

## Title Page

### Title

Use of a digital application to enhance communication and triage between care homes and National Health Service community services in the United Kingdom: a qualitative evaluation

### Short running title of less than 40 characters

Enhancing triage between care homes and the NHS

### Authors and affiliation

Siân Russell<sup>1</sup>, Rachel Stocker<sup>2</sup>, Zoë Cockshott<sup>3</sup>, Suzanne Mason<sup>4</sup>, Jo Knight<sup>5</sup>, Barbara Hanratty<sup>1</sup>, Nancy Preston<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Population Health Sciences Institute, Faculty of Medical Sciences, Newcastle University

<sup>2</sup> School of Biomedical, Nutritional and Sport Sciences, Faculty of Medical Sciences, Newcastle University.

<sup>3</sup> Division of Health Research, Health Innovation One, Lancaster University

<sup>4</sup> School of Health and Related Research, University of Sheffield

<sup>5</sup> Lancaster Medical School, Faculty of Health and Medicine, Lancaster University

### Corresponding author

Dr Siân Russell

Population Health Sciences Institute

Faculty of Medical Sciences

Newcastle University

M4.078, Leech Building

Framlington Place

Newcastle upon Tyne

NE2 4HH

[sian.russell@newcastle.ac.uk](mailto:sian.russell@newcastle.ac.uk)

### Academic qualification (degree)

Siân Russell, PhD, MSc, MA(Hons)

Rachel Stocker, PhD, MSc, BSc

Zoë Cockshott, PhD; MSc; BSc(Hons)

Suzanne Mason, MD, MBBS, FRCS, FFAEM

Jo Knight, PhD, BSc

Barbara Hanratty, MD, MPH, MSc, MBChB

Nancy Preston, PhD, BSc

### Acknowledgements

The team would like to thank all participants for their time, HDRUK for their funding and support, and the members of the *HDRUK Northern Partnership Care Homes Project Team* involved in this evaluation.

### Conflict of Interest

Authors declare that they have no competing interests.

**NOTE:** This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.



1 Use of a digital application to enhance communication and triage between care homes and  
2 National Health Service community services in the United Kingdom: a qualitative evaluation

3 **Abstract**

4 Recent years have seen a rise in digital interventions to improve coordination between care homes  
5 and NHS services, supporting remote sharing of data on the health of care home residents. Such  
6 interventions were key components in the response to the COVID-19 pandemic. This paper presents  
7 findings from the qualitative component of an evaluation of an implementation of the HealthCall  
8 Digital Care Homes application, across sites in northern England. The implementation commenced  
9 prior to the pandemic and continued throughout.

10 Semi-structured, qualitative interviews were held with stakeholders. Interviews were conducted  
11 remotely (October 2020 -June 2021). Data were analysed via a reflexive thematic analysis then  
12 mapped against Normalization Process Theory (NPT) constructs (coherence, collective action,  
13 cognitive participation, and reflexive monitoring) providing a framework to assess implementation  
14 success.

15 Thirty-five participants were recruited: 16 care home staff, six NHS community nurses, five relatives  
16 of care home residents, four HealthCall team members, three care home residents, and one local  
17 authority commissioner. Despite facing challenges such as apprehension towards digital technology  
18 among care home staff, the application was viewed positively across stakeholder groups. The  
19 HealthCall team maintained formal and informal feedback loop with stakeholders. This resulted in  
20 revisions to the intervention and implementation. Appropriate training and problem solving from  
21 the HealthCall team and buy-in from care home and NHS staff were key to achieving success across  
22 NPT constructs.

23 While this implementation appears broadly successful, establishing rapport and maintaining on-  
24 going support requires significant time, financial backing, and the right individuals in place across  
25 stakeholder groups to drive implementation and intervention evolution. The digital literacy of care  
26 home staff requires encouragement to enhance their readiness for digital interventions. The COVID-  
27 19 pandemic has pushed this agenda forward. Problems with stability across the workforce within  
28 care homes need to be addressed to avoid skill loss and support embeddedness of digital  
29 interventions.

30 **Keywords:** Qualitative, intervention, evaluation, Digital technology, care homes, Normalisation  
31 process theory

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

1 **What is known about this topic?**

- 2
- 3 • Improving healthcare delivery in UK care homes is a health policy priority.
  - 4 • Digital interventions designed to enhance the referral process between care homes and NHS  
5 services and improve the healthcare delivery in care homes have become increasingly  
6 common in the UK. The HealthCall Digital Care Homes application is one such intervention.
  - 7 • These interventions and their implementations require evaluation to ensure that they  
8 operate as intended, function coherently and are considered appropriate and legitimate to  
9 the care home setting.

10 **What this paper adds?**

- 11
- 12 • The HealthCall Digital Care Homes app is a feasible, appropriate and legitimate intervention  
13 for referral, triage and health care support for non-urgent health care needs of care home  
14 residents.
  - 15 • The ongoing involvement of end users in further developing the intervention, and the level  
16 of monitoring and support provided by the implementation team appears to be key to the  
17 implementation's success.
  - 18 • The digital preparedness of UK care homes is limited. Ensuring that care homes are digitally  
19 enabled, with a digitally literate workforce, should be a policy and research priority.

20 **Background**

21 Residents in long-term residential and nursing care homes have complex health and social care  
22 needs. This population has a high degree of multimorbidity, disability and frailty, with impaired  
23 cognitive and behavioural functioning (Gordon et al., 2014), which has increased over the past 20  
24 years (Barker et al., 2021). Estimates indicate that emergency admissions and accident and  
25 emergency attendances among care home residents are 40-50% higher than the general population  
26 ≥75 years (Smith, 2015). Of such admissions ~50% could be avoided (Harrison et al., 2016). Such  
27 complexity can place strain on care homes and the community NHS services that support them.

28

29 Improving the quality of healthcare provision in care homes is a priority for the NHS and adult social  
30 care (BGS, 2011, 2021). Digital technologies to support communication between care homes and  
31 NHS services could support this goal (BGS, 2021). Such interventions use smart devices for the  
32 transfer of data such as vital signs observations for the calculation of Early Warning Scores. The  
33 National Early Warning Score (NEWS) has been a common component of digital interventions within  
34 care homes and community NHS settings (Brangan et al., 2018; Hodgson et al., 2022; Russell et al.,  
35 2020; Scott et al., 2019; Stocker et al., 2021) and is being implemented in other countries including  
36 Norway (Steinskog et al., 2021). Such interventions have met with some success, including improving  
37 communication between health care services and care homes, and instilling confidence in care home  
38 staff (Hodgson et al., 2022; Oung, 2021; Scott et al., 2019; Stocker et al., 2021) though the  
39 complexity of the care home setting may present barriers (Russell et al., 2020). The need for remote  
40 communication between care homes and services produced by the COVID-19 pandemic has led to  
41 increased use of and support for digital interventions within care homes (BGS, 2021; Chu et al.,  
42 2021; Edelman et al., 2020; Stocker et al., 2021).

43  
44  
45

## 1 **HealthCall Digital Care Homes Application**

2 HealthCall is a collaboration of seven NHS Foundation Trusts across the Northeast of England and  
3 North Cumbria (NHSHealthCall, [online]). It focuses on producing digital solutions to health care  
4 challenges. One such solution is the Digital Care Homes application, designed to enhance reporting  
5 of non-urgent referrals. The app aims to shorten referral times between care homes and NHS  
6 services, with the transfer of relevant information through the app as opposed to care home staff  
7 waiting in a queue on the phone. Through the app care home staff can record:

- 8 a) vital signs to calculate NEWS
- 9 b) contextual information (free text format) including “soft” signs of deterioration (changes in  
10 behaviour, mood, sleep, appetite, toileting).

11  
12 The reporting structure uses the Situation, Background, Assessment, Recommendation (SBAR) tool  
13 (Leonard et al., 2004), designed to promote organised communication of necessary, contextual  
14 information about patients. The referral is reviewed by a clinician at a Single Point of Access (SPA),  
15 who requests further information from the care home or triages to an appropriate service. The care  
16 home is notified of action taken. Senior carers are most likely to use the app as part of their role.

