 2013 Failed half of standards checked.
August 2013 Failed Medications
November 2015 Fails all. Requires Improvements.

LE MORS BB5 5QU

REGISTRATION 1. REGAL CARE HOMES
Archived Reports: 2
October 2009 2 Star Good.
January 2012 Failing 3 standards.

REGISTRATION 2. REGAL CARE TRADING CLEAN SLATE
January 2013 Compliant
November 2013 Compliant
July 2015 Failed all standards. Requires improvements.

LINDEN MANOR NN8 1NF

REGISTRATION 1. REGAL CARE HOMES
Archived Reports: 4
December 2010 2 Star Good.
September 2011 Failed all. Serious harm inflicted.
January 2012 Compliant.
August 2012 Compliant.

REGISTRATION 2. REGAL CARE TRADING CLEAN SLATE
August 2013 Compliant on 4 of 5 standards.
January 2016 Inadequate on all standards. Suffering and harm already done.

LOOSE COURT ME16 9UD
REGISTRATION 1. REGAL CARE HOMES
Archived Reports: 7
November 2009 Zero Star Poor.
February 2010 Zero Star Poor.
April 2010 Zero Star Poor.
July 2010 Zero Star Poor.
December 2010 Failed half of standards checked.
May 2011 Compliant.
June 2012 Compliant.

REGISTRATION 2. REGAL CARE TRADING  CLEAN SLATE.
April 2013 Compliant.
Not Inspected since.

MOORLANDS NG16 5AB

REGISTRATION 1. REGAL CARE HOMES
Archived Reports: 4
September 2009 1 Star Adequate.
April 2010 2 Star Good.
September 2011 CQC inspect when informed home is failing and fail home.
January 2012 Compliant.

REGISTRATION 2. REGAL CARE TRADING  CLEAN SLATE
December 2012 Compliant.
November 2013 Compliant.
May 2015 Fails All. Requires improvement.

ST CATHERINE'S S3 9DH

REGISTRATION 1. REGAL CARE HOMES
Archived Reports: 3
April 2010 1 Star Adequate
August 2010 Zero Star Poor. Embargo after PCT informs CQC and Local Authority of Serious Concerns. Harm and Suffering already done.
November 2011 Compliant with a But (Not Compliant CQC jargon).

REGISTRATION 2. REGAL CARE HOMES. CLEAN SLATE
July 2013 Compliant.
THE HOLLIES TN4 0NX

REGISTRATION 1.  REGAL CARE HOMES
Archived Reports: 2
  December 2009  2 Star Good.
  September 2011 Serious failings core areas.

REGISTRATION 2.  REGAL CARE TRADING.  CLEAN SLATE
  October 2012 Compliant.
  August 2013 Compliant.
  October 2015 Inadequate. Suffering and harm already done.

WESTLANDS CARE HOME NN8 4JH

REGISTRATION 1.  REGAL CARE HOMES
ARCHIVED REPORTS 4
  September 2009  Zero Star Poor.
  December 2009 Zero Star Poor.
  February 2010  2 Star Good.
  November 2011  Compliant.

REGISTRATION 2.  REGAL CARE TRADING  CLEAN SLATE
  November 2012 Compliant
  July 2013  Compliant
  April 2014  Compliant
  April 2015  Failing all but one standard. Requires improvement.

WOODLANDS PURLEY CR8 3DA

REGISTRATION 1.  REGAL CARE HOMES
Archived Reports: 3
  November 2009  1 Star Adequate
  March 2011  Serious failures in safeguarding.
  August 2011 Compliant.

REGISTRATION 2.  REGAL CARE TRADING  CLEAN SLATE
  June 2013  Compliant.
  January 2016 Good.

COMPANY 3: CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
ABBEYCREST RG4 9RG

REGISTRATION 1. ABBEYCREST.
Never inspected.

REGISTRATION 2. CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
Archived Reports: 2
   November 2011   Compliant.
   October 2012   Compliant.

REGISTRATION 3. CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
   November 2013 One standard checked - Compliant.
   November 2014 Good.

