

# FOQIS Training

## Training on the FOQIS Procedures

# FOQIS Purpose and Goal

- Evaluate QIS State Agency performance
- Structured and objective process
- Ratio: 1:4

# Offsite Prep Steps

- DAR-RO Review
- Select a Survey
- Create Scoring Sheet
- Ensure forms are available
- Assemble reference materials/supplies
- State prep for wired network method

# Targeted Evaluations

- Targeted Evaluation Based on Offsite DAR-RO Data:
  - Team selection
  - Onsite evaluation activities for Stage 1 investigation (Measure 2) and Stage 2 investigation (Measure 4)
- Mandatory Evaluation:
  - Team Meetings (Measure 1)
  - Transition S1 to S2 (Measure 3)
  - Analysis and Decision Making (Measure 5)

# DAR-RO for the QI and FOQIS

- Quality Improvement Call
  - Occurs after receipt of each 1/4ly DAR-RO or at least bi-annually
  - Review and discuss all data items that are an outlier (low and high outliers)
- FOQIS
  - Review four data items
  - Only focus on low outliers

# Step 1: DAR-RO Review

- DAR-RO Item 2&19 (2 is the triggering rate)
  - Resident Interview
  - Resident Observation
- Examples:
  - Low rate for Skin Conditions (Resident Observation) = RO will follow-up onsite
  - Low rate for Notification of Change (Family Interview) = RO will not follow-up onsite

# Step 1: DAR-RO Review

- DAR-RO Item 2&19 (19 is the citation rate when triggered)
- Abuse is a high priority area
- May need to prioritize workload

# Training DAR-RO Items 2 and 19

Regional Office: Region 11										
Survey Exit Dates: 1/1/2012 - 3/31/2012										
Quarterly Report Date: 5/01/2012										
Q1 CY2012		National	Region 11	State A	DO1	DO2	DO3	DO4	DO5	DO6
yellow-low outlier										
green-high outlier										
Number of Surveys Included:		849	240	183	24	24	36	42	30	27
2&19 Triggering: Number (# Triggered) and percentage (% Triggered) of surveys on which the Care Area triggered for a Stage 2 Investigation. Citation: Number (# Cited) and percentage (% Cited) of citations when triggered.										
Abuse	# Triggered	364	103	81	12	12	16	20	10	11
	% Triggered	43%	43%	44%	50%	50%	44%	48%	33%	41%
	# Cited	133	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	% Cited	37%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Abuse Prohibition Review	# Triggered	364	103	81	12	12	16	20	10	11
	% Triggered	43%	43%	44%	50%	50%	44%	48%	33%	41%
	# Cited	177	40	17	0	6	5	0	2	4
	% Cited	49%	39%	21%	0%	50%	31%	0%	20%	36%
Accidents	# Triggered	828	240	183	24	24	36	42	30	27
	% Triggered	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	# Cited	283	87	82	1	22	10	37	6	6
	% Cited	34%	36%	45%	4%	92%	28%	88%	20%	22%
Activities	# Triggered	399	112	81	0	12	20	22	15	12
	% Triggered	47%	47%	44%	0%	50%	56%	52%	50%	44%
	# Cited	177	44	33	-	5	8	9	6	5
	% Cited	44%	40%	41%	-	42%	40%	41%	40%	42%
Activities of Daily Living	# Triggered	343	95	82	3	17	17	9	18	18
	% Triggered	40%	40%	45%	13%	71%	47%	21%	60%	67%
	# Cited	130	40	38	0	7	17	0	7	7
	% Cited	38%	42%	46%	0%	41%	100%	0%	39%	39%
Admission, Transfer, and Discharge Review	# Triggered	304	91	73	24	8	13	12	8	8
	% Triggered	36%	38%	40%	100%	33%	36%	29%	27%	30%
	# Cited	187	66	41	12	5	7	7	5	5
	% Cited	62%	72%	56%	50%	63%	54%	58%	63%	63%
Behavioral and Emotional Status	# Triggered	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	% Triggered	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

# Step 1: DAR-RO Review

- DAR-RO Item 5 (negative response rate)
  - Resident interview
  - Resident observation

# Step 1: DAR-RO Review

- DAR-RO Item 12 (facility task citation rate)
- Infection Control, QA&A, Abuse Prohibition are high priority
- May need to prioritize workload

# Step 2: Select a Survey

- Select a Survey
  - Identify outliers from DAR-RO
  - Obtain SA schedule
  - Select a survey from a district and surveyors that have the most concerns from the DAR-RO

# Step 3: Create FOQIS Scoring Sheet

- FOQIS Scoring Sheet
  - Create electronic version of FOQIS Scoring Sheet
  - List concerns from DAR-RO in applicable Measure Scoring Sheet
- FOQIS package on the S&C website

# Steps 4 and 5: Forms

- Ensure forms are available
  - Print the Stage 1 Resident Interview and Resident Observation form (only one for all surveyors)
  - Print all other Stage 1 forms
  - Bring CMS-807 forms (for Stage 2 investigation)

