



**Assisted Living Facility Quality Measures Work Group
Meeting Minutes**

May 16, 2019

On May 16, 2019, the Department of Social and Health Services convened the eighth 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 Dingwall-Salquist.

Work Group attendees: Amy Abbott (DSHS-Residential Care Services), Alice Allen-Redfern (Alzheimer’s Association – Washington), Robin Dale (Washington Health Care Association), George Dicks (Harborview Medical Center), Brad Forbes (NAMI Washington), Patricia Hunter (LTC Ombuds), Morei Lingle (Argentum), David Lord (Disability Rights Washington), Cathy MacCaul (AARP Washington), Linda Moran (resident representative), Alyssa Schnitzius (LeadingAge Washington) and Betty Schwieterman (Developmental Disabilities Ombuds)

Work Group attendees on the phone or webinar: David Black (King County Behavioral Health Ombuds), G De Castro (Asian Counseling and Referral Service), Ian Davros (consumer representative), Nora Gibson (Full Life Care), Carolyn Ham (Department of Health), Sandra Miles (Sea-Mar Community Health Centers), John Swenson (resident representative) and Don Tivolacci (CRH Northwest)

Department of Social and Health Services staff attendees: Jessica Dingwall-Salquist (facilitator), Roger Gantz, Trish Harmon, Cathy McAvoy, Ken Michie, Tracey Rollins and Jim Sherman

Guest attendees: Dave Foltz (Fred Lind Manor)

Logistics and introductions

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

Review of April Minutes

Cathy McAvoy shared that she made two minor edits to the minutes that she had emailed to the work group. A vote to approve the minutes with these two edits passed unanimously. Nora Gibson, David Lord, Brad Forbes and Alice Allen-Redfern abstained from the vote.

Draft Interim Report for the Legislature

The subgroup met on May 10th for the initial editing of the draft report and their suggestions were incorporated to the report that was shared with work group members for this meeting.

Patricia Hunter asked if the group would see the report after Bill Moss reviews it. Cathy McAvoy said she would ask to receive a copy with his edits to present to the group. A reminder was given that a dissent report could be included with the interim report and would be due to Cathy McAvoy by Tuesday, May 28th. Linda Moran asked if we could have an opportunity to work out any disagreements before the dissent report was written. Robin Dale thought that would be all right. Cathy McAvoy inquired as to whether she should set up a conference call if a dissent report is submitted so the work group has an opportunity to discuss it before the final draft goes to Candy Goehring. Robin Dale stated that based on the current draft, he did not see that a dissent report was necessary on his part. Patricia Hunter commented she was not there yet as to if a dissent report would be submitted which is the reason she wants to see the report after it leaves Bill Moss's office. It was agreed there would not be a need for a conference call at this time but the work group would like to review the edits Bill Moss makes.

The group reviewed the timelines of the report. Cathy McAvoy will submit the Interim Report to Candy Goehring by June 6th. It should go to Bill Moss's office by Friday, June 14th in order to allow a month for his staff and him to review it. It is due to the Office of Policy and External Relations (OPER) by July 15th. OPER will submit the report by August 30th to the Legislature. Cathy McAvoy will route this final report to work group members and post it on the work group's website. Cathy McAvoy also confirmed that she will ask for the report that Bill submits and route this to the work group, as Patricia Hunter requested.

Jessica Dingwall-Salquist facilitated a review of the draft Interim Report for the full group by section.

Executive Summary

Robin Dale stated this report talks in detail about Wisconsin and less on Oregon and we have not reached out to New Jersey. He would like to see as much as possible on New Jersey's program in this report. Wisconsin and New Jersey's programs are voluntary unlike Oregon which is mandatory.

Cathy McAvoy will reach out and set up a meeting to touch bases with these states and incorporate their information into the report.

Patricia Hunter would like to see the terms "funded" and "unfunded" used in the report since we use "voluntary" and "not voluntary" included in the descriptions of the programs used by other states.

Roger Gantz asked about entering a table to what the three states are doing as this would be more informative to the reader. Robin Dale stated the tables could be in next year's report and recommended that the Interim Report use the narrative now. Linda

Moran said it should be framed in context for example, “at this moment in time” this is where we are in our research.

Patricia Hunter would like to consider moving the last paragraph to the fifth paragraph and then having a closing paragraph to wrap it up.

Background

Linda Moran will revise her statement and share it with Cathy McAvoy.

Process, Scope and Structure

Robin Dale commented that Cathy McAvoy has done a wonderful job of capturing the work we have been doing. David Black agreed with this.

Linda Moran stated she wants to capture why people like her, who need assistance, would end up in an ALF. She stated she has language she can provide. David Lord thought the language should be in the background section and she agreed stating yes, where her name and quote are mentioned.

Patricia Hunter stated the one thing the work group did not talk about is the consumers or the populations they serve.

Brad Forbes recommended we call out special populations such as those needing behavioral health support.

Robin Dale stated it is not in there and it would be a hard paragraph to write to include all of the populations. He recommended that Cathy McAvoy send an email to group members asking them for their suggestions of populations to list.

Patricia Hunter point was taken that this is also about consumers.

David Lord commented it would be adding context to who lives in ALFs...

Robin Dale added to that point, asking do we have that data for these various populations.

Linda Moran commented that maybe this does not need to be there and that she just wanted to make clear there is also a younger population and a diverse population and give a picture of that. ALFs are ADA accessible. David Lord agreed there a variety of reasons and a variety of disabilities in ALFs. Robin Dale commented this should be addressed but there is a wide range of populations. John Swenson stated that Linda’s comments were very true and our group (consumers) needs to be heard. Betty Schwieterman stated we need to give a picture of the diversity of services. Cathy McAvoy pointed out that 80% of those residing in ALFs are not Medicaid funded. We would not have information for those paying privately.

Jim Sherman commented that some populations are kids who have aged out of the foster care system into ALFs. However, we may lose some of those that are currently licensed as ALFs if they convert to Group Training Homes.

Cathy MacCaul would like to see this represented as simply as possible with bulleted points about the breadth and complexity ALFs are addressing and that the report could be used as an educational tool.

Jessica Dingwall-Salquist reiterated what she heard the group saying was that they would like to add language about the depth of various populations served in ALFs but offer this as a brief educational tool using bulleted points.

George Dicks commented he would wait to see what was produced and then he would provide feedback.

It was agreed that work group members should send Cathy McAvoy their lists of populations and settings for ALFs to include in the report.

David Foltz commented that Linda Moran's concerns and focus on age is tremendous and a good point. Providers do not know it can be more than the older populations.

Cathy McAvoy stated Don Tavalacci has specialty areas and it would be really appreciated if he could write something up for the populations he serves. Don Tavalacci stated he could do that.

David Black said likewise, that this could be done also for LBGQTQ.

Patricia Hunter stated we are always going to miss somebody but we can at least attempt to capture the various populations.

Environmental Scan and Literature Review

Patricia Hunter suggested that the appendix with the links to other states include the name of the webpage. Some reading the report will not have a computer to use to access the links embedded in the report. She would like to see both the name of the webpage and the web address.

Cathy MacCaul stated that the paragraph referencing the search engine is odd and not a valid data sampling. What pops up in the search engine would be different for everyone. This paragraph calls out Maryland, San Diego and Delaware. Does that information need to be in there?

Betty Schwieterman stated, in regard to the examples of usable web links, if there is something valuable say what it is. Patricia Hunter questioned what the term "usable" meant.

Recommendations for a Quality Metrics System

Cathy McAvoy asked the group if there was a better heading for these sections addressing the three requirements of the bill. The term "analysis" was suggested.

Recommendations for a Process for Monitoring and Tracking Performance

Patricia Hunter asked the group if we need this much information on Wisconsin. Cathy commented her point was that developing and maintaining a data collection system comes with a cost and she wanted to make the Legislature aware of what it had cost to get a system up and running in Wisconsin. Patricia Hunter thought it seems out of balance and Robin Dale suggested putting this information in an appendix.

Betty Schwieterman stated the subtitles are confusing. The report details the work group's activities and findings, but the work group isn't really making recommendations as the subtitles suggest. Cathy McAvooy stated she will change the term "recommendations" and is open to suggestions on a different term.

Betty Schwieterman stated that following the second paragraph on page 10 she would like to see how the paragraphs following the numbered statements correlate. She suggested adding 1, 2, and 3 to the paragraphs below to match the preliminary findings.

Carolyn Ham entered the following comment about page 11 into the webinar Question Pane: On page 11, the information on Wisconsin states that "Individual ALC (assisted living community) data is not shared with DHS." However in the next paragraph it states that "the Wisconsin regulatory agency provides regulatory relief and may visit a WCCEAL facility in good standing less frequently than a facility that is not in the WCCEAL program". How is it possible that they would make this determination if they don't have access to individual ALC data? Is DHS not the regulatory agency for Wisconsin? Cathy McAvooy will edit these sentences for clarity.

