



Assisted Living Facility Quality Measures Work Group Meeting Minutes

February 13, 2020

.....

On February 13, 2020, the Department of Social and Health Services convened the fifteenth 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), Ian Davros (consumer representative), George Dicks (Harborview Medical Center), Dave Foltz (Transforming Care), Candy Goehring (DSHS-Residential Care Services), Nick Hart (Alzheimer’s Association Washington), Patricia Hunter (LTC Ombuds), Linda Moran (resident representative), Alyssa Odegaard (LeadingAge Washington), and Betty Schwieterman (DD Ombuds)

Work Group attendees on the phone or webinar: G De Castro (Asian Counseling and Referral Service), Morei Lingle (Argentum), Cathy MacCaul (AARP Washington), Sandra Miles (Sea Mar Community Health Centers), and Don Tavalacci (CRH Northwest)

Department of Social and Health Services staff attendees: Amy Abbott, Amber Crosby, Beverly Court, Cathy McAvoy, Tracey Rollins, Jessica Salquist (facilitator), and Jim Sherman

Department of Social and Health Services staff attendees on the phone or webinar: Jeff Nelson

Guest attendees: Jenny Craven (UW Tacoma), Maureen Linehan (Dementia Action Collaborative), and Errol Porter (Transforming Care)

Guest attendees on the phone or webinar: Lindsay Schwartz (National Center for Assisted Living)

Logistics, welcome, and introductions

After some telephone difficulties, Jessica notified attendees that they only have the ability to utilize one cellphone and that members will have to speak directly into it. Members introduced themselves and Candy Goehring spoke briefly about the IDR

(Informal Dispute Resolution) Panel Pilot, which uses a panel of volunteers to hear disputes. The purpose of the panel is to conduct Informal Dispute Resolution meetings for Adult Family Home Providers. The panel completes the review of statements and documents from AFH providers as well as the RCS staff responsible for issuing the citations and/or enforcement actions in dispute. The IDR panel project is expected to last for six months through April 2020 before making any decisions about whether or not it will expand to other programs.

Member vacancies (all): David Lord with Disability Rights Washington and Katie Jacoby with Community Health of Central Washington resigned. Members conclusively agreed that vacancies will not be filled then or in the future and the charter stands as is without any amendments.

Review and approval of December 11, 2019 and January 23, 2020 Meeting Minutes

December Minutes:

Linda Moran requested that her amendment to the minutes from December 11, 2019 be shortened to make them simple and easy to follow, as the bar does for judges. Candy Goehring motioned to approve minutes as amended and Linda Moran seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by all of those in the room and on the phone who attended the December meeting.

January Minutes:

Cathy McAvoy reported that she highlighted the votes recorded for January. She asked the group to carefully check the tallies to make certain that they were accurate. Betty Schwieterman asked for clarification of the individual approval and denial of domains and what was meant by individual measures to be determined at a future date. Beverly Court stated that there was no definition in the motion about a specific date that was voted on and approved in January. George Dicks requested that his comment on page five be edited to recognize the individuality of mental illness adding that there is no standard in mental illness and that individuals that suffer from mental illness have individual strengths and abilities. Patricia Hunter motioned to approve the minutes as amended by George Dicks. Candy Goehring seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all of those in the room and on the phone who attended the January meeting.

Volunteers for Final Report subgroup: meeting will be held in Tacoma at 1:00 on Fri., April 3rd

Dave Foltz expressed that he wants to volunteer to be part of the subgroup and was under the impression that he was added to the list already. Robin Dale relayed that he will be out of town on April 3rd and will be unavailable that entire week. Cathy McAvoy will send a Doodle poll to volunteers to come up with a suitable date to review the draft Final Report.

Debrief presentation by Rich Kortum with NRC Health at January meeting

Cathy McAvoy reviewed six slides she pulled from Rich Kortum's January presentation to serve as a review of the presentation.

Patricia Hunter shared her concern that the resident survey does not capture Assisted Living Facility clients that were discharged and that individuals being discharged is a big issue. She would like to have a way to get feedback from former consumers.

Robin Dale asked how that could be tracked.

Patricia Hunter noted that there could be some measurements similar to employees. She also relayed the fact that individuals that have been diagnosed with cognitive issues by a doctor, can be screened out from participating and this concerns her. She suggested that the members of the committee could come up parameters around this. For instance, are individuals with dementia excluded? She agrees that trending over time is a good feature of the proposal for things like administrator change, which can make a difference in the ratings. This company offers performance measures for surveying employees and the star ratings are easy to understand.

Betty Schwieterman echoed what Patricia Hunter talked about in regards to individuals being screened out. What does this mean for mental health clients who experience bad days or clients with developmental delays? She agreed that there needs to be parameters. All individuals have the right to have an opinion.

Candy Goehring added a wild card, maybe for the parking lot, for adding a facial rating scale when it comes to non-verbal residents and other challenges, this can bring more opportunity for responses.

Dave Foltz expressed concern about not involving family in this and that they would be missing out if they were not involved.