# Step 6: Reference Materials and Supplies

- **Assemble materials**

- Laptop with the most recent release of ASE-Q
- SOM
- QIS Checklist
- QIS IT and Surveyor Guide
- Most Recent Quarterly State-Specific DAR-RO with Surveyor-Level Report
- Print copies of all Stage 1 forms
- Surveyor Notes worksheets
- CE and Facility Pathways
- Calculator (for Measure 3)
- Crossover Cable

# Step 7: SA Prep for Cable

The SA will have to confirm:

1. Two ports are opened in all firewalls
2. SA laptops are set up to use dynamic IP addresses from a DHCP server
3. Any questions or problems with wired network method SA should call QTSO Help Desk – 1-888-477-7876

# Onsite FOQIS Activities

- Initial Onsite Activities
- Introduce FOQIS to the SA team
- Measure 1 (Team Meetings)
- Measure 2 (Stage 1 Preliminary Investigations)
- Measure 3 (Transition S1 to S2)
- Measure 4 (Stage 2 Investigations)
- Measure 5 (Team Analysis and Decision Making)
- Debriefing the SA team

# Step 8: Initial Onsite Activities

- Enter the facility with the SA team
- Can accompany surveyor on Initial Tour
  - Not formally evaluated
- Extenuating circumstances, enter the facility before the initial SA team meeting

# Step 9: Introduce FOQIS to SA

- Explain the purpose of FOQIS
- DAR-RO and onsite evaluation activities
- On-going dialogue in Stage 1 and 2
- Parallel investigations
- RO guidance and education or re-direction
- SA must notify you of relevant activities and meetings
- Import SA data
- FOQIS scoring system
- Debriefing
- Confide in CMS interference from SA

# Step 10: Measure 1 – Team Meetings

- Assess the following team meetings:
  - Initial SA team meeting
  - Stage 1 team meetings
  - Stage 2 team meetings

# Scoring

- Scoring:
  - Follow the probes
  - Document concerns on the applicable scoring sheet
  - Provide a score for each Measure

Score	S/S Grid
Met	Level 1
Partially Met	Level 2
Not Met	Levels 3 or 4

# Measure 1 Probes

1. Discussed potential IJ
2. Discussed high likelihood of harm
3. Discussed pertinent findings for resident and facility tasks
4. Discussed pertinent concerns from general observations of facility and residents
5. Stage 2, discussed need to supplement/substitute Stage 2 sample
6. Discussed SQC and expanded sample as needed
7. Provided guidance and education

# Scoring for Measure 1

Score	Scoring for Measure 1: Team Meetings
<b>Met (Pass)</b>	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.
<b>Partially Met (Pass)</b>	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.
<b>Not Met (Fail)</b>	The SA surveyors failed to discuss IJ, SQC, or harm situations during the team meetings.

# Step 12: Measure 2 – Stage 1 Preliminary Investigations

- Stage 1 preliminary investigations:
  - Resident Interview (one per surveyor)
  - Resident Observation (one per surveyor)
  - Interview and observe the same resident
- Request Census Sample Report
- Document concerns on Resident Interview and Observation form
- Conduct multiple observations of the resident

# Measure 2 – On-going Dialogue Between the RO and SA

- On-going dialogue to determine if surveyor identified the same concerns
- Make general observations of the facility and all residents

# Measure 2 Probes

1. Identified potential Immediate Jeopardy
2. Asked questions as written and maintained the intent of the question if not understood by the resident
3. Asked all questions
4. RO and SA had the same negative responses
5. Conducted multiple observations
6. Identified high likelihood of harm
7. Documented relevant findings for negative response
8. Identified all concerns during general observations

# Scoring for Measure 2

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, and 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.

# Step 15: Measure 3 – Transition from S1 to S2 and S2 Sampling

- Assess whether the SA:
  - Correctly identifies issues and residents for Stage 2 investigation
- Steps:
  - Import TC's data after QCLIs are calculated (Step 14)

# Measure 3 – Import Vs. Synch

- ASE to ASE Import
  - Done in ASE
  - Mirror image of TC's data
  - Overwrites previous file
- Synchronizing data in ASE-Q
  - Done in ASE-Q
  - Either push or pull of specific data at a given point in time

# Measure 3 – Reconciliation of Stage 1 Findings

- Reconciliation of Stage 1 Findings:
  - Negative responses missed by the SA
  - Determine whether the SA has a reasonable explanation for the missed concern
- Determination whether a situation warrants RO re-direction

# Measure 3 – Stage 1 Re-direction

- Stage 1 Re-direction:
  - Failure to trigger a care area or task
    - Negative responses missed by the team would have caused a care area or task to trigger
    - If the RO provides re-direction, the SA initiates the care area and at least three residents
    - Document the decision in relevant findings
  - Failure to address harm or IJ
    - Initiate the applicable care area and resident(s)
    - Document the decision in relevant findings

# Measure 3 Probes

1. Initiated all pertinent care areas/residents identified during meetings
2. Included in the Stage 2 sample any IJ situation
3. Included in the Stage 2 sample any harm situations
4. Accurately corrected Stage 1 data entry errors
5. Initiated the four mandatory areas
6. Assigned all Stage 2 work
7. Negative response differences that affected the triggering of a care area
8. Provided guidance and education

