

Ministry of Long-Term Care
Long-Term Care Operations Division
Long-Term Care Care Inspections Branch

North District
159 Cedar St, Suite 403
Sudbury, ON, P3E 6A5
Telephone: (800) 663-6965

Original Public Report	
Report Issue Date: April 14, 2023	
Inspection Number: 2023-1416-0003	
Inspection Type: Complaint	
Licensee: Espanola General Hospital	
Long Term Care Home and City: Espanola General Hospital (operating as Espanola Nursing Home-LTC), Espanola	
Lead Inspector Karen Hill (704609)	Inspector Digital Signature
Additional Inspector(s)	

INSPECTION SUMMARY

The inspection occurred off-site on the following date(s): March 6-7, 22-24, and 30, 2023.

The following intake(s) were inspected:

- One intake regarding a complaint about concerns with an applicant's bed refusal.

The following **Inspection Protocols** were used during this inspection:

Admission, Absences and Discharge

INSPECTION RESULTS

WRITTEN NOTIFICATION: Licensee consideration and approval

NC #001 Written Notification pursuant to FLTCA, 2021, s. 154 (1) 1.

Non-compliance with: FLTCA, 2021, s. 51 (7)

The licensee has failed to ensure that the following grounds were met when they refused an applicant's

Ministry of Long-Term Care

Long-Term Care Operations Division

Long-Term Care Care Inspections Branch

North District

159 Cedar St, Suite 403

Sudbury, ON, P3E 6A5

Telephone: (800) 663-6965

admission to the Long-Term Care Home (LTCH): the home lacked the physical facilities necessary to meet the applicant's care requirements; the staff of the home lacked the nursing expertise necessary to meet the applicant's care requirements; or circumstances existed which were provided for in the regulations as being grounds for withholding approval.

Rationale and Summary:

An applicant had been approved to the LTCH's waitlist for admission. After the home reviewed updated documents provided by Home and Community Care Support Services North East (HCCSSNE), the LTCH withdrew their approval for admission. The home identified the reason for refusing the applicant for admission was because they lacked the nursing expertise necessary to meet the applicant's care requirements.

The home's written refusal of admission letter cited specific care requirements of the applicant; and indicated that the home did not have the physical facilities to meet the specific care requirements. The home's letter did not identify how they lacked the physical facilities or how the staff lacked the nursing expertise necessary to meet the identified care requirements.

The Assistant Director of Care (ADOC) and the Director of Care (DOC) stated that the home's staff were trained in how to provide the specified care requirements, and that external resources were also available to assist the home. They acknowledged that there were residents living in the LTCH who had the specified care requirements, but that they did not accept applicants to the home if an applicant had those care requirements prior to admission.

There was moderate impact to the applicant, when the home withheld their approval for admission without the appropriate grounds, as the applicant was not able to transition to the LTCH that was their first choice. This posed a potential risk of the applicant not receiving the care and supports they needed.

Sources: An applicant's application for admission to LTC, including assessments, reassessments, refusal letters and communication logs; emails; interviews with the complainant, Power of Attorney (POA) for the applicant, HCCSSNE staff, the ADOC, and the DOC.

[704609]

WRITTEN NOTIFICATION: Approval by licensee**NC #002 Written Notification pursuant to FLTCA, 2021, s. 154 (1) 1.**

Non-compliance with: O. Reg. 246/22, s. 179 (5)

The licensee has failed to ensure that the appropriate notice was given under paragraph 1 or 2 of O.

Ministry of Long-Term Care

Long-Term Care Operations Division

Long-Term Care Care Inspections Branch

North District

159 Cedar St, Suite 403

Sudbury, ON, P3E 6A5

Telephone: (800) 663-6965

Reg. 246/22, s. 179 (3), within three business days of receiving the additional information provided under subsection (4).

Rationale and Summary

HCCSSNE placement services, received written notification of the LTCH's decision to withdraw approval for an applicant's admission to the home. The decision was appealed the same day.

Over the next two months the LTCH made several requests for and was provided with, additional information about the applicant. During that time the home was advised that the application required either an acceptance or rejection.

After an additional four months had passed, HCCSSNE contacted the home for a status update on the application. At that time, the LTCH communicated to placement services their decision to reject the applicant's appeal. The LTCH indicated that a written letter about their decision was sent to a representative of the applicant two months prior; they stated they would forward a written copy of the letter to HCCSSNE for their records.

The POA for the applicant and HCCSNE, both confirmed that they did not receive notification of the home's decision until six months after the appeal. Further to this, HCCSNE identified that what had occurred was not the usual process, and that the delays in responding to the appeal were significant.

Failing to provide a written response as required had moderate impact on the applicant, in that for a significant period of time, the applicant was left uninformed of the status of their appeal, and was at potential risk for not having an active application for admission to an alternate LTCH of their choice.

Sources: An applicant's application for admission to LTC, including assessments and reassessments; communication logs, emails; interviews with the complainant, POA for the applicant, HCCSSNE staff, and the DOC.

[704609]