17  
18 Care homes are given a digital device and in-house training from HealthCall’s local Clinical Trainers.  
19 Training covers the app’s purpose, using the digital device, taking vital signs and what to record on  
20 the SBAR tool. App use is monitored by HealthCall. Members of community NHS teams, such as  
21 community nurses, also communicate with HealthCall and can support care homes with the app.

22  
23 This paper concerns the qualitative component of an evaluation of the Digital Care Homes  
24 application’s implementation into residential and nursing care homes in Northern England.

## 25 26 **Patient and Public Involvement (PPI)**

27 Patients and the public were involved at the idea generation stage, confirming that research to  
28 improve care for care home residents is viewed as a priority. A PPI panel was established. Research  
29 questions, topic guide, study design, findings and dissemination strategies, were discussed via a  
30 series of online meetings.

## 31 32 **Methods**

33 A phenomenological approach was undertaken. Methods of qualitative inquiry were used, seeking  
34 to gain in-depth data about participants’ experiences of and views towards the intervention and its  
35 implementation.

### 36 37 *Identification and sampling*

38 Relevant stakeholders included the local HealthCall team, local authority staff involved in the  
39 implementation, care home staff and residents, relatives of residents, and community NHS staff.

40  
41 Care home and NHS staff were recruited using purposive sampling aiming for variety in terms of care  
42 home size and type, and type of clinician. Convenience and snowball sampling were then used to  
43 increase sample size. Residents and relatives were recruited using convenience and snowball  
44 sampling.

### 45 46 *Recruitment*

47 A member of the local HealthCall team made initial contact, via email, with their colleagues, a Local  
48 Authority Commissioner who worked on the implementation, care homes and NHS services on

1 behalf of the research team. They provided a brief description of the evaluation and contact details  
2 for the research team who then followed-up on this initial contact.

3  
4 Care home staff introduced the evaluation to residents who had capacity to provide informed  
5 consent. Relatives were sought using a short advert through online community networks. Interested  
6 stakeholders were given a PIS and offered the opportunity to ask questions about the evaluation and  
7 their participation. PIS were adapted for each stakeholder category. If the wish to participate was  
8 upheld a suitable time for data collection was arranged. As the evaluation was conducted remotely,  
9 informed consent was secured electronically or verbally, meeting Health Research Authority  
10 principles for remote consent.

11  
12 *Data Collection*

13 Data were collected between November 2020 and July 2021 via semi-structured interviews, one-on-  
14 one, dyadic, and small group. Interviews were conducted online using video conferencing platforms  
15 or by telephone. The topic guide was developed based on similar evaluations conducted by  
16 members of the research team (Russell et al., 2020; Stocker et al., 2021) and evaluation aims. As is  
17 typical for semi-structured interviews, the topic guide acted as an aide-mémoire rather than being  
18 rigidly followed. Interviews were audio-recorded with permission from the participant(s). Data  
19 collection ceased once data sufficiency (Dey, 1999) was realised.

20  
21 *Data Analysis*

22 An initial phase of analysis followed the six-phase process for reflexive thematic analysis (TA) (Braun  
23 & Clarke, 2019, 2021): familiarisation, generating initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing  
24 themes, defining themes and analysis write-up.

25  
26 Tentative initial codes were discussed among the team based on relevant previous work. Rather  
27 than “bracketing” these potential codes they were included in the initial phase of coding and  
28 removed if not relevant, thereby informing, but not leading, early analysis.

29  
30 In reflexive TA coding is “fluid, organic, and recursive” where codes can “expand, contract, be  
31 renamed, split apart ... collapsed together ... and even be abandoned” (Braun & Clarke, 2021). This  
32 reflects our approach to this process. RS, ZC, and SR led the analysis, independently coding  
33 transcripts, and meeting regularly to review codes and collaborate on the production, reviewing and  
34 defining of themes. Developing analysis was discussed with the wider qualitative team, NP and BH,  
35 at various stages of data collection and analysis, supporting the sense making work of analysis  
36 (Braun & Clarke, 2019, 2021).

37  
38 Data were then considered against Normalization Process Theory (NPT) (May & Finch, 2009; Ross et  
39 al., 2019) constructs of coherence, collective action, cognitive participation, and reflexive monitoring  
40 to provide a framework to evaluate implementation success (see Table 3). Similar approaches have  
41 been undertaken elsewhere (Asiedu et al., 2019; Ross et al., 2019; Russell et al., 2020). Conducting a  
42 TA prior to considering NPT constructs ensured that the voices of participants were accounted for,  
43 and analysis was not driven solely by an existing framework.

44

1 **Results**

2 *Participants*

3 Thirty-five participants were recruited (see Table 1). The majority, sixteen, were care home staff. Six  
 4 of the eight care homes were residential only, two were independently run and they varied in size.  
 5 Six NHS community nurses, three residents and five relatives participated. The relatives were not  
 6 related to residents interviewed. Five participants directly involved in implementation were  
 7 interviewed: four from the local HealthCall team and one Local Authority Commissioner.

8  
 9 Twenty-four interviews were one-to-one. Community Nurse 1 was interviewed individually and  
 10 participated in a group interview. Twenty-two participated via video conferencing.

11 **Table 1: Participants**

| Group                              | Participant ID     | Interview type | No.        | Online / Phone |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------|----------------|
| <b>Local HealthCall Team (HC)*</b> | HC1                | One-on-one     | 1          | Online         |
|                                    | HC2 - Trainer      | One-on-one     | 1          | Online         |
|                                    | HC3 - Trainer      | One-on-one     | 1          | Online         |
|                                    | HC4                | One-on-one     | 1          | Online         |
| <b>Local Authority (LC)</b>        | LC Commissioner    | One-on-one     | 1          | Online         |
| <b>NHS Community Nurses (CN)</b>   | CN1**              | One-on-one     | 1          | Online         |
|                                    | CN2                | One-on-one     | 1          | Online + Phone |
|                                    | CN1**              | Focus Group    | 2 (3)**    | Online         |
|                                    | CN3                |                |            |                |
|                                    | CN4                |                |            |                |
|                                    | CN5<br>CN6         | Dyadic         | 2          | Online         |
| <b>Care Home Staff***</b>          |                    |                |            |                |
| <i>Care Home 1</i>                 | SC1<br>SC2         | Dyadic         | 2          | Online         |
|                                    | JC                 | One-on-one     | 1          | Online         |
|                                    | <i>Care Home 2</i> | DM1            | One-on-one | 1              |
| <i>Care Home 2</i>                 | SC3                | One-on-one     | 1          | Online         |
|                                    | <i>Care Home 3</i> | DM2            | Dyadic     | 2              |
| <i>Care Home 3</i>                 | SC4                |                |            |                |
|                                    | <i>Care Home 4</i> | CHM1           | One-on-one | 1              |
| <i>Care Home 5</i>                 | CHM2               | Focus Group    | 3          | Online + Phone |
|                                    | DM3                |                |            |                |
|                                    | SC5                |                |            |                |
| <i>Care Home 6</i>                 | CHM3               | One-on-one     | 1          | Online         |
| <i>Care home 7</i>                 | CHM4               | One-on-one     | 1          | Online         |
|                                    | SC6                | One-on-one     | 1          | Online         |
|                                    | SC7                | One-on-one     | 1          | Online         |
|                                    | <i>Care Home 8</i> | SC8            | One-on-one | 1              |
| <b>Residents</b>                   |                    |                |            |                |
| <i>Care Home 1</i>                 | Resident 1         | One-on-one     | 1          | Online         |
| <i>Care Home 8</i>                 | Resident 2         | One-on-one     | 1          | Phone          |
|                                    | Resident 3         | One-on-one     | 1          | Phone          |
| <b>Relatives</b>                   | Relative 1         | One-on-one     | 1          | Phone          |
|                                    | Relative 2         | One-on-one     | 1          | Phone          |

|  |              |            |           |        |
|--|--------------|------------|-----------|--------|
|  | Relative 3   | One-on-one | 1         | Phone  |
|  | Relative 4   | One-on-one | 1         | Phone  |
|  | Relative 5   | One-on-one | 1         | Online |
|  | <b>Total</b> |            | <b>35</b> |        |
| * To preserve anonymity the job role of two HealthCall participants has not been specified |              |            |           |        |
| ** Community Nurse 1 was interviewed one-on-one and within a group interview               |              |            |           |        |
| *** SC=Senior Carer; CHM=Care Home Manager; DM=Deputy Manager; JC=Junior Carer             |              |            |           |        |

1

2 **Findings**

3 The TA process resulted in three themes Theme 1: “It’s a bit like anything new”: Anticipated,  
4 unexpected and implicit challenges of implementation, Theme 2. Communication and Training and  
5 Theme 3. Efficiency and Appropriacy, as detailed below. Exemplar quotes are presented in Table 2.

6

7 **Theme 1. “It’s a bit like anything new”: Anticipated, unexpected and implicit challenges of  
8 implementation**

9 The implementation faced challenges anchored on pre-existing skills and confidence of staff,  
10 workplace habits and inter-professional dynamics, and problems with the technology.

11

12 *Digital skills and confidence*

13 Poor digital skills and limited confidence using digital devices among care home staff was widely  
14 acknowledged across stakeholder groups. Older care home staff were viewed as particularly  
15 apprehensive. HealthCall participants identified this as a considerable, yet unanticipated challenge.  
16 There was an assumption that the general prevalence of smart technology meant staff would be  
17 digitally literate. However, the need for digital skills training was viewed as greater than for training  
18 on vital signs observations.

19

20 Some care home staff mentioned their own lack of digital confidence. This was flagged as a training  
21 need that went beyond the Digital Care Homes application.

22

23 *Practices, Habits, and Cultures*

24 Care home staff could fall back into pre-intervention practices, particularly using the phone for  
25 referrals rather than the app. **CHM1**, while supportive of the intervention and aware that changing  
26 behaviour could take time, believed the volume of information required by the app could seem  
27 more time consuming than picking up the phone. The local HealthCall team believed such challenges  
28 should be anticipated in the introduction of novel interventions. **HC3 - Trainer** stated the need to  
29 stress that the app was “*not an extra job, it’s an ‘instead of’ job*” during training to tackle this issue.

30

31 Reverting to using the phone to make a referral also occurred as a response to the COVID-19  
32 pandemic. The local HealthCall team assumed this was due to anxiety caused by COVID-19, a view  
33 shared by **CN1**: “*they just want to speak to a human [...] That’s a human response*”. **CN1** felt this  
34 questioned how embedded the intervention was prior to the pandemic.

35

36 Negative views toward care home staff were expressed by two community nurses. While they  
37 acknowledged the challenges within care homes, including staff turnover, and the pressure faced by  
38 care home nurses, they characterised some staff as “needy” and “manipulative” in their use of the  
39 app. These community nurses also believed that care home staff would make “excuses” for when a  
40 resident’s observations could not be obtained. This highlights the potential for problematic



1 relationships between stakeholders. That obtaining observations is not always possible was  
2 understood by HealthCall and the option to not put observations into the app was something  
3 HealthCall provided.

4

#### 5 *Technology and Operations*

6 Issues with the technology could disrupt the use and embedding of the intervention. The technology  
7 could occasionally not work as intended, for example, referrals sent but not received. Unreliable Wi-  
8 Fi signals in some care homes could restrict app use to certain parts of care homes or to a desktop  
9 computer, typically within the manager's office, rather than a tablet. **HC3 - Trainer** believed app use  
10 would decline where the convenience of using it was hampered, an issue that poor Wi-Fi signals  
11 created. HealthCall discussed problem solving such issues by installing the app onto smartphones  
12 with 4G, expanding online access.

13

14 **HC1** warned that care homes have been "bombarded" with digital technology, especially in response  
15 to COVID-19, and was concerned that care homes might end up with too many tablets and  
16 applications causing a burden to staff and the IT capability of care homes.

17

#### 18 **Theme 2: Communication and Training**

19 The HealthCall team maintained relationships with NHS services and care homes, working with them  
20 and supporting them as required, and adjusting the training and the app due to this collaborative  
21 approach.

22

#### 23 *Relationships and support*

24 The local HealthCall team discussed the processes involved in developing a rapport with care homes,  
25 monitoring use of the app and providing additional support and problem solving, whether this was  
26 training or technical support, as required. This work was proactive and involved communication  
27 between the HealthCall team, the Single Point of Access, NHS community staff and the care homes,  
28 and thus considerable co-ordination.

29

30 The local HealthCall team's relationships with community NHS services could be harnessed to  
31 further support the care homes and identify problems. Buy-in from community nurses meant that  
32 these stakeholders, who maintain regular contact with the care homes, could encourage  
33 engagement with the app. Relatedly, members of the local HealthCall team spoke about having to  
34 negotiate expectations and relationships between care homes and NHS services in relation to the  
35 intervention. However, the negative views expressed by two community nurses (discussed in Theme  
36 1) suggests these negotiations may be an ongoing requirement for the intervention to function  
37 coherently. HealthCall also contacted care homes to check how they were coping with COVID-19,  
38 potentially further embedding these relationships.

39

40 Relatives of residents were not explicitly familiar with HealthCall. Relatives were ambivalent about  
41 whether they should be informed of the intervention. Whether families were informed about or  
42 aware of the intervention could differ across the care homes. Relatives felt that families would not  
43 mind how healthcare professionals were contacted, as long as residents received appropriate health  
44 interventions.

45

1 *Appropriacy of training*

2 The HealthCall Trainers had appropriate experience and knowledge for their job such as  
3 considerable clinical experience and one had a background in intervention implementation. **HC1 -**  
4 **Trainer** also commented positively on their own HealthCall induction: *I don't want to blow smoke,*  
5 *but it was the best induction I've had.* Some community nurses provided training during the early  
6 phases of the implementation which meant the app was introduced to care homes by someone they  
7 were familiar with.

8  
9 Training was delivered to staff within their own care home. Therefore, practice taking vital signs and  
10 using the app occurred in a real-world setting. This was followed up with further visits from the  
11 Trainers. The approach to training was well received by care homes and care home staff viewed the  
12 Trainers as patient and approachable.

13  
14 HealthCall amended the approach to training in response to the different phases of implementation,  
15 the COVID-19 pandemic, and to address poor digital literacy levels amongst care home staff. In  
16 response to the pandemic, the implementation was accelerated to ensure all care homes had use of  
17 the app for remote monitoring. The Trainers engaged in pragmatic workarounds, delivering training  
18 flexibly. This compromised the depth of the training and further resource had to be spent later to  
19 "mop up" (**HC2 -Trainer**) staff that had missed the training delivered in the early months of the  
20 pandemic.

21  
22 *Application and implementation evolution*

23 Various participants discussed the app being developed with care homes and NHS staff and  
24 acknowledged the feedback loop of ongoing communication between these stakeholders and  
25 HealthCall. This meant that the app improved and evolved with insight from end users, enhancing its  
26 appropriacy and legitimacy. The language used within the app also evolved and other adjustments,  
27 such as allowing care home staff to not report all vital signs if a resident refused, were added.