Robin Dale agreed that family should be involved in this process if they are an active member of the resident's life.

Patricia Hunter agrees that if the family member is a decision maker or representative they should be given the opportunity to respond.

George Dicks brought up concern around exclusion and asked if individuals would need a diagnosis. How are people being rated to be included or excluded?

Dave Foltz pointed out that there is rarely a diagnosis and questioned who would be the one to determine this?

Patricia Hunter mentioned that we want the results to be accurate and referenced the fact that there is no test to vote for president. The practicality of the provider needs to be considered and if they do all of the screenings they will be missing the mark. Everyone should have the opportunity to respond; let the people vote.

Cathy McAvoy concluded the discussion by adding that there was no preference on the part of the state as to which vendor is selected for the survey process if the group decides to go forward with this recommendation. A formal process to solicit bids would be provided to the public so that all vendors would have an equal opportunity to apply. She thanked Robin Dale for offering Rich Kortum to speak to the work group about satisfaction surveying.

Continued discussion on Potential Measures and Approach document

Beverly Court provided a brief summary of the January 23rd measures contained in the Summary of Potential Items to Measure by Domain document. She encouraged members who had not attended the January meeting to share their thoughts. Below are highlights of the discussion and votes about specific domains and measures:

1. Consumer Satisfaction

- Patricia Hunter: voted yes
- Beverly Court mentioned that the term facility is not always appropriate because there are other types of facilities that would be included in the surveying.
- Betty Schwieterman: voted yes and recommended a more positive than neutral baseline.

2. Safety

- Patricia Hunter pointed out that safety is something she is passionate about and a core reason why people move in to a facility. The measures could include personal property, falls, and complaints.
- Betty Schwieterman shared that resident-to-resident violence is important and one of the reasons she comes to the meetings. People do not share how they feel about this and there are so many issues. There have been some safety questions in regards to core indicators and what the measures can and should do.
- Cathleen MacCaul shared via the webinar, “safety is very subjective. Does safety mean from the outside community or from internal theft or violence by other residents?”
- Morei Lingle shared via the webinar, “I agree it should be a generic question, as stated previously, safety means different things to different people.”

- George Dicks communicated that safety goes with everything and that it is not a CoreQ topic.
- Robin Dale shared that he has no problem with safety or that it is too broad or specific. The domain for safety was decided and the specific measures were undecided. His problem is that the group voted and made a decision at the January meeting and now the domains are being discussed again.
- Dave Foltz clarified that votes are being gathered and recorded for the record for those who didn't attend the January meeting.
- Robin Dale expressed concern about the process of allowing those who were not present at the January meeting to vote now.
- Nick Hart expressed concern for the comment under the domain of safety, *"The domain of safety is not as important for comparative quality measure purposes compared to other domains being considered."*
- Beverly Court pointed out that the comments were provided to capture the range of opinions on this domain, so some of them appear contradictory.
- Candy Goehring brought up that one of the roles of the group is to avoid duplicating regulations that already have to be followed. WACs exist around environmental safety and physical safety and can be found in safety reports so there is already a measure for those.
- Patricia Hunter asked if current domains are being voted on, or are new motions being made?
- Beverly Court clarified that current domains are being voted on, unless a member wants to make a new motion.
- George Dicks voted yes to the domain of safety, as did Cathy MacCaul.
- Patricia Hunter voted yes but expressed concern about not including safety as it means many things to residents and there are many ways to measure safety.

- Betty Schwieterman: voted no, and asked that there be further consideration and a specific date be given for this discussion. She recommends that the group look at NCI (National Core Indicators) indicators related to safety.
- Patricia Hunter shared that she was confused at this point and asked about what is happening after the comment Betty Schwieterman made.
- Beverly Court asked the group if they wanted a process to entertain other domains.
- Dave Foltz reiterated that the group already made a decision about domains and measures at the January meeting and that those who missed the meeting were now given the chance to weigh in on that decision in order to add their votes to the record.
- Alyssa Odegaard suggested looking at potential measures after other measures could be vetted.
- Patricia Hunter questioned the process and asked if there was still room for changing and voting on domains, adding that none of these were finalized. She asked when they would be able to finalize these things.
- Beverly Court clarified that this would be a record of recommendations and included in the legislative report. If an exact safety measure wasn't included, the domain would still be seen as important.
- Patricia Hunter asked if they are no longer able to consider safety as a domain.
- Beverly Court shared that the purpose is to capture all concerns and discussions around domains.
- Candy Goehring added that they knew that they couldn't have too many or too few domains and that the domains needed to be prioritized. There are already regulations concerning ALF environmental safety and facility citations that can be reported. The other safety domains have no measurement.
- Robin Dale shared that this domain is a struggle because what is really meant by safety. This domain could be a whole lot of things.

