

Pauline Dorn - Quotes
15 February 2018

PD – Pauline Dorn PAJ – Phil Austen-Jones RAJ – Rachael Austen-Jones SCAJ – Dr S Austen-Jones

Statements made by Pauline Dorn in the recorded meeting held on 15th February 2018.

- *“What we can’t do is change the review.” (8.00)*
- *“I didn’t know which Band 8 it was” (8.40)*
- *“I can’t question the review paperwork that has now been completed.” (11.40)*
- PD – *“I acknowledge that what was said to you in the meeting differs from the review paperwork that has now been completed. I will take that back as not best practice. So that’s not something that should happen. It should be that the outcome from review that is agreed with the relatives or the patient themselves and that’s the outcome that is then taken forward.” (12.05)*
- PD – *“This will go to an MDT” (12.30)*
- PAJ – *“So, basically, you’ve come to this meeting knowing that actually we are going to MDT.”* PD – *“It has to go to MDT, yes.” (13.20)*
- *“If there has been a change in need, an identified change in need in the review, then it should be referred to MDT.” (13.40)*
 - SCAJ challenged this stating that the National Framework states that the change has to indicate that the person by no longer have a Primary Health Need.
- *“CHC Team have obviously reviewed, have had a look at the review, and have reflected on that and would like to have further exploration through a Multi-Disciplinary Team.” (14.15)*
 - PAJ stated that they might like to but they are ignoring the guidelines.
- Rachael may not be eligible as the report states a *“change in need of cognition and the potential change in Altered State of Consciousness.”*
 - PAJ stated that this was not acceptable as the review meeting did not say that.
 - PD – *“I agree that the process has not been best practice.”*
 - PAJ stated that process has not been followed.
- *“MDT is nothing to fear.” (23.10)*
 - Challenged on basis on all the failures to follow due process
 - PD – *“You will be part of the MDT.”*
 - Told that we were part of the reviews and as soon as our backs were turned the outcome was changed.

- PAJ – *“There was no concept of what we say, you were coming to this meeting, it’s going to MDT whether you like it or not. Even though process has not been followed, you came to this meeting with it’s going to MDT.”* PD – *“Unfortunately the outcome has to remain.”* (25.25)
- *“If [redacted] the Case Coordinator was not convinced of those then she should have communicated that to you at the time because for her to go back to the office and discuss it further.”* (32.50)
SCAJ – *“She was.”*
- PAJ – *What are the (CCG) guidelines?* PD – *“I will have to go back and review that.”* (33.50)
- RAJ (quoting PD) – *“It’s not best practice.”* RAJ – *“It’s not practice at all.”* SCAJ – *“That is an essential part of most recent complaint. The changes should not have been made.”* PD – *“In my view this needs to have an MDT to look at all of the evidence.”*
- *“Recommendation was for MDT due to minor change.”* (40.15)
- PAJ – *“A failure to follow process. In that meeting, a priority and two severe is not an indication that the individual will no longer meet criteria. Do you accept that?”* PD – *“I accept that. Following that meeting...”* PAJ – *“Irrelevant.”* PD – *“Following that, the evidence was reviewed by a senior member of staff.”* SCAJ – *“That is irrelevant. They are not allowed to.”* PAJ – *“They shouldn’t have been reviewing it.”* (41.00)
- PAJ – *“You have accepted that within the meeting there was not evidence that Rach would not meet criteria.”* PD, *“Yes.”* PAJ – *“End of case.”* PD – *“It isn’t because the evidence was then reviewed...”* SCAJ – *“It shouldn’t have been reviewed. That’s completely out of order and contrary to the Care Act which does not allow such reports on meetings to be altered afterwards.”* PD – *“I’m not suggesting that that would be something that I would support, however, what I can’t do is go back and change what has happened.”* (43.00)
- PAJ – *“That is accepted, that Rach does have a Primary Health Need on the basis of that review and yet we can’t change the decision?”* PD – *“No, because the evidence was then reviewed and I haven’t seen the evidence to review for myself.”* SCAJ – *“But that review of evidence should never have taken place.”* PD – *“I can only apologise for the process that has been followed. The outcome still has to stand.”* (44.00)
- *“How I take this forward has to be based on the review documentation that I have.”* (54.10)
- (After challenge, PD offered AJs to submit additions to report in light of CHC Team’s additions.) PD – *“It isn’t going to change the outcome”* (1.18.05)

- PAJ - *"I agree, that two severe and a priority would indicate a Primary Health Need."* (1.22.40)
- PD – *"I need to check the policy. Like I said, I will go back and check our policies."*
PAJ – *"And if your policy is not to do that, what is going to happen?"* PD – *"It will go to MDT based on the review paperwork."* (1.23.05)
- PAJ – *"I'm extremely disappointed to learn that you came here with a determination that it was going to MDT no matter what happened in this meeting."* PD – *"I am sorry you feeling disappointed."* (1.27.24)
- PD – *"I have said that the outcome of the review meeting of two severe and one priority would not lead to an MDT. However, that was then reviewed by a senior manager and I cannot change the outcome of that."* (1.28.25)