Data Systems within the State

A work group member questioned where this section belongs. The second to last paragraph needs to state TIVA incidents not TIVA Information.

Conclusion - Summary

Robin Dale stated that on page 16, after the quality metric system is defined, a discussion will proceed to proposing a system to monitor and track individual ALF performance. The word "individual" needs to be removed. Cathy stated she would remove individual and Robin suggested monitor and tracking performance. Don Tavolacci agreed with these comments.

Patricia Hunter commented that "to inform consumers" needed to be added at the end of that sentence.

Study of the States update

Roger Gantz presented an update to the Study of the States. Robin Dale asked to see both reports and Roger stated he would send those out.

Wordsmithing performance metrics domains from guiding principles

As requested during the April meeting, Beverly Court drafted potential domains based on the five Guiding Principles in the work group's charter. A copy of the document was shared with meeting participants.

Patricia Hunter recommended adding an indicator for Domain #1 Safety: Proportion of people satisfied with care they receive. David Lord stated this should be an additional domain for the first guiding principle.

Linda Moran asked what safety does a facility have in place and how do they measure it? Is that who runs the facility? Morea Lingle stated that most satisfaction surveys ask that question.

Patricia Hunter recommended the term “secure” in relation to the term “safety”.

David Lord shared two good questions from the National Core Indicators that were part of the meeting handouts:

1. Can you get out in case of an emergency and are your belongings safe?
2. Are there systems in place?

Morea Lingle stated that her concern is that you can check the box but that doesn't mean you are really answering the questions.

Jim Sherman informed the work group that WAC requires that there is an emergency system in place for ALFs.

Robin Dale stated Candy Goehring distributed a report, the *Environmental Scan of Instruments to inform Consumer Choice in Assisted Living Facilities*, and he recommended it as an upcoming topic for discussion. Resident Satisfaction is a good tool that strives to make communities better.

Patricia Hunter added that we know different facilities will have varied results because of the clients they serve.

Robin Dale expressed concern about having the ALF's Disclosure of Services on line. It is easy to check the box about the bill of rights and serving the LBGTQ community, but he questioned if this would help facilities improve their care.

George Dicks asked how family members factor in to the satisfaction survey.

Cathy MacCaul raised questions about accessing benefits, activities of daily living, consistency of language, and person-centered planning. Morea Lingle believes that these may be synonymous with care.

Patricia Hunter pointed out that some ALFs don't provide personal care – the provider can explain the services they offer.

Jim Sherman stated that some ALFs primarily provide medication assistance.

David Lord suggested that a home like environment could relate to the domain for privacy.

The work group discussed the domains listed for the second Guiding Principle. Patricia Hunter asked if the term “social support” should be its own domain.

Linda Moran questioned what the difference was between person-centered planning and person-centered care.

David Foltz stated that assistance with coordination of care and services should be its own domain.

Morea Lingle asked a question regarding self direction and how it applies to various populations.

Linda Moran questioned how self direction is different than choice, stating they are the same so we don't need both. Patricia Hunter recommended that we flesh out one indicator at the next meeting. She sees choice and self-direction as the same thing.

David Lord likes choice and would still like to see it remain as a domain.

David Black shared that he thinks choice is plainer language.

The work group then discussed the third guiding principle and accompanying domains of rights and respect. Patricia Hunter stated that this third guiding principle needs something that calls out diversity and inclusivity so the consumer knows the culture and tone of setting and are they welcomed in their community.

George Dicks recommended that the group is careful about this domain, especially the term culturally sensitivity. He would like to see recognition of a culture of inclusion. G de Castro stated that a culture of inclusion is a good start.

Betty Schwieterman thought that the document that Robin Dale referred to would be helpful to look at before the next meeting.

Public and work group comment period

A request was made to move the meeting start time from 1:30 to 1:00 to make the commute easier. The work group did not disagree with this request. Cathy will send a revised meeting schedule. The next afternoon meeting is not until September 11th.

June agenda and wrap up

Jessica Dingwall-Salquist reviewed the agenda items for the June 20th meeting that the group identified during the meeting which included:

- Further discussion and development of the domains;
- Small groups reports back to group: if subgroups are formed to discuss potential measures for each domain;
- Cathy McAvoy to report out feedback received on domains (she will create a document to include those added during the meeting and seek feedback from work group members via email in preparation for the June meeting); and
- Update on the Study of States.

Next meeting

The work group's next meeting is Thursday, June 20, 2019, 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. at the DSHS Blake East Office Park Building located at 4500 10th Avenue SE Lacey WA 98503. The meeting will be held in the Mt Hood Conference Room on the second floor.