- Patricia Hunter brought up the NCI core indicators that have an indicator for the safety at home.
- Robin Dale suggested adding, “Do you feel safe? Yes/No” followed by an open-ended question “why?”
- Alyssa Odegaard shared that these things really need to be vetted and this is a great question to ask as a provider.
- Patricia Hunter pointed out that safety could fall under quality of life.
- Alyssa Odegaard questioned if a resident would recommend a facility if they didn’t feel safe?
- Patricia Hunter shared that if that is the way of thinking, then that should be the only question.
- Linda Moran clarified that the discussion about safety was too deep and that was why it was set aside. Environmental safety is monitored by surveys and at the last meeting the work group came to the conclusion that they felt comfortable moving forward with the other domains. She asked if there would be more discussion on the domains before the legislative recommendations are sent and if these are the exact questions that are being sent as recommendations. She suggested pulling from existing resources and draw from work that has already been completed.
- Betty Schwieterman pointed out that they are created and haven’t been processed. She added that the comments on the document reflect that safety isn’t important and she would like the notes to say, “this committee believes that safety is important and more work needs to be done around this topic.” She also mentioned that there are measures that exist and they are ignored.
- Beverly Court suggested that the committee think about creating a new version of this discussion to ensure legislative recommendation reflects this topic accurately.
- Betty Schwieterman asked if test questions should be made and be looked at by the department or committee. She shared that she hopes that they are building something new and different.

- Patricia Hunter added that Rich Kortum talked about testing specific questions and that these allow customers to shop and compare facilities.
- Robin Dale shared that he is not defending providers that do not find safety important. He added that a committee member cannot miss a meeting and come to the following meeting and change things that were previously voted on.
- Jessica Salquist stepped in and asked if the committee would like to decide if the discussion around domains needs to be reopened, pointing out that all of this discussion will be included in the report.
- Betty Schwieterman pointed out that the agenda from the previous meeting did not include that there would be discussion about specific recommendations. She would have made a different decision about coming to the meeting if she had known that they were going to vote on the domains. She added that the comments on the document make it sound as if safety is not important.
- Cathy McAvoy assured the group that the legislative report would include all of the recommendations shared within the documents and ballots. There has to be a balance of information contained in the report and in the appendices as the report cannot be too long. She pointed out that all meeting minutes are posted on the group's webpage and if the group decides that safety isn't captured by the CoreQ questions then a dissent report can be written and included in the Final Report.
- Dave Foltz brought things back to the beginning of this discussion and suggested the process of getting the votes from those that weren't present and added that if Patricia Hunter would like to reopen the subject that could become a new motion.

Members were queried on their votes on the three remaining domains.

3. Equity, Diversity and Inclusivity

- The four members who were not at the January meeting voted as follows:
 - i. Betty Schwieterman: yes
 - ii. Cathleen MacCaul: yes
 - iii. Patricia Hunter: yes

iv. George Dicks: yes

4. Informed Choice and Decision Making/Person-Centered Planning

- The three members who were not at the January meeting voted as follows:
 - i. Betty Schwieterman: yes
 - ii. Cathleen MacCaul: yes
 - iii. Patricia Hunter: yes

Note: George Dicks did not vote on this domain or the following domain as he was in attendance when these domains were voted on during the January meeting.

5. Community Participation/Quality of Life

- Betty Schwieterman: voted yes
- Betty Schwieterman proposed a solution that “Safety” include the same comment as “Equity, Diversity, and Inclusivity”. The comment would be, “the domain is important, validated measures need to be explored.” She noted that the comments around safety seem contradictory. The group should take the time to find out if there is a good measure for safety. She made a motion to match the motion made for Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion, which was that the, “domain is very important and validated measures needs to be explored.” Robin Dale seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Discussion on a recommendation for tracking and monitoring ALF performance

Each member shared their thoughts and comments around the process for monitoring and tracking ALF performance. They weighed in on each section of the Proposing a Process for Monitoring and Tracking ALF Performance Components/Option Examples for Implementing Resident Survey document. Each members shared their opinions on the provided components and options, including members on the webinar.

Linda Moran expressed that she did not have enough information to provide feedback at this time. Candy Goehring also pointed out that legislative funding could be added to Medicaid rates and cautioned against using Civil Money Penalty funds to fund the program. As the funds exist, today it is unlikely that these funds would be replenished.

Overall, the group agreed that all facilities should participate with a one-year pilot before results are posted to the public. There was general agreement that one vendor should be selected to complete the satisfaction surveys on behalf of the providers.

A motion was made to have a formal vote on the elements of the document so all can weigh in. The results of the vote will be reviewed at the March meeting with further discussion. The vote was unanimous.

Public and WG comment period

Maureen Linehan, former director of the Seattle King County Area Agency on Aging and current member for the Dementia Action Collaborative, shared that she hopes that the group will continue to consider giving residents with dementia and other cognitive needs and their families the opportunity to participate in satisfaction surveys. She was happy to hear the group discuss this.

March 18th agenda and wrap-up

Results of the vote for the options for developing a system for monitoring and tracking performance will be reviewed and discussed. The draft outline of the Final Report will be presented by Cathy McAvoy.