BRADBURY HOUSE CM7 1ES

REGISTRATION 1. GREENACRES LTD
Never inspected.

REGISTRATION 2. CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
Archived Reports: 1
   March 2013   Compliant.

REGISTRATION 3. CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
   October 2015 Good
NB: Since 2010 total inspections were 2 in 6 years.

CLAYDON HOUSE BN7 2QT

REGISTRATION 1. 2010. CLAYDON LTD
Never inspected.

REGISTRATION 2. CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
Archived Reports: 1
   May 2013   Compliant

REGISTRATION 3. CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
   November 2013 Failed 1 of 3 standards checked.
   December 2013 Only 1 standard checked and met.
June 2014 Report missing, scant version implies Compliant.
September 2014 Good. Compliant 4 of 5 standards.

COPPICE LEA RH1 3QN

REGISTRATION 1. 2010 COPPICE LEA LTD

REGISTRATION 2. CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
Archived Reports: 2
June 2012 Compliant.
July 2013 Compliant.

REGISTRATION 3 CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
March 2014 Compliant.
August 2015 Fails 2 of 5. Requires improvement.

COXHILL MANOR GU24 8AU

REGISTRATION 1. COXHILL LTD
BAD HISTORY

REGISTRATION 2. CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
Archived Reports: 1
January 2013 Compliant.

REGISTRATION 3. CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP LTD
March 2014 Compliant.
Not inspected

CRANMER COURT CR6 9PE

REGISTRATION 1. IN 2010 CRANMER COURT LTD
Never inspected.

REGISTRATION 2. CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
Archived Reports: 2
October 2012 Compliant.
August 2013 3 Standards checked Compliant.
REGISTRATION 3.  CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
August 2015 Good.

DEER PARK VIEW TW11 0DX

REGISTRATION 1.  CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
Archived Reports: 2
March 2011 Compliant.
December 2012 Compliant.

REGISTRATION 2.  CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
January 2014 Compliant.
August 2015 Good.

EAST HILL HOUSE GU33 7RR

REGISTRATION 1. IN 2010 AFFINITY Ltd.
Never inspected

REGISTRATION 2.  CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
Archived Reports: 1
June 2012 Compliant.

REGISTRATION 3.  CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
February 2015 Good.
Total 2 inspections in 6 years.

FRETHEY HOUSE TA4 1AB

REGISTRATION 1. 2010 AFFIRMATIVE CARE LTD
Never Inspected.
REGISTRATION 2.  CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
Archived Reports: 2
September 2012 Compliant.
June 2013 Compliant.

REGISTRATION 3.  CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
February 2015 Good.
GALSWORTHY HOUSE KT2 7LX

REGISTRATION 1.  2010 SOUTH LONDON NURSING HOMES.
Never Inspected.

REGISTRATION 2.  CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
Archived Reports: 2
    July 2012 Compliant.
    June 2013 Compliant.

REGISTRATION 3.  CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
    April 2014   3 Standards checked and met.

GARTH HOUSE RH4 2AY

REGISTRATION 1.  2010 ASSURED CARE LTD.
Never inspected.

REGISTRATION 2.  CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
Archived Reports: 2
    December 2011 Compliant with a But.
    December 2012 Compliant.

REGISTRATION 3.  CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
    October 2014   Failed 1 of 3 standards inspected.
    November 2015   Failed 4 of 5. Requires Improvement.

GILDAWOOD COURT CV11 4PJ

REGISTRATION 1.  2010 GILDAWOOD LTD
Never inspected.

REGISTRATION 2.  CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
Archived Reports: 2
    October 2012 Compliant.
    July 2013 Compliant.

REGISTRATION 3.  CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
Registered July 2013 Not inspected to date.
Only 2 inspections since 2010.
HEFFLE COURT TN21 8DR

REGISTRATION 1.  2010 HAREBEATING CARE HOLDINGS
DIRE HISTORY ARCHIVED.

REGISTRATION 2.  CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
Archived Reports:  1
    March 2013 Compliant.

REGISTRATION 3.  CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
    December 2013  Compliant.
    September 2015 Fails 3 of 5.  Requires improvement.

HULCOTT HP22 5AX

REGISTRATION 1.  JULY 2011 HULCOTT LTD
Never inspected.

REGISTRATION 2.  CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
Archived Reports:  2
    November 2011 Compliant.
    October  2012 Compliant.

REGISTRATION 3.  CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
    December 2013 Failed 2 of 6 standards inspected.
    June  2014 Failed 1 of 5 standards inspected.
    Not inspected since.

HUNTERCOMBE HALL RG9 5SE

REGISTRATION 1.  HUNTERCOMBE LTD
HISTORY GOOD

REGISTRATION 2.  CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
Archived Reports:  1
    March 2013 Compliant.

REGISTRATION 3.  CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
    December 2015 Failed 4 of 5 standards.  Requires improvement.
KINGSCLEAR GU15 2LN

REGISTRATION 1. 2010 KINGSCLEAR
Never inspected.

REGISTRATION 2. CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
Archived Reports: 4
January 2012 Major Concerns on 2 standards.
May 2012 Failed. People at risk of abuse. Staffing levels poor.
November 2013 Compliant.
July 2013 Compliant.

REGISTRATION 3. CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
October 2013 Failed 2 of 7 standards.
February 2014 1 standard checked and met.

KIPPINGTON TN13 2PG

REGISTRATION 1. OAKDENE LTD
ARCHIVED HISTORY GOOD.

REGISTRATION 2. CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
Archived Reports: 3
June 2012 Serious failings on 3 of 9 standards.
January 2013 Failed 3 of 6 standards.
July 2013 Failed 2 of 5 standards.

REGISTRATION 3. CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
October 2013 Compliant on 2 of 2 inspected.

KNOWLE PARK GU8 8JL

REGISTRATION 1. 2010 SOUTH LONDON HOMES
Never inspected.

REGISTRATION 2. CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
Archived Reports: 2
March 2013 Failed 2 of 5 standards.
May 2013  Compliant on 2 of 2 standards.

REGISTRATION 3.  CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
July 2013 Failed 3 of 5. DIRE.
Not inspected since.

Laverstock SP1 3YU

REGISTRATION 1.  CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
Archived Reports: 12
June 2009 2 Star (in only 4 Wks!)
October 2009 Random inspection in response to serious concerns.
March 2010 1 Star Adequate.
December 2010 Compliant But (ie Not Compliant).
February 2011 Failed. Widespread concerns and harm.
August 2011 Compliant
October 2011 Compliant But (ie Not Compliant)
February 2012 Failed. Dire.
June 2012 Even worse suffering. Dire.
September 2012 Compliant.
January 2013 Met 3 of 3 inspected.

REGISTRATION 2.  CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
February 2014 1 standard checked and met.
June 2014 Report missing scant version implies some failures.
July 2015 Fails 4 of 5. Requires improvement.

Magna BH21 3BQ

REGISTRATION 1.  CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
Archived Reports: 5
June 2011 Dire. Suffering and harm, one of worst ever seen.
August 2011 Failed half the standards, other half contradicted by evidence.
December 2011 Compliant.
January 2013 Failed 1 of 7 ie Staffing but that should have affected ratings for other standards.
June 2013 Compliant 4 of 4
REGISTRATION 2. CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP  
April 2015 Good.

MILL HOUSE GL55 6DR

REGISTRATION 1. CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP  
Archived Reports: 2  
  September 2011 Compliant.  
  September 2012 Compliant.

REGISTRATION 2. CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP  
  November 2013 Failed 1 of 5.  
  February 2014 Compliant on 1 of 1.  
  December 2015 Good on 4 of 5.

MOORLANDS GU18 5SU

REGISTRATION 1. 2010 MOORLANDS  
Never Inspected.

REGISTRATION 2. CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP  
Archived Reports: 1  
  March 2013 Compliant.

