

FOQIS Measure 1: Team Meetings Scoring Sheet

Exit Date:

Facility:

Event_ID:

SA Team Members:

Measure 1 (Team Meetings) Probes – Use the probes to guide your investigation and assist in determining the score for this measure. Once you have completed your investigation, provide a score for the team for Measure 1.

1. The SA team discussed the existence of potential Immediate Jeopardy (IJ) situations during each team meeting.

(Failure to identify a situation is scored in other measures, such as, Measure 2, Stage 1 Preliminary Investigations or Measure 4, Stage 2 Investigations.)

Notes:

2. The SA team discussed the existence of situations with a high likelihood of rising to the level of harm during each team meeting.

(Failure to investigate the related care area and resident is evaluated in Measure 3, Transition, and Stage 2 Sampling.)

Notes:

3. The SA surveyors discussed all pertinent findings for both resident and facility task assignments with the SA team during team meetings.

Notes:

4. The SA surveyors discussed all pertinent concerns from general observations of the facility and its residents.

Notes:

5. During Stage 2 team meetings, the surveyors discussed the need to substitute or supplement the Stage 2 sample.

Notes:

FOQIS Measure 1: Team Meetings Scoring Sheet

<p>6. The SA team discussed possible situation(s) of substandard quality of care (SQC) during the Stage 2 team meetings and expanded the sample to confirm or rule out SQC. (This must occur before the Team Analysis and Decision-making meeting.)</p> <p>Notes:</p>
<p>7. The RO evaluator did not need to provide guidance and education to correct the SA surveyor's team meetings.</p> <p>Notes:</p>

Score	Scoring for Measure 1: Team Meetings
Met (Pass)	The SA surveyors discussed all pertinent findings for residents and facility tasks or those that were not discussed had the potential for no more than minimal harm to the resident.
Partially Met (Pass)	The SA surveyors failed to discuss pertinent findings for residents and facility tasks that had the potential for more than minimal harm/discomfort to the resident, but not actual harm.
Not Met (Fail)	The SA surveyors failed to discuss IJ, SQC, or harm situations during the team meetings.

Note: Any concern should be provided to the SA manager so the State can follow-up internally.

Additional Notes:

**FOQIS Measure 2: Stage 1 Preliminary Investigation of the
Resident Interview & Resident Observation
Scoring Sheet**

Measure 2 (Resident Interview and Observation) Probes - Use the probes to guide your investigation and assist in determining the score for this measure. Once you have completed your investigation, provide a score for the team for Measure 2.

1. The SA surveyors identified any potential IJ situation and immediately brought it to the attention of the SA team.

Notes:

2. The SA surveyors asked all questions as written or, in the case of needed clarification, the surveyors provided a clear explanation of the intent of the question.

Notes:

3. The SA surveyors asked all questions.

Notes:

4. The SA surveyor conducted multiple observations of the resident throughout Stage 1.

Notes:

5. The RO evaluator and the SA surveyors had the same negative responses for the resident interview and observation.

Notes:

6. The SA surveyors correctly identified situations having a high likelihood of rising to the level of harm. The SA team's Stage 2 investigation of the resident concern substantiated harm.

Notes:

FOQIS Measure 2: Stage 1 Preliminary Investigation of the Resident Interview & Resident Observation Scoring Sheet

7. The SA surveyors documented all relevant findings for resident interview and observation responses with negative implications.

Notes:

8. The SA surveyors identified all concerns during general observations of the facility and its residents.

Notes:

Score	Scoring for Measure 2: Stage 1 Preliminary Investigation
Met (Pass)	The SA surveyors identified all resident interview, resident observation, and general observation concerns or those that were not identified had the potential for no more than minimal harm to the resident. The SA surveyors adequately followed the QIS process and any failures had the potential for no more than minimal harm to the resident.
Partially Met (Pass)	The SA surveyors failed to identify resident interview, resident observation, or general observation concerns that had the potential for more than minimal harm/discomfort to the resident, but not actual harm. The surveyors adequately followed the QIS process and any failures had the potential for no more than minimal harm to the resident.
Not Met (Fail)	The SA surveyors failed to identify IJ, SQC, or harm concerns for the resident interview, resident observation, and general observations. The SA surveyors failed to follow the QIS process that subsequently had a significant negative impact on the resident.

Note: Any concern should be provided to the SA manager so the State can follow-up internally.

Additional Notes:

FOQIS Measure 3: Transition from Stage 1 to Stage 2 and Stage 2 Sampling Scoring Sheet

Measure 3 (Transition from Stage 1 to Stage 2 and Stage 2 Sampling) Probes – Use the probes to guide your investigation and assist in determining the score for this measure. Once you have completed your investigation, provide a score for the team for Measure 3.