28  
29 The perceived successes of the implementation relied on monitoring app use, providing training and  
30 technical support, listening to and responding to feedback from various stakeholders. However, **HC4**  
31 noted that this created considerable work and was at risk of stretching resources: *all of that needs to*  
32 *be constantly updated otherwise the system won't work and that's getting busier and busier [...] to*  
33 *cope with.*

34  
35 **Theme 3. Efficiency and Appropriacy**

36 *Enhancing resident care and improving efficiency*

37 Despite issues with digital skills in care homes the view that the intervention was easy to use was  
38 common. Care home and NHS staff highlighted the improvements to efficiency afforded by the app,  
39 enhancing its legitimacy within this setting. For care home staff, the ease of use and prompt referral  
40 process meant they had more time for other tasks and for residents. For community nurses, having  
41 vital signs and contextual information about residents in advance of a visit was valuable: *...it helps*  
42 *with your priorities...* **CN1.** The HealthCall team and LA Commissioner also highlighted these benefits.

43  
44 While the residents interviewed did not appear to be fully aware of the intervention, one resident,  
45 **Resident1**, recalled having her vital signs taken and being seen by a medical professional quickly. She  
46 described this as giving her *"peace of mind in a very short time"*. **Resident2** mentioned being happy  
47 to have her temperature taken every morning. This was mentioned when discussing COVID-19, and

1 as such does not necessarily speak to the app. Relatives were also not fully aware of the  
 2 intervention. Opinions towards it, as an abstract idea, explained during interviews, were generally  
 3 positive.

4  
 5 *Accountability and legitimacy*

6 A key element of the app is how accountability has been addressed. While care home staff are  
 7 responsible for recognising a potential decline in a resident’s health and communicating relevant  
 8 information within a referral, the SPA acts as a safety net. SPA staff are clinically trained with access  
 9 to patient records via digital health records, providing them with further information on the resident  
 10 of concern. If SPA have concerns about the information received from a care home, they can contact  
 11 the care home for clarification. As the clinical experience of care home staff is variable and often  
 12 limited, placing the responsibility for interpretation of clinical information and response onto the  
 13 SPA removes this potential burden of clinical accountability from the care homes.

14  
 15 Care home staff spend considerable time with their residents and typically recognise ‘soft’ signs of  
 16 deterioration. This pre-existing knowledge was deemed vital for the intervention to perform  
 17 coherently. This intervention legitimised these skills by placing them on par of importance with more  
 18 objective observations such as vital signs. The local HealthCall team and community nurses  
 19 appreciated that NEWS alone is not an appropriate tool for diagnosis, but part of a wider overview  
 20 of the resident. This recognition prevented the intervention from having an onus on obtaining all  
 21 vital signs, which is not always possible.

22  
 23 *Upskilling*

24 Stakeholders believed the app improved the digital literacy and capability of care home staff. This  
 25 may have been influenced by the increased need for remote monitoring and digital communication  
 26 created by COVID-19. Improvements in communication were noted with participants across  
 27 stakeholder groups observing that clinical knowledge among care home staff had advanced and the  
 28 information they provided to support referrals had improved.

29  
**Table 2: Themes and sub-themes and exemplar quotes**

| <b>Theme 1 “It’s a bit like anything new”: Anticipated, unexpected and implicit challenges of implementation</b> |  |
|--|--|
| <i>Digital skills and confidence</i>   | <p><i>...all of [...] made an assumption that all people in care homes are going to be happy to use a digital technology. Even though it’s no different to some of the phones they’re using, some are very, very afraid of digital technology</i><br/> <b>HC3 - Trainer</b></p> <p><i>... the main issue we’ve found is the lack of IT skills in care homes [...] even now I think we probably are still quite astounded by how poor they are</i><br/> <b>HC1</b></p> <p><i>[SC4’s] a technical wizard ... She keeps me right. I’m the technophobe [...] I let [HealthCall 3 - Trainer] show [SC4] and then [SC4] showed me because I’m very slow with technology [...] But no, I’m getting there.</i><br/> <b>DM2</b></p> |
| <i>Practices, Habits and Cultures</i>  | <p><i>... rather than doing the easy thing and picking up the telephone [...] changing that habit [...] There’s a lot of information you have to input that seems a bit much when you’re just trying to get someone out to have a look at someone [...] what their blood pressure is and all the rest of it [...] we need to do this, this and this, before we actually go on the iPad to put it into the HealthCall system.</i><br/> <b>CHM1</b></p> <p><i>...it’s a bit like anything new I think. It takes a little while to get it embedded and entrenched and become custom and practice and used to.</i><br/> <b>HC2 – Trainer</b></p>   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p><i>...not an extra job, it's an 'instead of' job</i> <b>HC2 – Trainer</b></p> <p><i>...they just want to speak to a human [...] That's a human response [...] We thought it was really well embedded but actually when there's a pandemic it's a phone call...</i> <b>CN1 (one-on-one interview)</b></p> <p><b>CN6:</b> <i>... they've worked out what makes us tick [...] They manipulate. [...] we've made them quite needy because we're there as soon as they need us. [...] sometimes they don't do the observations and one of the excuses is they say the patient won't allow them and then obviously when we go there they do allow you to do observations [...]</i></p> <p><b>CM5:</b> <i>Yeah they'll make an excuse as to why they haven't done [the observations] but then tell you all sorts of other things that will make you turn up [...] if you had the observations you could actually say, 'Well this person's temperature isn't up, the blood pressure isn't that low, [...] the blood pressure is normal,' but if they don't do that then you're going on what they say the patient is like, which could be at times fabricated.</i></p> <p><b>Interviewer:</b> <i>Do [residents] mind having their vital obs. taken? Sounds like it was something you were doing...</i></p> <p><b>SC7:</b> <i>Yeah it was something we would do anyway so not really. Obviously it can be difficult if a resident has dementia and they don't want them doing. That's fine so there is an option to click no observations but then just to put the reason why, so you can put in that the resident refused...</i></p>  |
| <p><i>Technology and Operations</i></p>           | <p><i>[...] we do have problems with one of our tablets [...] in that we can't access the camera [...] you can take wound assessments and take pictures and we can't do that. We have had support though. There's a gentleman who comes and sees us regularly and he tried to fix it I don't know how many times but it hasn't worked. I would say that's probably the only technical issue we've had.</i> <b>CHM1</b></p> <p><b>Interviewer:</b> <i>[...] What is better for them in picking up a phone?</i></p> <p><b>HC3 - Trainer:</b> <i>Usually it is access to the internet or access to the technology. So a lot of homes have very poor internet [...] So even though they've got the smart pads, then if they were in a certain area of the home then they can't access the internet anyway. Quite a lot of homes operate so that the care staff do not use the office space, so they don't have access to the desk top which could be another alternative to using our app [...] it does tend to be the convenience of using it. [...] I'll give you an example, one of our homes had a 33% use against their population, and once we gave them a phone that they could drop into their pocket and it was 4G so it was connected to the 4G rather than their home internet, last month's figures was 130% usage – so they used it for everything. [...] So that's what we've got to work on – finding the quickest route and the easiest route for each individual care home because no one size fits all.</i></p> <p><i>[...] from a strategic point of view we have bombarded the homes with equipment and actually we were just adding a load of burden [...] We've given them tablets, NHS England or X [...] are offering them iPads left, right and centre. [...] actually what do the care homes need? We're all assuming that they need this stuff [...] but actually we're potentially creating a massive burden for their IT people and their own infrastructure [...] we don't want it to be at the point where we've got a tablet for HealthCall, a tablet for this, a tablet for this... [...] a lot of this is being done knee-jerk reaction to covid obviously- [...]</i> <b>HC1</b></p> |
| <p><b>Theme 2: Communication and Training</b></p> |  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><i>Relationships and support</i></p> | <p><i>They would rather just pick up a phone up [...]we're trying to tackle that [...] we'll get a message back from the Single Point of Access to say they've received the call, they're taking the care workers name now and then that way we can pass that on to the care home managers and say does this person need some more training? [...] we'd be sending hints and tips through via email – group emails with the care homes just reminding them all when baseline obs. were needed and when they weren't [...] HC4</i></p> <p><i>[...] either myself, [or other team members] would kind of make the initial approach to the home and basically explain as to what we were doing [...] where it all came from as a joint exercise between the CCG, the Trust, ourselves [...]then we basically arranged a time to go and do some training focussed mainly on either the manager or the seniors or both [...] then schedule in a revisit the following week just by way of support [...] give them our mobile numbers, our email addresses [...] and give them a ring [...] then follow that up with regular visits. Once they're established on it once a month per home [...] if homes are struggling post roll out they'll need a lot more support... HC2 - Trainer</i></p> <p><i>Any concerns that we've got they're very quick at responding and fixing the problem. SC6</i></p> <p><i>...we ask them why they haven't used the [app]. Once we know why they haven't and they do tell us, we let the [local HealthCall] team know if there's any problems with training or passwords and they pick that up directly with the care homes... CN2</i></p> <p><b>CN4:</b> <i>... Some of them use [HealthCall] better than others, some forget [...] you kind of go back in and say, 'Can you start using it again?' and they do.</i><br/> <b>Interviewer:</b> <i>So, in that case would you say that you encouraged the care homes to use it as much as possible?</i><br/> <b>CN4:</b> <i>Yeah definitely.</i><br/> <b>Interviewer:</b> <i>Was that something [...] you arranged with HealthCall for themselves or was that because you think it's such a good intervention?</i><br/> <b>CN1:</b> <i>[...] we knew that it was an intervention that needed exploring [...] we went to a couple of meetings [with the implementers] we had the opportunity to put that human side to it instead of somebody from above telling us what we needed to be asking we were saying, 'Well we wouldn't ask in that way,' [...] so we had that opportunity to build it which was really good and that was definitely a success.</i></p> <p><i>What we experienced initially was some resistance from our specialist practitioners who wouldn't accept triages without a full set of observations and being slightly unrealistic about what the care homes could produce. That obviously was discussed [...] we came to an agreement about what could and couldn't and would and wouldn't be accepted. HC3 – Trainer</i></p> <p><i>[...] sometimes it was just to sit down with the manager and going, 'Are you ok?' and just doing a bit of a welfare check with them [...] We've got good relationships with the managers and [the HealthCall Trainers] were able to just to have that bit of time that a lot of other medical or clinical staff weren't able to [...] HC1</i></p> <p><b>Interviewer:</b> <i>[...] Have you come across [the Digital Care Homes app] at all?</i><br/> <b>Relative2:</b> <i>No, I haven't. [LATER] I wouldn't have to be told, no. It would be interesting to know I suppose but, so that I could have sat with him for some of them. It would have been good if they did it that way [...] but no I</i></p> |
|---|---|

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>wouldn't mind if they didn't say, whatever they have to do to help people is fine. <b>Relative 2</b></p>   |
| <p>Appropriacy of training</p>                          | <p>[...] when it was first launched we were involved in the training of the staff members [...] so [care homes] had sort of a friendly face... <b>CN1</b></p> <p><b>DM2:</b> [HC2-Trainer] told us how it was set up on the actual pad. Then showed us what to do with our usernames, our passwords and then gradually we got down to well this is how you get in touch with the community matrons. This is how you get in touch with the practice managers [...] this kind of thing [...] Initially [HC2-Trainer] came quite a bit but it was like maybe trying to catch people on different shifts as well and ensuring that we all were singing from the same song sheet [...] [HC2-Trainer] was very patient. No question was silly [...]</p> <p>[...] In the COVID roll out, the speedy roll out, we mainly cut it down to the digital technology only. If we had nurses in the nursing homes we asked them to train the clinical skills [...] Quite a few of our homes already had carers that had been through their company taught clinical skills [...] But the difficulty with COVID was the getting the access to the staff so we did a lot of remote training [...] training in a car park [...] But because of that we did miss some of the more resistant staff because it gave them a chance to hide [...] We are now mopping those people up now [...] <b>HC3 - Trainer</b></p> |
| <p>Application and implementation evolution</p>         | <p><b>SC6:</b> ... they came to the home and did sessions with all our seniors and managers and stuff and then me and [colleague 1] went to a meeting with the head of the [community] nurses, the ones who were – what are they called...?</p> <p><b>Interviewer:</b> At the Single Point of Access? [...]</p> <p><b>SC6:</b> Yeah. It was like people from like different care homes were there and it was really interesting. It was just a bit of a catch up of how everyone's finding it. Was there any concerns? [...]</p> <p>[...] we've got a generic email folder where the care homes can send any queries in if the staff's got issues with log-ins. I can help them out with that. If they've got new residents or if they've got leavers all of that needs to be constantly updated otherwise the system won't work and that's getting busier and busier [...] to cope with. <b>HC4</b></p>  |
| <p><b>Theme 3. Efficiency and Appropriacy</b></p>       |   |
| <p>Enhancing resident care and improving efficiency</p> | <p>We click the person's name and then it will ask you what are you concerned about? Have you got observations? And it just says blood pressure, temp, oxygen levels, things like that and you just fill in the boxes, the questions. Have there been changes? What have you done to help already? Things like that so and then you submit and it's that easy. <b>SC7</b></p> <p><b>Interviewer:</b> [...] would you want to go back to life without it?</p> <p><b>SC6:</b> No [...] I mean you could be in a queue and you could be number nine in that queue for an hour and a half and you've got other things to be doing [...] That patient could be getting progressively worse whereas if you've got the app you can just put the observations straight on it and it'll go directly [...] It just cuts out the time.</p> <p>[...] it was a reduction of two admissions per month from the care homes that were in [the pilot] [...] 'Right so times that by 12 months by [all] care homes,' and you're talking mega savings [...] the feedback from [...] the frontline staff who were using the system [...] how much time it saved them [...] They were able to spend more time with the residents... <b>LAC</b></p>   |

|                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
|                               | <p>[...] because of COVID the [local HealthCall] team pushed through access for all of the care homes quicker, they finished much faster than they were originally planned to do it then uptake was really, really good. <b>CN2</b></p> <p>Oh yes. I got a wonderful examination [...] on the computer, yes [...] I got peace of mind in a very short time. <b>Resident1</b></p>   |
| Accountability and legitimacy | <p><b>HC2 - Trainer:</b> That's where the kind of safety net is. They've [SPA] got a 15 minute response time.</p> <p><b>Interviewer:</b> Okay so that's a 15 minute response time from when they get that referral through [...]?</p> <p><b>HC2 - Trainer:</b> Yes [...] you get obviously a full case history and everything with [digital health record]. They can get the NEWS score, they'll get all the relevant information that comes through from the app and they can sort of align that to [digital health record]. [...] if you're not happy with the obs. [...] just phone them you know [...] Our understanding is once that referral comes through we've then got clinical responsibility for that patient in terms of the [SPA] side of things ...</p> <p>[...] "they're just not right" and being just not right is a clinical sign for elderly [...]</p> <p>[...] as a registered nurse I'm, I don't think it's [NEWS] something we should be using as a diagnostic tool [...] the actual scoring on it is too prescriptive for the co-morbidities within care and nursing homes [...] NEWS itself, is a very useful triage tool [...] and at HealthCall we don't use NEWS for a diagnostic we only use it as a guide to how ill the person could be and take the other things into consideration. <b>HC3 - Trainer</b></p> |
| Upskilling                    | <p>I think the app itself has developed people's technological skills as well. Everyone in here was a little bit scared about using it to start off with but it's really straight forward but I think yeah staff are learning [...] when they read someone's blood pressure they're going, 'Oh no that's a bit high,' or 'That's a bit low,' so they are starting to understand that. <b>CHM4</b></p> <p>[...] descriptive language is vastly improved. They are looking at the wider picture [...] They put things like, 'Has just finished antibiotics. Still got a chest infection' [...] we're getting a lot more detail in there now... <b>CN1, One-on-one Interview</b></p>  |

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7

## Normalisation Process Theory

Table 3, below, outlines how the findings from the thematic analysis relate to NPT constructs (further detail provided in Appendix S1). Resident and relative stakeholders' awareness of the intervention was limited and their involvement in the implementation passive as opposed to active. As such the NPT findings relate chiefly to other participants.

| Table 3: Findings in relation to NPT Constructs  |   |
|--|---|
| <p><b>Core Construct: Coherence</b><br/>Process of sense-making and understanding that individuals and organisations go through in order to promote or inhibit the routine embedding of a practice to its users. These processes are energized by investments of meaning made by participants.</p> |   |
| <p><b>Differentiation:</b> Do stakeholders see this as a new way working?</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledged across stakeholders, particularly for care home staff: Referral via app not phone, specific contextual information requested, increased digital and clinical knowledge required.</li> <li>Community nurses discussed how the app altered practice such as approach to prioritising visits.</li> </ul> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>Individual specification:</b> <i>Do individuals understand what tasks the intervention requires of them?</i></p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder understanding of the intervention and their role was clear.</li> <li>Problems with digital skills in, and preparedness of, care homes a potential barrier to engaging coherently with the intervention.</li> <li>Disparaging comments about care home staff (two community nurses) suggests the potential for sociocultural barriers to Individual Specification.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Communal specification:</b> <i>Do all those involved agree about the purpose of the intervention?</i></p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder's all commented on the core aims of the intervention: reducing referral time, improving communication and quality of information, enhancing resident care and reducing avoidable hospital admissions.</li> <li>Care home staff defaulting to the phone to refer and the disparaging comments of two community nurses suggest some undermining of Communal Specification</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Internalisation:</b> <i>Do all the stakeholders grasp the potential benefits and value of the intervention?</i></p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Achieved across stakeholder groups</li> <li>Stakeholders discussed the upskilling of care home staff, improvements to efficiency and communication, quality of data for triage and prioritising visits, and improvements to resident care</li> <li>The remote link between care homes and community NHS staff enhanced by COVID-19.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Core Construct: Cognitive Participation</b><br/> <i>Process that individuals and organisations have to go through in order to enrol individuals to engage with the new practice. These processes are energized by investments of commitment made by participants.</i></p> |   |
| <p><b>Enrolment:</b> <i>Do the stakeholders believe they are the correct people to drive forward the implementation?</i></p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The local HealthCall team appeared confident in their roles within the implementation</li> <li>The Community Nurses participated in activities to support and sustain the implementation, providing training to care home staff and encouraging engagement</li> <li>Care home managers and seniors were supportive of the app</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Initiation:</b> <i>Are they willing and able to engage others in the implementation?</i></p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The local HealthCall Team and Community nurses were concerned with encouraging and supporting other stakeholders to engage with the intervention, monitoring use and engagement and managing relationships</li> <li>Care home managers and Senior carers were involved in supporting use and engagement within care homes</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Activation:</b> <i>Can stakeholders identify what tasks and activities are required to sustain the intervention?</i></p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HealthCall identified ways to improve and adapt the implementation over time, ensuring the app and implementation were appropriate.</li> <li>Community nurses supported care home staff and alerted HealthCall to training needs in care homes</li> <li>Habits and issues of convenience could undermine activation. Care homes increasingly utilised the app in daily practice and alerted HealthCall where further support was required</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Legitimation:</b> <i>Do they believe it is appropriate for them to be involved in the intervention?</i></p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Care home managers and seniors, and community nurses were supportive of the app and their engagement with it appeared to be viewed as a valid part of both care and health care.</li> <li>Onus of responsibility for high level clinical decisions was not placed on care home staff</li> </ul>  |



|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local HealthCall team enthusiastic about their and had the right experience and skills to drive implementation.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Core Construct: Collective Action</b><br/> <i>The work that individuals and organisations have to do to enact the new practice. These processes are energized by investments of effort made by participants.</i></p>  |   |
| <p><b>Interactional workability:</b> <i>Does the intervention make it easier or harder to complete tasks?</i></p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improvements to efficiency were often commented upon across stakeholder groups</li> <li>For care home staff the ease and quick referral process was key</li> <li>Community nurses appreciated the steady improvement in information they received. They felt more prepared for visits and could prioritise their visits</li> <li>Poor digital literacy among care home staff had the potential to undermine this</li> </ul>                  |
| <p><b>Skill set workability:</b> <i>Do those implementing the intervention have the correct skills and training for the job?</i></p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The HealthCall Team had the appropriate skill set and experience for their roles with care home staff commenting positively on their approach to training and approachability</li> <li>Buy-in and support from community nurses and care home managers meant that their skills as implementation allies bolstered the work done by the HealthCall team.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Relational integration:</b> <i>Do those involved in the implementation have confidence in the new way of working?</i></p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While the implementation experienced some challenges, views toward the intervention were broadly positive and HealthCall were proactive in dealing with issues that arose</li> <li>The negative views concerning motivations of care home staff in using the app, expressed by two of the Community Nurses, suggest that there may be sociocultural barriers</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Contextual integration:</b> <i>Do local and national resources and policies support the implementation?</i></p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current drive to improve health care delivery within care homes, at both local and national level</li> <li>Clinical Commissioning Groups, NHS Trusts and Local Authorities across the UK have sought to implement and evaluate similar digital innovations</li> <li>Government pledge to digitised adult social care by March 2024</li> <li>HealthCall raises a warning that care homes should not be “bombarded” with technology</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Core Construct: Reflexive Monitoring</b><br/> <i>Informal and formal appraisal of a new practice once it is in use, in order to assess its advantages and disadvantages and which develops users’ comprehension of the effects of a practice. These processes are energized by investments in appraisal made by participants.</i></p> |   |
| <p><b>Systemisation:</b> <i>Will stakeholders be able to judge the effectiveness of the intervention?</i></p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitoring of app use by HealthCall</li> <li>Evaluation: Quantitative component examining changes in referral patterns and decisions, rates and nature of hospital admission and discharge. Qualitative component exploring usability and acceptability, impact on referral practices and resident care, indicators of implementation success</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Individual appraisal:</b> <i>How will individuals judge the effectiveness of the intervention?</i></p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No formal indicators or measures for how individuals appraised the intervention beyond their own personal interactions with the app and other stakeholders</li> <li>This evaluation offered stakeholders the opportunity to express their views</li> </ul>   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p><b>Communal appraisal:</b> <i>How will stakeholders collectively judge the effectiveness of the intervention?</i></p>       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Steps taken to judge effectiveness were typically “informal” by HealthCall. They maintained a dialog with care homes, community nurses and other stakeholders such as the Local Authority Commissioner, creating a feedback loop</li> <li>• Stakeholders had discussed the intervention within their own teams highlighting successes and problems</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Reconfiguration:</b> <i>Will stakeholders be able to modify the intervention based on evaluation and experience?</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The feedback loop created by the relationships between the local HealthCall team and other stake holders allowed for both the intervention and the implementation to be adapted and to evolve in response to feedback from end users</li> <li>• The involvement of key stakeholders has been ongoing since the development stage</li> <li>• HealthCall also creatively adapted approach to training in response to COVID-19</li> </ul> |

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

## Discussion

The core themes presented above provide a clear narrative around the challenges faced by the ongoing implementation of the Digital Care Homes app, and how those involved have sought to find solutions, harnessing a feedback loop born of the open and positive communication the implementers created. When considered against NPT constructs, the findings confirm that the implementation has been comprehensive and adaptive, with proactive and appropriately skilled individuals driving the implementation, which is appropriate for a complex intervention.

The intervention has broadly been viewed as a legitimate and valuable contribution to care work and health care delivery, achieving buy-in from key stakeholders. This buy-in was informed by positive experiences with the app, chiefly the ease of use and efficient referral time. Community nurses appreciated the additional information they received that enabled them to better prepare for their visits. These positive opinions suggest that this intervention was meeting its aims. Findings from previous work evaluating interventions like the Digital Care Homes app (Russell et al., 2020; Stocker et al., 2021) suggests that, for this kind of intervention to achieve buy-in from care home staff and community NHS services implementation teams should: -

- work *with* key stakeholders in developing the intervention and implementation
- account for the challenging nature of care homes including multiple competing priorities and medically complex residents
- understand that obtaining vital signs from residents is not always achievable and care home staff should not be accountable for clinical decisions.
- respect care home staffs’ ability to recognise soft signs of deterioration and acknowledge the importance of such information
- provide training that is comprehensive with a practical element (taking vital signs on care home residents in-house), delivered by those with appropriate clinical skills and experience with care homes
- monitor engagement and use of the intervention, flagging any further support needs
- provide ongoing support with digital technology and further training.

The development and implementation process undertaken by HealthCall appears to have accounted for these issues.

It should be noted that NEWS was developed for use in acute rather than community settings (RCP, 2017). Concerns have been raised about the use of NEWS with medically complex populations

1 (Grant, 2018; Grant & Crimmons, 2018) questioning its appropriacy for use with care home  
2 residents. NEWS is not a standalone tool, and should be considered alongside further contextualised  
3 information about a patient (RCP, 2017). A reliance on NEWS within a similar intervention  
4 implemented in northern England was ultimately addressed, with a revised version of the  
5 implementation reducing reliance on NEWS while acknowledging the importance of soft signs of  
6 deterioration (Russell et al., 2020; Stocker et al., 2021). The Digital Care Home app has used a similar  
7 approach, avoiding reliance on NEWS alone and emphasising the importance of soft signs of  
8 deterioration and further contextual information. This shows that interventions of this ilk have  
9 evolved over time to become better suited to the medical complexity of care home residents and  
10 the skills of care home staff.

11

12 This qualitative evaluation has raised three issues that could influence future implementations of  
13 this and similar interventions. Firstly, despite being part of this implementation's success, the level  
14 of monitoring and staffing required to maintain the ongoing success of the implementation could  
15 pose barriers to maintaining current levels of support and the replicability of this intensive  
16 implementation process.

17

18 Secondly, the belief held by two community nurses that care home staff could be "needy", and  
19 "manipulative" is problematic, suggesting a potential for strained relationships across core  
20 stakeholders; a disconnect between care homes' and community nurses' understandings concerning  
21 expectations and the purpose of the app. Negative views towards care staff may be linked to the  
22 stigma and diminished status given to those working in aged care and long-term care facilities  
23 (Manchha et al., 2021; Ostaszkievicz et al., 2016). Implementors of similar interventions should be  
24 alert to the potential for such cultural issues to influence implementation success.

25

26 Thirdly, digital skills and preparedness in care homes are limited. This issue needs to be addressed,  
27 not just for the success of the Digital Care Homes app, but to ensure that care homes are better  
28 prepared for future pandemics and digital interventions in general, including interventions designed  
29 to support the well-being of residents (Gutman & Shade, 2020; Stadler, 2021; Subramaniam &  
30 Woods, 2016; Zamir et al., 2020). The UK Government has pledged to have all care homes digitised  
31 by March 2024 (DHSC, 2022). Upholding this pledge appears to be vital to ensuring adult social care  
32 can provide a range of person-centred care interventions, and timely and appropriate health care.

33

### 34 **Strengths and limitations**

35 We captured the experiences and views of a range of stakeholders, including care home residents  
36 who are often excluded from such evaluations due to challenges of recruitment. Most care home  
37 staff interviewed were senior carers, the most common user of the Digital Care Homes application,  
38 providing data on the real world, practical experience of the intervention. This is a strength this  
39 evaluation.

40 No care home nurses were recruited and from the NHS perspective we only spoke with community  
41 nurses. This may have influenced the findings produced.

42

### 43 **Conclusion**

44 The HealthCall Digital Care Homes app appears to be a feasible, appropriate and legitimate  
45 intervention to support improved referral, triage and health care support for non-urgent health care  
46 needs of care home residents. The comprehensive implementation process that welcomed feedback  
47 to support improvements to the intervention and implementation is the core of this intervention's

1 success. For this and similar interventions to achieve success nationally, implementations require  
2 rapport building and a willingness among those driving the implementation to listen to the views of  
3 end users. Ensuring that care homes are digitally enabled with a digitally literate workforce will  
4 require structural and economic support from national and local policy makers and care home  
5 providers.

## 7 **Acknowledgements**

8 The team would like to thank all participants for their time, HDRUK for their funding and support,  
9 and the members of the *HDRUK Northern Partnership Care Homes Project Team* involved in this  
10 evaluation.

## 12 **Conference Presentations**

13 This paper, in draft form, was delivered as an oral conference presentation at the 6<sup>th</sup> International  
14 Long-term care Policy Network (ILPN) Conference in London on September the 10<sup>th</sup> 2022.

## 16 **Conflict of Interest**

17 Authors declare that they have no competing interests.

## 19 **Author Contribution**

20 NP, JK, SM were involved from the idea generation phase. SR, RS and ZC drafted study documents,  
21 collected data and led the analysis. BH and NP oversaw the qualitative work. SR drafted this paper,  
22 with contributions from co-authors.

## 24 **Ethics Approval**

25 Ethical approval was granted by HRA and Health and Care Research Wales (ref: 20/LO/0962) and  
26 Newcastle University (ref: 12966/2020). The team adhered to accepted ethical standards, ensuring  
27 that informed consent was obtained from participants prior to the collection of data. Data were  
28 organised in secure shared folders. Only members of the qualitative team were privy to any non-  
29 anonymised data. Data were anonymised for analysis and reporting.

## 32 **References**

- 33 Asiedu, G. B., Fang, J. L., Harris, A. M., Colby, C. E., & Carroll, K. (2019). Health Care Professionals'  
34 Perspectives on Teleneonatology Through the Lens of Normalization Process Theory. *Health*  
35 *Sci Rep*, 2(2), e111. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hsr2.111>
- 36 Barker, R. O., Hanratty, B., Kingston, A., Ramsay, S. E., & Matthews, F. E. (2021). Changes in health  
37 and functioning of care home residents over two decades: what can we learn from  
38 population-based studies? *Age Ageing*, 50(3), 921-927.  
39 <https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afaa227>
- 40 BGS. (2011). *Quest for quality: British Geriatrics Society joint working party inquiry into the quality of*  
41 *healthcare support for older people in care homes. A call for leadership, partnership and*  
42 *quality improvement*. [https://www.bgs.org.uk/sites/default/files/content/attachment/2019-](https://www.bgs.org.uk/sites/default/files/content/attachment/2019-08-27/quest_quality_care_homes.pdf)  
43 [08-27/quest\\_quality\\_care\\_homes.pdf](https://www.bgs.org.uk/sites/default/files/content/attachment/2019-08-27/quest_quality_care_homes.pdf)
- 44 BGS. (2021). *Ambitions for change: Improving healthcare in care homes*  
45 [https://www.bgs.org.uk/resources/ambitions-for-change-improving-healthcare-in-care-](https://www.bgs.org.uk/resources/ambitions-for-change-improving-healthcare-in-care-homes)  
46 [homes](https://www.bgs.org.uk/resources/ambitions-for-change-improving-healthcare-in-care-homes)
- 47 Brangan, E., Banks, J., Brant, H., Pullyblank, A., Le Roux, H., & Redwood, S. (2018). Using the National  
48 Early Warning Score (NEWS) outside acute hospital settings: a qualitative study of staff

