



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

May 20, 2020

---

On May 20, 2020, the Department of Social and Health Services convened the seventeenth 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 held using GoToWebinar and was facilitated by DSHS staff, Cathy McAvoy.

**Work Group attendees via webinar:** Robin Dale (WHCA), Ian Davros (consumer representative), G De Castro (Asian Counseling and Referral Service), George Dicks (Harborview Medical Center), Dave Foltz (Transforming Care), Brad Forbes (NAMI Washington), Carolyn Ham (Department of Health), Nick Hart (Alzheimer’s Association – Washington), Patricia Hunter (LTC Ombuds), Morei Lingle (Argentum), Cathy MacCaul (AARP Washington), Linda Moran (resident representative), Alyssa Odegaard (LeadingAge Washington), and Betty Schwieterman (Developmental Disabilities Ombuds)

**Work Group member attending in person:** Candy Goehring (Residential Care Services – DSHS)

**Department of Social and Health Services staff attendees via webinar:** Trish Harmon, Jeff Nelson, and Tracey Rollins

**Department of Social and Health Services staff attending in person:** Amy Abbott, Beverly Court, and Cathy McAvoy (facilitator)

### **Logistics and introductions**

Cathy McAvoy presented the recommended guidelines for participating in a virtual meeting via GoToWebinar. She thanked the group for taking time in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic to attend the meeting.

### **Review and approval of minutes**

Candy Goehring motioned to approve the March 18<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes as submitted. Ian Davros seconded the motion. Cathy McAvoy sent a poll from the webinar to the participants and the minutes were approved unanimously. Note: the meeting in April was canceled to allow members to respond to the COVID-19 pandemic.

## **Review of the first draft of the Final Report**

A round robin process for commenting on the draft report was facilitated by Cathy McAvoy to give all attendees the opportunity to offer suggestions and edits.

Robin Dale stated that he is pretty satisfied with the report. All in all he thinks it is good and doesn't think he will be submitting a dissent report. He will submit any additional edits or comments if he identifies an issue via email.

Ian Davros shared that he did not propose any major edits and agreed to send in a quote from the consumer's perspective.

G De Castro had no further comment at this time. He will send additional comments by email to Cathy McAvoy

George Dicks reported that he had no revisions at present to add in the GoToWebinar chat pane.

Nick Hart stated that he also had no edits.

Dave Foltz stated he was fine with the document as written.

Brad Forbes thanked everyone for the work and collaboration on this. He did not have any edits at this time but will shoot Cathy McAvoy an email if he comes up with any edits.

Candy Goehring had sent edits using Track Changes to Cathy McAvoy. She recommended adding to the Executive Summary where they left off with CoreQ and clarify for the reader there is more work to done there. Bev Court and Cathy McAvoy incorporated her suggestions in the draft being reviewed but they will check her document again to see what was missed.

Carolyn Ham said that she had no suggestions or edits at this time.

Patricia Hunter stated that she had more questions than comments. On page 3 of the Executive summary will there be a sentence that points readers to the dissent report if any are submitted? She shared that she hadn't decided if she is submitting a dissent report yet. She questioned if there was consensus about if the posting of the Disclosure of Services was voluntary as stated on page 4. For the 5<sup>th</sup> recommendation on page 4 she asked if that was the group's recommendation. Bev Court shared that this was the recommendation contained in the Interim Report. Patricia would like to add a 6<sup>th</sup> recommendation on page 4 that further deliberation is needed. In the first paragraph under the heading Further Deliberation is Needed she recommends that this work group should reconvene to pick up where the group left off. She did not support the formation of a different work group. She shared that the most important point is that reconvening this work group is another recommendation so that more measures can be fleshed out.

Morei Lingle stated that she missed the last meeting. She shared that her only comment was on page 3, Recommendation #2. Regarding the list of domains, she didn't think that community participation was selected as one of the final domains by the group and added that this may have been decided when she was not at the meeting.

Cathy MacCaul pointed out a couple of things. Regarding consistency, at the beginning of the report the numerations of the domains in Recommendation 2 are in a different order than in the two tables in pages 9 and 10. On page 11 the process for tracking and monitoring performance doesn't refer to the survey completed by the group and presented in Appendix 7. Page 11, which refers to a resident survey process to inform consumers, doesn't reflect all the work the group had done. She believes that there was more agreement that isn't reflected. Bev Court and Cathy McAvoy explained the thoughts around what was included in the current draft. The group was not given a chance to discuss potential facets for tracking and monitoring performance at the March 18<sup>th</sup> meeting because the meeting adjourned early. The group voted before there was discussion. Because the April meeting was canceled the work group was never given a chance to discuss the results of the votes. Cathy MacCaul stated that the clarification just given should be woven into this section.