1. The SA team initiated all pertinent care areas or residents identified during Stage 1 team meetings.
Notes:

2. The SA team included in the Stage 2 Sample any situation identified as IJ.
Notes:

3. The SA team included in the Stage 2 Sample any situation(s) identified as having a high likelihood of rising to the level of harm.
Notes:

4. The SA team made Stage 1 data changes only for entries identified as a data entry error.
Notes:

5. The SA team coordinator initiated, as applicable, at least one resident for each of the following care areas: Dialysis, Ventilator, Preadmission Screening and Resident Review (PASRR), and Certified Medicare Hospice/End of Life Services.
Notes:

6. The SA team assigned all Stage 2 care areas, residents, and facility tasks.
Notes:

FOQIS Measure 3: Transition from Stage 1 to Stage 2 and Stage 2 Sampling Scoring Sheet

<p>7. The concerns missed by the SA team would have caused a care area or task to trigger. Notes:</p>
<p>8. The RO evaluator did not need to provide guidance and education to correct the SA surveyor's transition meeting. Notes:</p>

Score	Scoring for Measure 3: Transition from Stage 1 to Stage 2 and Stage 2 Sampling
Met (Pass)	The SA surveyors initiated all applicable care areas/residents and the SA's Stage 1 responses triggered the appropriate care areas or some Stage 1 response differences were found that had the potential for no more than minimal harm to the resident.
Partially Met (Pass)	The SA surveyors failed to trigger care areas because of Stage 1 response differences or failed to initiate applicable care areas/residents that had the potential for more than minimal harm/discomfort to the resident, but not actual harm.
Not Met (Fail)	The SA surveyors failed to trigger care areas because of Stage 1 response differences, failed to initiate all applicable care areas/residents or failed to include residents in the Stage 2 sample for IJ, SQC, or harm situations.

Note: Any concern should be provided to the SA manager so the State can follow-up internally.

Additional Notes:

**FOQIS Measure 4: Stage 2 – Stage 2 Investigations
(Care Area and Facility Task)
Scoring Sheet**

Measure 4 (Stage 2 Investigations) Probes – Use the probes to guide your investigation and assist in determining the score for this measure. Once you have completed your investigation, provide a score for the team for Measure 4.

1. The SA surveyors identified any potential IJ situation and immediately brought it to the attention of the SA team.

Notes:

2. The RO evaluator and SA surveyors agreed on all compliance decisions for a care area's critical elements related to assessments, care plans, and care plan implementation.

Notes:

3. The RO evaluator and SA surveyors agreed on all compliance decision(s) for a care area's critical element(s) related to the provision of care and services.

Notes:

4. The RO evaluator and SA surveyors agreed on all compliance decision(s) for a critical element related to the facility task.

Notes:

5. Of the CEs where both the RO evaluator and SA surveyor agreed on noncompliance, there was agreement on all severity-level determinations.

The RO evaluator must use severity guidance in Appendix P and PP to support the severity determination.

Notes:

**FOQIS Measure 4: Stage 2 – Stage 2 Investigations
(Care Area and Facility Task)
Scoring Sheet**

6. The SA surveyor investigated related structure, process or outcome care areas, or F-tags, as applicable.
Notes:

7. The RO evaluator did not need to provide guidance and education to correct the SA surveyor’s investigation.
Notes:

Score	Scoring for Measure 4: Stage 2 Investigations
Met (Pass)	The SA surveyors’ investigation was adequate or the SA surveyors’ investigation required RO guidance and education because the SA surveyors failed to identify concerns during the in-depth investigation and/or failed to make the correct compliance or severity determination that had the potential for no more than minimal harm to the resident.
Partially Met (Pass)	The SA surveyors’ investigation required RO guidance and education because the SA surveyors failed to identify concerns during the in-depth investigation and/or failed to make the correct compliance or severity determination that had the potential for more than minimal harm/discomfort to the resident, without actual harm.
Not Met (Fail)	The SA surveyors’ investigation required RO guidance and education because the SA surveyors failed to identify IJ, SQC, or harm concerns during the in-depth investigation and/or failed to make correct IJ, SQC, or harm compliance or severity determinations.

Note: Any concern should be provided to the SA manager so the State can follow-up internally.

Additional Notes:

FOQIS Measure 5: Team Analysis and Decision Making Scoring Sheet

Measure 5 (Team Analysis and Decision Making) Probes – Use the probes to guide your investigation and assist in determining the score for this measure. Once you have completed your investigation, provide a score for the team for Measure 5.

1. The SA team marked all applicable residents for inclusion in the citation (no residents were inappropriately excluded).

Notes:

2. The SA team made correct compliance decisions.

Notes:

3. Where the RO evaluator agreed with the compliance decision, the SA team made correct F-tag determinations.

Notes:

4. Where the RO evaluator agreed with the compliance decision, the SA team made correct severity and scope decisions.

Notes:

5. The SA team identified SQC as defined in Appendix P at this point in the survey and expanded the sample to confirm or rule out SQC.

Notes:

6. The RO evaluator did not need to provide guidance and education to correct the SA surveyor's analysis and decision making meeting.

Notes:

FOQIS Measure 5: Team Analysis and Decision Making Scoring Sheet

Score	Scoring for Measure 5: Team Analysis and Decision Making
Met (Pass)	The SA surveyors made the correct compliance, F-tag, and severity and scope decisions, or when they did not, the incorrect decisions had the potential for no more than minimal harm to the resident.
Partially Met (Pass)	The SA surveyors made incorrect compliance, F-tag, and severity and scope decisions that had the potential for more than minimal harm/discomfort to the resident, but not actual harm.
Not Met (Fail)	The SA surveyors made incorrect compliance, F-tag, and severity decisions that were IJ, SQC or harm.

Note: Any concern should be provided to the SA manager so the State can follow-up internally.

Additional Notes: