

## Social Affairs Sub-Panel (Overdale Review)

### Meeting Notes (PRIVATE SESSION)

Date: 29th August 2006

Location: First Floor Meeting Room, Morier House

Present Deputy A.E. Pryke, Chairman

Miss. A

In attendance Mr. W. Millow, Scrutiny Officer

1. A record of the meeting would be kept in the Office file in which Miss. A would be named. However, any records released into the public domain would not name her: based on previous Scrutiny reviews, it would be possible to refer to her as 'Miss. A' in such public records.
2. Miss. A's knowledge of the proposals relating to Overdale Hospital initially came from an article in the *Jersey Evening Post*. She had found it difficult to ascertain the precise nature of the proposals and there had been confusion over whether the proposal involved merely purchasing respite beds in the private sector. There was little information in the public domain to explain why it had become necessary to purchase beds in the private sector. However, it appeared to Miss. A that more consideration may have been given to the condition of buildings at Overdale Hospital than to the level of care received by patients.
3. Miss. A indicated that communication between the Department of Health and Social Services and her family had not always been clear: information was not always forthcoming from the Department and it had been necessary on occasion to 'push' for information.
4. Miss. A had a relative who was currently at Overdale Hospital. This relative had received care in the private sector some two to three years previously. However, Miss. A felt this level of care had not been as satisfactory as that provided at Overdale. Whilst in the private sector, Miss. A's relative had been hospitalised. Following this incident, the relative moved to [REDACTED] Ward at Overdale.
5. In the private sector, it appeared that the relative had been left alone for much of the time and that this time had been spent in bed. In addition, there had been a large turnover of staff in the private sector. Miss. A questioned whether the standard of care in the private sector would match that offered on Leoville and McKinstry Wards. She also questioned whether it would be possible to monitor satisfactorily the level of care in the private sector once patients had been transferred.
6. As part of the Department's proposal to purchase private care beds, Miss. A's relative had been assessed. It appeared the relative would move to [REDACTED] although no date had been given for the transfer to occur. It was not clear how much choice had been given regarding the transfer.
7. When asked what impact the transfer might have on her relative, Miss. A indicated her relative would possibly be confused and that she would lose the stimulation of being on a public ward. She highlighted that one potential issue involved in the transfer was the transition of pain management.
8. Miss. A indicated that public wards were not necessarily a problem provided that patients' dignity was respected. She complimented Overdale Hospital on the manner in which space was currently used in Leoville and McKinstry Wards to accommodate the needs of patients.