REGISTRATION 3. CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP  
  August 2013 Compliant.  
  June 2014 Missing Scant version implies Compliant.  
  September 2014 Missing. Scant version says was in response to concerns.  
  March 2015 Inadequate. Dire  
  June 2015 Failed. Requires improvement.

MIRANDA SN4 7AY

REGISTRATION 1. 2010 QUALITY CARE.
REGISTRATION 2.  CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP  
Archived Reports: 3  
    July 2012 Compliant.  
    June 2013 Failed 2 of 2.  
    June 2013 Compliant on 4 of 4.

REGISTRATION 3.  CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP  
     June 2014 Report is missing but scant version but the inspector committed to answering the five questions. (Very rare) Compliant.

MOUNT PLEASANT DE15 0DR

REGISTRATION 1.  CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP  
Archived Reports: 2  
    June 2012 Compliant.  
    May 2013 Compliant.

REGISTRATION 2.  WILLOW CARE  
Never Inspected.

REGISTRATION 3.  CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP (AGAIN).  
    November 2015 Good.  
    Since 2011 a total of 3 inspections.

OAK MANOR NR19 2PG

REGISTRATION 1.  CARING HOME HEALTHCARE GROUP  
Archived Reports: 6  
    August 2009 No rating.  
    May 2011 In response to concerns. Suffering and harm already done. Dire.  
    July 2011 Compliant.  
    August 2011 Compliant.  
    August 2012 Compliant.  
    July 2013 Failed 3 of 5.

REGISTRATION 2.  CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP  
    November 2013 Dire – Enforcement taken  
    January 2014 Compliant on 3 of 3.
January 2015 Failed 3 of 5. Requires improvement.

OAKEN HOLT OX2 9NL

REGISTRATION 1. OAKEN HOLT LTD
FAILING HISTORY ARCHIVED

REGISTRATION 2. CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
Archived Reports: 1
    November 2011 Compliant.

REGISTRATION 3. CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
    July 2014 Report missing. In scant version inspector answers questions so
    accept Compliant.

RECTORY HOUSE BN15 0DA

REGISTRATION 1. RECTORY LTD
Good history archived.

REGISTRATION 2. CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
Archived Reports: 2
    February 2013 Failed 1 of 6.
    April 2013 Failed 3 of 4. Dire.

REGISTRATION 3. CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
    January 2014 Compliant.
    July 2014 Missing but some failures implied in scant version.
    March 2015 Good.

ST GEORGE’S BS5 7PD

REGISTRATION 1. ST GEORGE'S 2010
Never Inspected.

REGISTRATION 2. CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
Archived Reports: 2
    June 2012 Major failings. Dire.
    November 2012 Compliant.
REGISTRATION 3. CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
April 2014 3 of 3 met.
July 2015 Failing all. Requires improvement.

SUNDRIDGE BR1 3NG

REGISTRATION 1. HARLEY HEALTHCARE
DIRE HISTORY ARCHIVED

REGISTRATION 2. CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
Archived Reports: 4
August 2012 Failed 2 of 4.
May 2013 Enforcement taken. Dire.
July 2013 Met 2 of 2.
October 2013 Failed 1 of 2.

REGISTRATION 3. CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
December 2013 Failed 1 of 2.

TALL TREES 0XL 6DB

REGISTRATION 1. CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
ARCHIVED REPORTS 7
October 2009 1 Star Adequate.
June 2010 1 Star Adequate.
April 2011 Failed all. Dire. but still no enforcement?
October 2011 Compliant.
February 2012 Compliant.
June 2013 Failed Records.

REGISTRATION 2. CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
April 2014 Report only scant version but questions answered so accept Compliant.
April 2015 Fails 4 of 5. Requires improvement.

WALSTEAD RH16 2QG
REGISTRATION 1. WALSTEAD LTD 2010
Never inspected.

REGISTRATION 2. CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
Archived Reports: 1
   January 2013 Compliant.

REGISTRATION 3. CARING HOMES HEALTHCARE GROUP
   January 2014 Compliant.
   November 2015 Good.

BAD HOMES NOT INSPECTED

INTRODUCTION

The next section contains a random selection of homes from the CQC website. A few of these homes do have the banner highlighting action is underway to address the poor standards, however many of these, despite their last inspections evidencing that the CQC are aware of how bad things were, are still not inspected by the CQC who promised to tackle the worst homes first.

HOME NAME  Maybank House  M23 9JH
Date CQC Site checked 2 February 2016

No Banner up

Treating People with Respect Involving them In Their Care ✓
Providing care, Treatment and Support that Meets Needs ✗
Caring for people Safely and Protecting Them From Harm ✓
Staffing ✓
Quality and Suitability of Management ✗

DATE LAST INSPECTED 8th August 2014
HOME NAME Grove Lodge DT2 9NN  
Date CQC Site checked 2/2/2016

Treating People with Respect Involving them In Their Care  
Providing care, Treatment and Support that Meets Needs  
Caring for people Safely and Protecting Them From Harm  
Staffing  
Quality and Suitability of Management  

DATE LAST INSPECTED 8 November 2014

HOME NAME Forest Hill  
Date CQC Site checked 3/2/2016

Banner on page Checks being made.

Treating People with Respect Involving them In Their Care ✓  
Providing care, Treatment and Support that Meets Needs ✓  
Caring for people Safely and Protecting Them From Harm ✗  
Staffing ✓  
Quality and Suitability of Management ✓  

DATE LAST INSPECTED October 2013
HOME NAME Bradlands NG12 1AF  
Date CQC Site checked 3/2/2016

No Banner up

Treating People with Respect Involving them In Their Care ✓
Providing care, Treatment and Support that Meets Needs ✓
Caring for people Safely and Protecting Them From Harm ❌
Staffing ✓
Quality and Suitability of Management ❌

DATE LAST INSPECTED 13\textsuperscript{th} January 2015

HOME NAME Chestnut View DE73 5SB  
Date CQC Site checked 3/2/2016

No Banner up.

Treating People with Respect Involving them In Their Care ❌
Providing care, Treatment and Support that Meets Needs ❌
Caring for people Safely and Protecting Them From Harm ❌
Staffing ❌
Quality and Suitability of Management ❌ ❌

DATE LAST INSPECTED 14\textsuperscript{th} August 2014
HOME NAME  Ashleigh House RH1 4BG
Date CQC Site checked 3/2/2016

No Banner up

- Treating People with Respect Involving them In Their Care  ❌
- Providing care, Treatment and Support that Meets Needs  ❌
- Caring for people Safely and Protecting Them From Harm  ❌

Staffing  ✓

Quality and Suitability of Management  ❌

DATE LAST INSPECTED 12th June 2014

HOME NAME Berry Hill NG18 4JR
Date CQC Site checked 3/2/2016

No Banner up

- Treating People with Respect Involving them In Their Care  ✓
- Providing care, Treatment and Support that Meets Needs  ❌
- Caring for people Safely and Protecting Them From Harm  ✓

Staffing  ✓

Quality and Suitability of Management  ❌

DATE LAST INSPECTED 8th May 2014
HOME NAME Leawood Manor NG2 6HY
Date CQC Site checked 3/2/2016

No Banner up

Treating People with Respect Involving them In Their Care ✓
Providing care, Treatment and Support that Meets Needs ✗
Caring for people Safely and Protecting Them From Harm ✓
Staffing ✓

Quality and Suitability of Management ✓

DATE LAST INSPECTED 12th July 2014

HOME NAME Ashfield NG17 8BP
Date CQC Site checked 3/2/2016
Banner states, Inspecting because information of concerns received.
Note previous failures, why not inspected sooner?

Treating People with Respect Involving them In Their Care ✓
Providing care, Treatment and Support that Meets Needs ✗
Caring for people Safely and Protecting Them From Harm ✗
Staffing ✓

Quality and Suitability of Management ✗

DATE LAST INSPECTED 9th October 2014
HOME NAME Latimer Lodge BA21 3AQ
Date CQC Site checked 3/2/2016

No Banner up.

Treating People with Respect Involving them In Their Care ✔
Providing care, Treatment and Support that Meets Needs ✗
Caring for people Safely and Protecting Them From Harm ✔
Staffing ✗
Quality and Suitability of Management ✗

DATE LAST INSPECTED 24th May 2014

HOME NAME Egerton Lodge
Date CQC Site checked 3/2/2016

No Banner up

Treating People with Respect Involving them In Their Care ✔
Providing care, Treatment and Support that Meets Needs ✗
Caring for people Safely and Protecting Them From Harm ✗
Staffing ✔
Quality and Suitability of Management ✔

DATE LAST INSPECTED 28th February 2014
HOME NAME Age Concern Holmfield M20 2XF
Date CQC Site checked 3/2/2016

No Banner up

Treating People with Respect Involving them In Their Care ✔

Providing care, Treatment and Support that Meets Needs ✔

Caring for people Safely and Protecting Them From Harm ✗

Staffing ✔

Quality and Suitability of Management ✗

DATE LAST INSPECTED 11th February 2014

HOME NAME Kathleen House DY5 3RR
Date CQC Site checked 3/2/2016

No Banner up

Treating People with Respect Involving them In Their Care ✗

Providing care, Treatment and Support that Meets Needs ✔

Caring for people Safely and Protecting Them From Harm ✔

Staffing ✔

Quality and Suitability of Management ✗

DATE LAST INSPECTED 25th September 2014
HOME NAME Phonix Court OL14 5SJ
Date CQC Site checked 3/2/2016

Banner up. Inspecting

Treating People with Respect Involving them In Their Care ✓
Providing care, Treatment and Support that Meets Needs ✓
Caring for people Safely and Protecting Them From Harm ✗
Staffing ✓
Quality and Suitability of Management ✓

DATE LAST INSPECTED 11\text{th} June 2014

HOME NAME Forrester Court W2
Date CQC Site checked 3/2/2016

No Banner up

Treating People with Respect Involving them In Their Care ✓
Providing care, Treatment and Support that Meets Needs ✗
Caring for people Safely and Protecting Them From Harm ✓
Staffing ✓
Quality and Suitability of Management ✓

DATE LAST INSPECTED 21\text{st} August 2014
HOME NAME St Annes HD5 9U2
Date CQC Site checked 3/2/2016

No Banner up

Treating People with Respect Involving them In Their Care ✓
Providing care, Treatment and Support that Meets Needs ✓
Caring for people Safely and Protecting Them From Harm ✗
Staffing ✗
Quality and Suitability of Management ✗

DATE LAST INSPECTED 4th January 2014

HOME NAME Ladymead BL1 4DL
Date CQC Site checked 3/2/2016
Banner says archived on 4th Jan 2016
No Inspections Since 2014, what happened in between?

Treating People with Respect Involving them In Their Care ✗
Providing care, Treatment and Support that Meets Needs ✗
Caring for people Safely and Protecting Them From Harm ✗
Staffing ✗
Quality and Suitability of Management ✗

DATE LAST INSPECTED 22nd August 2014
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOME NAME</th>
<th>Wingfield Rd BA14 9ED</th>
<th>Date CQC Site checked</th>
<th>3/2/2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| No Banner up       |                                     |                       |          |
|--------------------|                                     |                       |          |
| Treating People with Respect Involving them In Their Care | ✔️ | ✔️ | ✔️ |
| Providing care, Treatment and Support that Meets Needs | ✔️ | ✔️ | ✔️ |
| Caring for people Safely and Protecting Them From Harm | ❌ | ❌ | ❌ |
| Staffing           |                                     |                       |          |
| Quality and Suitability of Management | ❌ | ❌ | ❌ |

DATE LAST INSPECTED 22\textsuperscript{nd} August 2014
HOME NAME  Abbey Rose B24 9JA  
Date CQC Site checked 3/2/2016