Linda Moran had no comments except for context. She shared that there was going to be a meeting by a subgroup to help shape the draft but this did not happen. So members didn't miss anything. What had been planned to happen before the full group received the draft did not take place.

Alyssa Odegard stated that she didn't have any major edits. The one thing that came to her mind is the study of states. The estimate was included for Wisconsin and she wondered if we had that same information for Oregon. Cathy McAvoy shared that she had reached out to Oregon this past week and they didn't have a clear cut number to provide. Alyssa recommended that in Appendix 6 it might be worth calling out why there were different dates for voting on the domains. At the end of page 4, regarding the interruption of the work group, it should state they didn't have any discussion instead of that they did not complete their discussion.

Betty Schwieterman offered a couple of comments. She stated that she wanted to make sure that the report talks about CoreQ measures and that they are not enough. Also that so much more conversation is needed around developing more measures. She would also like it stated that if resident surveys are used that we make sure people are not screened out of the survey. Cathy McAvoy shared that Brad Forbes also mentioned that residents with behavior health issues should not be excluded. There was also concern expressed in the past that those with Alzheimer's or other dementia should be given the opportunity to participate in resident surveys.

After everyone shared their edits and comments, Cathy McAvoy offered members the opportunity for a second round of comments as the discussion may have given them other ideas based on the comments of other members.

Robin Dale offered that the conclusion on page 13 represents how far the group had gotten and what had been discussed.

Patricia Hunter pointed out that they add that sentence to the Executive Summary for the 6<sup>th</sup> recommendation to reconvene the work group to finish developing the measures. She is concerned the Legislature will stop at the Executive Summary and not read the entire report.

Candy Goehring added that she had just read page 4 and page 13 which goes back to her original comment that the work group had consensus on domains but not the metrics. She thinks this needs to be stated stronger in that section.

Discussion concluded about the draft Final Report and Cathy McAvoy asked members if they had any further comments on the report or any other comments that were unrelated to the report.

Cathy McAvoy will have the revised draft incorporating the comments from today's discussion out to the work group on May 27<sup>th</sup>. This will be the second of three opportunities members will have to review the draft. She also asks that any dissent reports be sent to her via email by June 1<sup>st</sup>. She will return the revised draft to the work group after June 1<sup>st</sup> so that they will know if there were any dissent reports submitted. She will revise the draft according to if there are any dissent reports submitted. If the dissent reports are too long they will be summarized in the Executive Summary and body of the report with the full report placed in an appendix.

### **Public and work group comment period**

There were no members of the public attending the meeting. There were no comments offered by work group members or DSHS staff.

### **June agenda and wrap-up**

Discussion moved on to the June 18<sup>th</sup> meeting. Cathy McAvoy asked if the group would like to meet and if not, if someone would make a motion to cancel the meeting. The meeting on the 18<sup>th</sup> will be held after the final draft is submitted to Bill Moss on June 15<sup>th</sup> so there may not be much to discuss. Betty Schwieterman made a motion to not meet on June 18<sup>th</sup>. Candy Goehring seconded it and the motion to cancel the June 18<sup>th</sup> meeting passed unanimously.

Bev Court congratulated members on the work that they had done to develop their recommendations and commended them.

Candy Goehring added that she thought it was well done.

Cathy McAvoy acknowledged the following for all the work and support they had provided to the work group:

- Jessica Dingwall Salquist for facilitating the work group meetings;

- Bev Court for providing her expertise for the quality metrics and report writing;
- Trish Harmon for taking meeting minutes and providing support before meetings;
- Jim Sherman for recording attendance and any motions and votes;
- Roger Gantz for the Study of the States;
- The Residential Care Services Management Team – Candy Goehring, Amy Abbott, Tracey Rollins, Ken Michie, and Jeff Nelson; and
- Work group members for being so conscientious and for all of their hard work.

Ian Davros commented on the amazing job Cathy McAvoy had done coordinating this work group. The meeting was adjourned.