

Further response from Connaught House

Dear Ms Ollivere,

Thank you for your follow up letter dated the 18th of March and for the opportunity to comment further.

The email correspondence you kindly enclosed shows that Sylvia's 1:1 observations were to be removed on the 3rd of February which was also the planned discharge date from Connaught House. To reiterate, Sylvia remained on her 1:1 observations whilst in our care at Connaught House.

Had Sylvia not been due to leave our care on the 3rd of February we would have requested that we continue to have the 1:1 in place but monitor Sylvia from a distance for up to a week to ensure that the removal of the 1:1 was appropriate in our care setting at that time and did not pose a risk to Sylvia's safety. We would then have reconvened with the Social Worker to discuss the result of monitoring Sylvia from a distance. This is a procedure we routinely follow when asked to remove 1:1 care in each of our homes.

As we outlined in our previous response the agreement to provide 1:1 observations is often a source of conflict between care homes and commissioners and there is often pressure to remove the enhanced observations. This is especially true when the resident who is in receipt of enhanced observations is settled as a result of this enhanced care.

This was the situation with Sylvia and her 1:1 paperwork evidenced that she was settled for the majority of the time. It was our contention that she was settled as a result of the 1:1 observations and this was discussed with the social worker during discussions around the need for this enhanced care.

The social worker was of the view that Sylvia did not need 1:1 care as her 1:1 paperwork reflected that she was settled for large periods. We contend that this was evidence of a well-met need but it is also true that the social worker was involved in making the placement at the Orchards Nursing Home and was in possession of information we did not have. For instance, following their pre-admission assessment, the Orchards Nursing Home may have decided that due to the fact that Sylvia was on 1:1 care during the day she may be placed in a bedroom directly opposite the Nurse's Station where she could be closely monitored. This is a clinical decision for another setting and we are not aware of their decision making process or what steps they had planned to take following their assessment.

Our clinical decision was that Sylvia required 1:1 observations whilst in our care. We continually reevaluated and this was reduced to 12 hours during the day as we utilised our assistive technology during the night. It was the clinical decision of the Orchards Nursing Home that they could meet her assessed needs without the need for 1:1 supervision. It is worth noting that Sylvia was a resident of the Orchards Nursing Home for slightly longer than she was at Connaught House and any clinical decision should be subject to constant review. If they felt at any stage that Sylvia required 1:1 care then it was their responsibility to seek authorisation.

We share your concerns regarding the MDT process regarding the removal of 1:1 funding and were very pleased to receive an email on Thursday 21st of March outlining a new process adopted by the ICB:

“The ICB have put a new process in place whereby 1:1 can only be removed after our reviewer has discussed the safety of potential removal with the Care Home Nurse and the Social Worker. One person can’t remove the 1:1 in isolation.”

We have ensured that this has been cascaded to our staff team and a poster has been placed in each nursing station to ensure that all involved in any 1:1 review are fully aware of this new process. We will also ensure that any visiting professional also fully considers the potential impact of the removal of 1:1 observations.

Should you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,



Operations Director

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender