



Assisted Living Facility Quality Measures Work Group Meeting Minutes

December 11, 2019

On December 11, 2019, the Department of Social and Health Services convened the thirteenth meeting of the Assisted Living Facility Quality Measures Work Group. This work group was established in response to [Engrossed House Bill 2750](#), passed during the 2018 legislative session, with authority found in [RCW 18.20.510](#). The meeting was facilitated by DSHS staff, Jessica Salquist.

Work Group attendees: Robin Dale (Washington Health Care Association), George Dicks (Harborview Medical Center), Vicki Elting (LTC Ombuds), Dave Foltz (Transforming Care), Brad Forbes (NAMI Washington), Candy Goehring (DSHS-Residential Care Services), Carolyn Ham (Department of Health), Morei Lingle (Argentum), Cathy MacCaul (AARP Washington), Linda Moran (resident representative), and Alyssa Odegaard (LeadingAge Washington), and Betty Schwieterman (Developmental Disabilities Ombuds)

Work Group attendees on the phone or webinar: Ian Davros (consumer representative), Erica Farrell (Alzheimer’s Association), Sandra Miles (Sea Mar Community Health Centers) and Don Tavalacci (CRH Northwest)

Department of Social and Health Services staff attendees: Amy Abbott, Jeanette Childress, Beverly Court, Trish Harmon, Laura Holloway, Cathy McAvoy, Bill Moss, Jeff Nelson, Jessica Salquist (facilitator), and Jim Sherman

Guest attendees: Carol Foltz (Skyline Assisted Living), Maureen Linehan (Dementia Action Collaborative), and Vicki McNealley (WHCA)

Logistics and introductions

Jessica Salquist presented the housekeeping instructions and reviewed the ground rules. Members introduced themselves.

Review of November Minutes

The minutes from the November meeting were reviewed. Don Tavalacci will be added to the list of attendees and the spelling of Doug Sample’s name will be corrected. On page 3 the sentence regarding CMP funds will be corrected indicating state not federal funds as requested by Candy Goehring. A vote to approve the minutes as amended passed. Dave Foltz and Linda Moran abstained.

Discussion with Bill Moss

Bill Moss thanked the work group for the challenging work they have completed. He cautioned the group to be mindful not to inadvertently effect the Medicaid facilities and to keep in mind this is a starting place when picking measures. In addition to measuring quality, the measures should be something the providers can successfully implement. If the recommendations will cost money he asked that the work group include a funding recommendation to the Legislature.

Bill Moss thanked Residential Care Services (RCS) for their contribution and leadership during this process and urged the group to consider subgroups to develop and propose recommendations to the full work group, as time is getting short. He would hate to see the work group backed up against a timeline. Again, he thanked the group and stated he was encouraged by what he has seen.

Betty Schwieterman asked a clarifying question about private pay versus Medicaid and inquired if that was what Bill meant when he said across the spectrum. Bill Moss responded that yes it was. She also asked if there were any measures that would not apply and Bill did not think so.

Bill Moss commented that all measures have value and to pick the ones with the biggest bang for the buck that have the ability to be implemented.

Linda Moran offered a unique perspective as a younger resident and commented that when you Google information about ALFs you are taken to paid websites first and not the DSHS webpage. She stated that there needs to be education for the consumers on how to get this information. Vicki Elting stated that she couldn't agree more and frequently directs folks to the DSHS website.

Morei Lingle commented that she sees a focus on satisfaction throughout the measures. She expressed support for the need to level the playing field for those who receive Medicaid funded services.

Sandra Miles stated that while there may be differences in the Medicaid funded and private pay populations, Medicaid funded residents still want the same things in their community and still desire good care.

Robin Dale stated Core-Q is still the answer. It's tested and CMS is onboard. This is a starting point for analysis on individual facilities. CoreQ could create a report card for the facility. The questions are broad enough and other questions can be added if needed. He also cautioned that the more questions you add the less responses you receive. Core-Q could a starting point for Washington and could be useful in comparing quality nationwide. Next month Rich Kortum from NRC Health is coming to the meeting. NRC creates and administers resident and family surveys.

Sandra Miles would like to include a question about being treated with respect.

Jessica Salquist noted that when Oregon begins reporting results their public website will include additional notes for facilities that provide care to special populations, such as behavior health, since they are not risk adjusting for individual facilities that accept higher acuity consumers.

Betty Schwieterman added that it will be an interesting discussion to see how CoreQ fits in with their additional measures. She asked Bill Moss if he had any ideas about the timing and funding for the work group's potential recommendations. Bill noted the timing is good with it being a Biennial year for the budget. There will be support from legislators who want to support these recommendations and include funding for them in the Governor's budget. He provided an example of the Dementia Action Coalition that asked for \$3.5 million in funding and received partial funding of \$1 million from the Legislature. DSHS could justify the request and indicate that DSHS has the skill to do something even if less funding is allocated.

Betty Schwieterman also asked Bill Moss if he was thinking about doing a pilot or test. Bill responded he believes the Legislature is looking for something preliminary now and that could be a pilot. Testing measures could be valuable before rolling out a program statewide.

Robin Dale commented that recommendations for quality measures would not need to be piloted if we use something that has already been tested. He stated that there were two parts to EHB 2750 and was assured that if they accepted the formation of the work group then rates would be raised. Bill Moss responded that Medicaid ALF rates were raised by 10 percent.

Bill Moss queried the group if they thought that they should begin with a pilot or begin with a few measures for all ALF providers.

Candy stated that we need to look at our public website to better help consumers. These measures could be part of a decision making process about how this information might be part of a package or scorecard for facilities.

Alyssa Odegaard reminded the group the Oregon has not even started and that 2020 information will be kept internally by their Department of Human Services. She noted that public reporting is not slated to begin until 2021.

Robin suggested a scorecard or a report card to assist people in making the decision to enter an ALF.

Cathy MacCaul stated that there are a lot of competing priorities, such as homelessness and transportation, which are vying for the attention of the Legislature this session. She stated that you will have a hard time engaging legislators around issues on aging. Unless they have personal experience, it is hard for legislators to grasp. We need to

have public comments to come up with metrics and to convince the Legislature to support any recommendations.

Vicki Elting stated the question of respect covers a lot and she really likes that question.

George stated that he represents many populations that will be looking at ALFs and wouldn't this information be more universal if we stick with CoreQ measures and add additional questions such as, "is it a fit for you?" He hopes that the work group will be more attentive to needs of folks that are at risk to become marginalized.

Carolyn Ham asked what behaviors drive providers. She asked how the question of satisfaction would address quality of care for those in the margins.

Alyssa Odegaard inquired how it would work if we used Core-Q. Robin Dale suggested that this is a question we should ask Rich Kortum next month when he presents to the work group about satisfaction surveying.

Morei Lingle added that if you add surveys for families that you can also get at the quality of care.

Jessica Salquist asked if the group would be interested or open to subgroups as suggested by Bill Moss.

Candy Goehring stated she agreed with Carolyn Ham regarding her comments on informing consumers and asked that Cathy McAvoy summarize the metrics and complete a skeleton of the work completed so far for a preliminary vote using subgroups or online meetings.

Bill Moss commented that the DSHS website will get improvements.

Brad Forbes commented that forming subgroups, while potentially helpful, often end up becoming the entire group as everyone wants to participate.

Candy Goehring commented the group has had some success with this thus far, for example the subgroup that met to discuss the initial draft of the interim report.

Cathy McAvoy asked the work group to consider Bev Court's recommendation; the work group should first determine if there should be a resident survey before deciding on specific measures.

Linda Moran added we could be similar to the Washington State Bar Association who have a rating they give judge candidates who can use when running for judge positions. The Bar's rating process for judges is qualified, well qualified, exceptionally well qualified or unqualified.

Dave Foltz stated that when we figure out the metrics then it will tell us if we need a survey; we have to choose our metrics first.

Cathy McAvoy will create a document reflecting what the work group has already looked at as potential models and get this to the group before the January 23rd meeting.

Debrief on Oregon’s presentation at the November meeting

Candy Goehring stated the work group was heading in a different direction than Oregon. Domains and measures get what people have an interest in. She enjoyed the presentation and thought that the lesson learned were really helpful.

Jessica Salquist highlighted the fact that unlike Oregon, our work group has ruled out falls and the non-standard use of antipsychotics.

Dave Foltz stated it violates all that Bill Moss stated earlier and that ALFs are different across the entire spectrum.

Candy Goehring added that we can get at some of these metrics through our processes and some of these may not be what residents are interested in. She supports whittling down the list of potential measures. Dave Foltz noted that many of the top measures are already a part of the survey process.

Jessica commented that the information shared by the Oregon presentation shows that this work group is on the right track.

Stakeholder listening sessions

Cathy MacCaul shared that she spoke briefly with Patricia Hunter before the meeting. Cathy stated she has 100 volunteers and 3,000 members she consults with out of a pool of 75,000 members. She employs Town Hall meetings, teleconferencing, and emails to communicate with this group. She asked the group if they want to wait until we determine what we would like to go forward with and then reach out to this group. This could help when they talk with the Legislature so there could be a benefit to testing and validating what the work group comes up with. She states that AARP has an active presence on Facebook and utilizes Survey Monkey. Surveys also inform the consumer so consumer education could also take place. A lot of members are in facilities and are interested. There is value with a paper survey and they will do this too. Cathy MacCaul asked the group to think about what they would like to do and she would be happy to work on this on behalf of the work group. Morei Lingle asked what AARP does to target specific groups. Cathy responded that they can drill down and target responses by specific demographics. She reports that that bulk of respondents are 50-64 years of age, another group is 65-80 years of age, with a final group of 80-110 years of age.