Banner up Inspecting

- Treating People with Respect Involving them In Their Care ✓
- Providing care, Treatment and Support that Meets Needs ✓
- Caring for people Safely and Protecting Them From Harm ✓
- Staffing ✗
- Quality and Suitability of Management ✗

DATE LAST INSPECTED 28th June 2014
HOME NAME   Acorn BD5 0NJ  
Date CQC Site checked 3/2/2016

Banner up inspecting

- Treating People with Respect Involving them In Their Care ✓
- Providing care, Treatment and Support that Meets Needs ✓
- Caring for people Safely and Protecting Them From Harm ✗
- Staffing ✓
- Quality and Suitability of Management ✗

DATE LAST INSPECTED 12th June 2014
HOME NAME   Oakland M40 9DH
Date CQC Site checked 3/2/2016

Banner up only inspecting now

Treating People with Respect Involving them In Their Care  
Providing care, Treatment and Support that Meets Needs  
Caring for people Safely and Protecting Them From Harm
Staffing
Quality and Suitability of Management

DATE LAST INSPECTED 14th February 2014

HOME NAME Upshire EN9 3SX
Date CQC Site checked 2/2/2016

No Banner up

Treating People with Respect Involving them In Their Care  
Providing care, Treatment and Support that Meets Needs
Caring for people Safely and Protecting Them From Harm
Staffing
Quality and Suitability of Management

DATE LAST INSPECTED 5 September 2014
HOME NAME The Oaklands NG20 0JE
Date CQC Site checked 2/2/2016

Banner up, only now inspecting

- Treating People with Respect Involving them In Their Care ✓
- Providing care, Treatment and Support that Meets Needs ✓
- Caring for people Safely and Protecting Them From Harm ✗
- Staffing ✓
- Quality and Suitability of Management ✓

DATE LAST INSPECTED 14th February 2014

HOME NAME Stoney gate LE2 2PJ
Date CQC Site checked 2/2/2016

No Banner up

- Treating People with Respect Involving them In Their Care ✗
- Providing care, Treatment and Support that Meets Needs ✗
- Caring for people Safely and Protecting Them From Harm ✗
- Staffing ✓
- Quality and Suitability of Management ✓

DATE LAST INSPECTED December 2013
HOME NAME St John BD13 2DF  
Date CQC Site checked 3/2/2016

No Banner up

- Treating People with Respect Involving them In Their Care  ✔
- Providing care, Treatment and Support that Meets Needs  ✔
- Caring for people Safely and Protecting Them From Harm  ☒
- Staffing  ✔
- Quality and Suitability of Management  ✔

DATE LAST INSPECTED 18th June 2014

HOME NAME Acorn BD5 0NJ  
Date CQC Site checked 3/2/2016

Banner up just inspecting

- Treating People with Respect Involving them In Their Care  ✔
- Providing care, Treatment and Support that Meets Needs  ✔
- Caring for people Safely and Protecting Them From Harm  ☒
- Staffing  ✔
- Quality and Suitability of Management  ☒

DATE LAST INSPECTED 12th June 2014
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOME NAME  Richmond Court DY1 3JD</th>
<th>Date CQC Site checked 3/2/2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Banner up</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treating People with Respect Involving them In Their Care</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing care, Treatment and Support that Meets Needs</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring for people Safely and Protecting Them From Harm</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality and Suitability of Management</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DATE LAST INSPECTED</strong> 12th June 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOME NAME Southwell Court NG25 0TX</th>
<th>Date CQC Site checked 3/2/2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No banner up</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treating People with Respect Involving them In Their Care</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing care, Treatment and Support that Meets Needs</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring for people Safely and Protecting Them From Harm</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality and Suitability of Management</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DATE LAST INSPECTED</strong> 3rd June 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOME NAME  Parkside NG19 0AR
Date CQC Site checked 2/2/2016

No banner up

Treating People with Respect Involving them In Their Care  ✓
Providing care, Treatment and Support that Meets Needs  ✓
Caring for people Safely and Protecting Them From Harm  ✓
Staffing  ❌
Quality and Suitability of Management  ✓