# Scoring for Measure 3

<b>Score</b>	<b>Scoring for Measure 3: Transition from Stage 1 to Stage 2 and Stage 2 Sampling</b>
<b>Met (Pass)</b>	<b>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.</b>
<b>Partially Met (Pass)</b>	<b>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.</b>
<b>Not Met (Fail)</b>	<b>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.</b>

# Step 18: Measure 4 – Stage 2 Investigations

- Assess the surveyor's:
  - Stage 2 in-depth investigations skills
  - Individual decision-making skills
- Request the Stage 2 Report by Stage 2 Surveyor (Step 16)

# Step 17: Measure 4 – Stage 2 Workload Preparation

- Stage 2 workload prioritization criteria:
  - At least one care area or non-mandatory task for each surveyor
  - Mix of quality of care and quality of life care areas
  - CAs where harm, SQC or IJ is suspected
  - Multiple evaluations of the same CA for different surveyors
- Have the pathway available
- Determine why each selected area triggered

# Measure 4 - Stage 2 Parallel Investigation

- Parallel investigation is your investigation of the same care area or task that the surveyor investigates during a FOQIS
- Perform a comprehensive and thorough investigation
- Conduct part of the investigation with the surveyor (e.g., formal observations and interviews and whenever possible, routine observations)
- Conduct part of the investigation independently of the surveyor (e.g., if necessary, routine observations and record review)

# Measure 4 - Examples of Formal Observations

- Toileting or incontinence care
- Transfers
- Wound observation
- Dressing change
- ADL care
- Feeding assistance
- Rehab or restorative services
- *Please note that this is not a comprehensive list*

# Measure 4 - Examples of Routine, Brief Observations of the Resident

- Splint applied
- Proper grooming
- Position changes or repositioning
- Activity involvement
- Fall prevention devices in place
- Proper positioning
- *Please note that this is not a comprehensive list*

# Measure 4 - Stage 2 Guidance and Education

- Ongoing dialogue between the RO and the surveyor
- Ask the surveyor about conclusions, reasoning, plan for the investigation, and CE compliance decisions

# Measure 4 - Stage 2 Guidance and Education

Provide guidance and education if:

- The surveyor is not conducting an adequate investigation
- The surveyor is not conducting a related care area investigation
- Certain that the surveyor would not have taken corrective action on his/her own

# Measure 4 - Examples that Warrant Stage 2 Guidance and Education

- ROM care plan indicates the resident receives restorative PROM every morning (Level II program).
- The RO determines through conversation with the surveyor that the surveyor doesn't plan to observe this activity.
- The surveyor doesn't discuss this resident during the end of the day meeting with the team.
- The team plans to exit the next day.
- The RO provides guidance and education.

# Measure 4 - Examples that Warrant a Stage 2 Guidance and Education

- The RO observes restorative feeding with the surveyor.
- The RO notes concerns with the feeding.
- During the meal, the RO asks the surveyor if he/she has any concerns. The surveyor indicates No.
- The RO intervenes since the surveyor's investigation is inadequate.
- Since the surveyor failed to appropriately identify concerns, the necessary follow-up observations and interviews with the resident and staff would not have been conducted without the RO's guidance and education.

# Measure 4 – Mandatory Facility Tasks (Step 13)

- Mandatory task investigations may start in Stage 1
- Parallel investigation conducted
- On-going dialogue between the RO and SA
- Guidance and education, as needed

# Measure 4 – Comparing Documentation

- Compare CE decisions by querying the surveyor
- Reconcile differences

# Measure 4 Probes

1. Identified any IJ situation
2. Agreement on all CE decisions for process tags
3. Agreement on CE decisions for provision of care
4. Agreement on CE decisions for facility tasks
5. Agreement on severity determinations
6. Investigated related structure, process or outcome areas, as applicable
7. Need for RO guidance and education

# Scoring for Measure 4

Score	Scoring for Measure 4: Stage 2 Investigations
<b>Met (Pass)</b>	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.
<b>Partially Met (Pass)</b>	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.
<b>Not Met (Fail)</b>	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.

# Step 20: Measure 5 – Team Analysis and Decision Making Meeting

- Import the Stage 2 Data (Step 19)
- RO can participate onsite or offsite
- Assess the team:
  - Makes correct compliance decisions
  - Makes correct scope and severity decisions

# Measure 5 Probes

1. Included all applicable residents
2. Made correct compliance decisions
3. Made correct F-tag determinations
4. Made correct S/S determinations
5. SQC identified and sample was expanded, as applicable
6. Provided guidance and education

# Scoring for Measure 5

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.

# Step 21: SA Debriefing

- Debrief the SA team following the analysis and decision making meeting
  - Communicate results of the FOQIS
  - Give indication of SA performance for each measure
  - Do not provide scores

# Post-Survey FOQIS Activities

- Evaluate the CMS-2567 (Step 23)
- Forward FOQIS Scoring Sheet to SA (Step 24)
- Enter FOQIS documentation in the FMS database (Step 25)