Robin Dale suggested that the group not get “too granular” such as those who are in a facility, looking for a facility, or already have a family member in a facility.

Brad Forbes recommended that they consider randomization. Alyssa Odegaard recommended that we better determine this sooner versus later when we may be too far into the process. Candy Goehring questioned if they have selected the right domains.

Dave Foltz responded that we would use this information as a tool and not for decision making. Candy proposed that we could create a report using the AARP information to include in the final report. Cathy MacCaul reported that AARP has a quarterly newsletter but wondered if we could get information within the next three months in order to include it in the final report. Cathy shared that Facebook is the fastest means for gathering feedback. They may get “trolls” but AARP can sort this out. Morei Lingle asked if they have experts that could help develop the survey and Cathy replied that they have expert staff who know how to shape questions.

Jessica Salquist asked the group how they would like to proceed. Should Cathy MacCaul give AARP staff our domains? Robin Dale suggested that instead of giving them our domains ask them what the public needed to know when selecting an ALF. Morei Lingle suggested dropdown boxes to make the information easier to tabulate. Robin added that he was not opposed to an AARP survey, his concern was that the survey would only include AARP members.

Cathy MacCaul stated that Facebook polling has been effective. Survey Monkey validates questions to be sure this is data that you would want to pull.

Morei Lingle asked about sorting within the database and how you can drill down. Cathy MacCaul stated that they can target specific demographics if needed.

Vacancies on the work group

One vacancy remains unfilled. The group discussed adding new members. Cathy MacCaul suggested adding a representative from SEIU. Candy Goehring reported that she had reached out to AL TSA tribal staff but had not received a recommendation for a tribal candidate. Robin Dale stated that he believes the vacancy should be filled with an ALF provider. Cathy MacCaul noted that SEIU is on Oregon’s council. Betty Schwieterman suggested that the group first decide if they want to fill the vacancy and then decide who they should nominate. Robin Dale made a motion to not fill any vacancies now or in the future, which was seconded and voted on. The vote resulted in a majority to not to fill any vacancies.

Review of vote on quality measures

Jessica Salquist reviewed the measures/indicators document created from the polling completed earlier in December. The polling resulted in two top measures for five of the six domains. There was a tie for the sixth domain (consumer and family satisfaction) so there were top three measures included in the final tally. This resulted in a total of 13 measures/indicators. An in depth discussion followed. Betty Schwieterman proposed that the work group only consider the top measure/indicator for each domain. Linda Moran asked if it might be helpful to look at the top measures/indicators regardless of domain. She would like more discussion about what the results represented. Bev Court offered to create a document based on the summary of top measures/indicators to assist the work group. Jessica Salquist suggested that the work group could apply the measures/indicators to a PICK (Possible, Implement, Challenge, and Kill) charting

activity. Robin Dale suggested that the group adopt CoreQ as a recommendation for the report and note that additional measures could be added after CoreQ is piloted.

Regarding the requirement for a recommendation for informing the public, Candy Goehring stated that we could educate and inform the public through the RCS website and the work group's website.

It was proposed that if they complete the PICK chart and any measures identified as "killed" could be captured as a parking lot item for the final report. It was noted that person-centered care planning is of interest and needs further discussion. The discussion closed with a commitment from Bev Court to create a document that would reflect the discussion of the six domains and questions that might be incorporated into a resident survey.

Public and work group comment period

Carol Foltz commented on the question regarding, "does resident feel satisfied with activities?" She shared that is it not the number of activities that are offered but does the resident feel satisfied and if they have some input into the activities that are being offered. What made some residents feel satisfied was that they were satisfied with the choices. For others the question is, "does management value their opinions on where those activities go?" Perhaps the question should be, "do you still have control, does the facility listen to me and give me control over what is offered?"

Next steps

Jessica reviewed the next steps for the January 23rd meeting:

1. Cathy McAvoy will formulate a document that reflects the discussion to date of various approaches the work group could consider in developing their recommendations.
2. Bev Court will create a document to reflect the work group's discussion from the vote on domains and indicators/measures.
3. Cathy McAvoy will send the NCI-AD Indicators again to the work group.

Next meeting

The work group's next meeting is Thursday, January 23, 2020, 9:00 a.m. to noon at the DSHS Blake East Office Park Building located at 4500 10th Avenue SE Lacey WA 98503. The meeting will be held in the Hood Conference Room on the second floor.