DATE LAST INSPECTED 26th March 2014

HOME NAME Redlynch CT21 5EU
Date CQC Site checked 2/2/2016

Banner up only just inspecting

Treating People with Respect Involving them In Their Care  ✓
Providing care, Treatment and Support that Meets Needs  ✓
Caring for people Safely and Protecting Them From Harm  ❌
Staffing  ✓
Quality and Suitability of Management  ❌

DATE LAST INSPECTED 8th July 2014
HOME NAME  Parkside SM7 3DL  
Date CQC Site checked 3/2/2016

No Banner up

- Treating People with Respect Involving them In Their Care  ✔
- Providing care, Treatment and Support that Meets Needs  ✔
- Caring for people Safely and Protecting Them From Harm  ✔
- Staffing  ❌
- Quality and Suitability of Management  ✔

DATE LAST INSPECTED 10th October 2013

---

HOME NAME  Hillside Farm NG11 6QQ  
Date CQC Site checked 3/2/2016

No Banner up

- Treating People with Respect Involving them In Their Care  ✔
- Providing care, Treatment and Support that Meets Needs  ✔
- Caring for people Safely and Protecting Them From Harm  ❌
- Staffing  ✔
- Quality and Suitability of Management  ❌

DATE LAST INSPECTED 4th December 2013
Astonbrook
Striving For Independence
Tower House 11 Residential Home
Neil Bradbury Bradbury House Ltd
Mr Richard Colten Lambton House Ltd
Methodist Homes
Mr and Mrs Yooma
Avery Homes
Sanctuary
Voyage
Alphonsus Care Services
Mr and Mrs Marjoram
Care UK Community Partnerships
Park Care Homes Ltd
Foundation of Katherine Leverson
Nazareth Charitable Trust
Lifestyle Care Homes
Avon Park Care Village
Orchard Care Homes
Mr Hudda Yara Enterprises Ltd
Homely Care Ltd
Mr Upmails Woodfields Residential Home
Mr and Mrs Hulkhory Ashleigh House
J E Webster Butterfly Care Homes
Mr K Ravivarouman Care For Your Life Ltd
Abacus Care Home Ltd
Mr Seedheeyan Pro Care Homes Ltd
K. Kalaiyalagan Esther Care Home
G and H Hughs Glenhomes Care Home
Mr and Mrs Cunningham Rosebank
T.D Wood and Wood Thornlea Rest Home
John Walton Woodleigh Care Home
P Maitrise Kent Farm
E Gulham Bliss Care Home
R Horton Eden Cottage
Emambux Landmark Care Homes
RYSA Ltd
Shiraz Boghani Shafik Sachedina SHC Chelsfold Group Ltd
JJB and KJ Patel Astley Care Homes Ltd
CONCLUSION

WHAT WE DO NOT NEED

Another ineffective re-branded regulator.

Another new “tough inspection” regime.

Yet more vulnerable people suffering and dying for the want of basic care, or being abused because whistle-blowers were ignored.

More good caring staff leaving or pushed out because they care.

Another wasteful Robert Francis type of inquiry that comes up with no more than window dressing.

No more Guardians or Champions or public relations spin.

Charities and other organisations funded by Government or the care industry forming committees and achieving nothing.

Any more excuses for why the CQC should not be held accountable.

WHAT WE DO NEED

Ednas Law, to protect those who are more likely to see wrongdoing, the whistle-blowers.

The evidence from the first 1500 whistle-blowers can be found here.
http://www.compassionincare.com/breakingthesilence

We instigated the BBC Panorama “Behind Closed Doors” as a result of whistle-blowers contacting Compassion In Care after they had already reported concerns to the Home, Police, CQC and Safeguarding.
Since then over four thousand whistle-blowers have contacted us. Their evidence says loud and clear what is needed - Edna's Law.

This report is dedicated to Edna, who suffered and died because seven whistle-blowers speaking out was not enough to stop the abuse.
She is always in my heart.

*Special thank you to Stephen Honour and Christine England for their invaluable help and support in producing this report.*