- 1 experiences in the West of England. *BMJ Open*, 8(10), e022528.  
2 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2018-022528>
- 3 Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in*  
4 *Sport, Exercise and Health*, 11(4), 589-597. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806>
- 5 Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). To saturate or not to saturate? Questioning data saturation as a useful  
6 concept for thematic analysis and sample-size rationales. *Qualitative Research in Sport,*  
7 *Exercise and Health*, 13(2), 201-216. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1704846>
- 8 Chu, C. H., Ronquillo, C., Khan, S., Hung, L., & Boscart, V. (2021). Technology Recommendations to  
9 Support Person-Centered Care in Long-Term Care Homes during the COVID-19 Pandemic  
10 and Beyond. *Journal of Aging & Social Policy*, 33(4-5), 539-554.  
11 <https://doi.org/10.1080/08959420.2021.1927620>
- 12 Dey, I. (1999). *Grounding Grounded Theory. Guidelines for Qualitative Inquiry*. Academic Press
- 13 DHSC. (2022). *Policy paper: A plan for digital health and social care*. Retrieved from  
14 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/a-plan-for-digital-health-and-social-care/a-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/a-plan-for-digital-health-and-social-care/a-plan-for-digital-health-and-social-care)  
15 [plan-for-digital-health-and-social-care](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/a-plan-for-digital-health-and-social-care/a-plan-for-digital-health-and-social-care)
- 16 Edelman, L. S., McConnell, E. S., Kennerly, S. M., Alderden, J., Horn, S. D., & Yap, T. L. (2020).  
17 Mitigating the Effects of a Pandemic: Facilitating Improved Nursing Home Care Delivery  
18 Through Technology [Editorial]. *JMIR Aging*, 3(1), e20110. <https://doi.org/10.2196/20110>
- 19 Gordon, A. L., Franklin, M., Bradshaw, L., Logan, P., Elliott, R., & Gladman, J. R. (2014). Health status  
20 of UK care home residents: a cohort study. *Age Ageing*, 43(1), 97-103.  
21 <https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/aft077>
- 22 Grant, S. (2018). Limitations of track and trigger systems and the National Early Warning Score. Part  
23 1: areas of contention. *Br J Nurs*, 27(11), 624-631.  
24 <https://doi.org/10.12968/bjon.2018.27.11.624>
- 25 Grant, S., & Crimmons, K. (2018). Limitations of track and trigger systems and the National Early  
26 Warning Score. Part 2: sensitivity versus specificity. *Br J Nurs*, 27(12), 705-710.  
27 <https://doi.org/10.12968/bjon.2018.27.12.705>
- 28 Gutman, G., & Shade, M. (2020). Digital Interventions to Promote Health and Well-Being of Older  
29 Adults. *Innovation in Aging*, 4(Supplement\_1), 755-755.  
30 <https://doi.org/10.1093/geroni/igaa057.2721>
- 31 Harrison, J. K., McKay, I. K., Grant, P., Hannah, J., & Quinn, T. J. (2016). Appropriateness of  
32 unscheduled hospital admissions from care homes. *Clin Med (Lond)*, 16(2), 103-108.  
33 <https://doi.org/10.7861/clinmedicine.16-2-103>
- 34 Hodgson, P., Greaves, J., Cook, G., Fraser, A., & Bainbridge, L. (2022). A study to introduce National  
35 Early Warning Scores (NEWS) in care homes: Influence on decision-making and referral  
36 processes. *Nurs Open*, 9(1), 519-526. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nop2.1091>
- 37 Leonard, M., Graham, S., & Bonacum, D. (2004). The human factor: the critical importance of  
38 effective teamwork and communication in providing safe care. *Quality and Safety in Health*  
39 *Care*, 13(suppl 1), i85-i90. <https://doi.org/10.1136/qshc.2004.010033>
- 40 Manchha, A. V., Walker, N., Way, K. A., Dawson, D., Tann, K., & Thai, M. (2021). Deeply Discrediting:  
41 A Systematic Review Examining the Conceptualizations and Consequences of the Stigma of  
42 Working in Aged Care. *Gerontologist*, 61(4), e129-e146.  
43 <https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/gnaa166>
- 44 May, C., & Finch, T. (2009). Implementing, Embedding, and Integrating Practices: An Outline of  
45 Normalization Process Theory. *Sociology*, 43(3), 535-554.  
46 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038509103208>
- 47 NHSHealthCall. ([online]). *HealthCall. Who We Are*. Retrieved 06.05.2021 from  
48 <https://nhshealthcall.co.uk/about/>
- 49 Ostaszkiwicz, J., O'Connell, B., & Dunning, T. (2016). 'We just do the dirty work': dealing with  
50 incontinence, courtesy stigma and the low occupational status of carework in long-term  
51 aged care facilities. *J Clin Nurs*, 25(17-18), 2528-2541. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.13292>

- 1 Oung, C., Rolewicz, L., Crellin, N., Kumpunen, S. (2021). *Research summary September 2021:*  
2 *Developing the digital skills of the social care workforce, Evidence from the Care City test*  
3 *bed.* <https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/files/2021-09/workforce-research-summary-final.pdf>  
4 RCP. (2017). *Royal College of Physicians, National Early Warning Score (NEWS) 2 standardising the*  
5 *assessment of acute-illness severity in the NHS.*  
6 <https://www.rcplondon.ac.uk/projects/outputs/national-early-warning-score-news-2>  
7 Ross, J., Stevenson, F. A., Dack, C., Pal, K., May, C. R., Michie, S., Yardley, L., & Murray, E. (2019).  
8 Health care professionals' views towards self-management and self-management education  
9 for people with type 2 diabetes. *BMJ Open*, *9*(7), e029961.  
10 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2019-029961>  
11 Russell, S., Stocker, R., Barker, R. O., Liddle, J., Adamson, J., & Hanratty, B. (2020). Implementation of  
12 the National Early Warning Score in UK care homes: a qualitative evaluation. *British Journal*  
13 *of General Practice*, *70*(700), e793-e800. <https://doi.org/10.3399/bjgp20X713069>  
14 Scott, L. J., Redmond, N. M., Garrett, J., Whiting, P., Northstone, K., & Pullyblank, A. (2019).  
15 Distributions of the National Early Warning Score (NEWS) across a healthcare system  
16 following a large-scale roll-out. *Emergency Medicine Journal*, *36*(5), 287-292.  
17 <https://doi.org/10.1136/emered-2018-208140>  
18 Smith, P. S.-J., C.; Ariti, C.; Bardsley, M. . (2015). *Quality Watch - Focus on: Admissions from Care*  
19 *Homes.*  
20 Stadler, T., Burtney, L. (2021). *Digital Skills in Adult Social Care: Rapid Evidence Review.*  
21 [https://www.skillsforcare.org.uk/Documents/Misc/Digital-Skills-in-Adult-Social-Care-Rapid-](https://www.skillsforcare.org.uk/Documents/Misc/Digital-Skills-in-Adult-Social-Care-Rapid-Evidence-Review-Mar21.pdf)  
22 [Evidence-Review-Mar21.pdf](https://www.skillsforcare.org.uk/Documents/Misc/Digital-Skills-in-Adult-Social-Care-Rapid-Evidence-Review-Mar21.pdf)  
23 Steinskog, T.-L. D., Tranvåg, O., Ciliska, D., Nortvedt, M. W., & Graverholt, B. (2021). Integrated  
24 knowledge translation in nursing homes: exploring the experiences of practice development  
25 nurses. *BMC Health Services Research*, *21*(1), 1283. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-021-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-021-07282-7)  
26 [07282-7](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-021-07282-7)  
27 Stocker, R., Russell, S., Liddle, J., Barker, R. O., Remmer, A., Gray, J., Hanratty, B., & Adamson, J.  
28 (2021). Experiences of a National Early Warning Score (NEWS) intervention in care homes  
29 during the COVID-19 pandemic: a qualitative interview study. *BMJ Open*, *11*(7), e045469.  
30 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-045469>  
31 Subramaniam, P., & Woods, B. (2016). Digital life storybooks for people with dementia living in care  
32 homes: an evaluation. *Clin Interv Aging*, *11*, 1263-1276. <https://doi.org/10.2147/cia.S111097>  
33 Zamir, S., Hennessy, C., Taylor, A., & Jones, R. (2020). Intergroup 'Skype' Quiz Sessions in Care Homes  
34 to Reduce Loneliness and Social Isolation in Older People. *Geriatrics*, *5*(4), 90.  
35 <https://www.mdpi.com/2308-3417/5/4/90>

36