

Protecting, Maintaining and Improving the Health of Minnesotans

Certified Mail # 7009 1410 0000 2303 6147

May 18, 2010

Laurie Anderson, Administrator Epiphany Assisted Living LLC 10955 Hanson Boulevard NW Coon Rapids, MN 55433

Re: Results of State Licensing Survey

Dear Ms. Anderson:

The above agency was surveyed on May 4, 5, and 7, 2010, for the purpose of assessing compliance with state licensing regulations. State licensing orders are delineated on the attached Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) correction order form. The correction order form should be signed and returned to this office when all orders are corrected. We urge you to review these orders carefully, item by item, and if you find that any of the orders are not in accordance with your understanding at the time of the exit conference following the survey, you should immediately contact me. If further clarification is necessary, an informal conference can be arranged.

A final version of the Correction Order form is enclosed. This document will be posted on the MDH website.

Also attached is an optional Provider questionnaire, which is a self-mailer, which affords the provider with an opportunity to give feedback on the survey experience.

Please note, it is your responsibility to share the information contained in this letter and the results of this visit with the President of your facility's Governing Body.

Please feel free to call our office with any questions at (651) 201-4309.

Sincerely,

Etricia Ala

Patricia Nelson, Supervisor Home Care & Assisted Living Program

Enclosures

cc: Anoka County Social Services Ron Drude, Minnesota Department of Human Services Sherilyn Moe, Office of the Ombudsman

01/07 CMR3199

Division of Compliance Monitoring Home Care & Assisted Living Program 85 East 7th Place Suite, 220 • PO Box 64900 • St. Paul, MN 55164-0900 • 651-201-5273 General Information: 651-201-5000 or 888-345-0823 • TTY: 651-201-5797 • Minnesota Relay Service: 800-627-3529 http://www.health.state.mn.us An equal opportunity employer

CERTIFIED MAIL #: 7009 1410 0000 2303 6147

FROM: Minnesota Department of Health, Division of Compliance Monitoring 85 East Seventh Place, Suite 220, P.O. Box 64900, St. Paul, Minnesota 55164-0900 Home Care & Assisted Living Program

Futricia Ala

Patricia Nelson, Supervisor - (651) 201-4309

TO: PROVIDER: ADDRESS: LAURIE ANDERSON EPIPHANY ASSISTED LIVING LLC 10955 HANSON BOULEVARD NW COON RAPIDS, MN 55433 DATE: May 18, 2010 COUNTY: ANOKA HFID: 21113

On May 4, 5 and 7, 2010, a surveyor of this Department's staff visited the above provider and the following correction orders are issued. When corrections are completed please sign and date, make a copy of the form for your records and return the original to the above address.

Signed:_____ Date: _____

In accordance with Minnesota Statute §144A.45, this correction order has been issued pursuant to a survey. If, upon re-survey, it is found that the violation or violations cited herein are not corrected, a fine for each violation not corrected shall be assessed in accordance with a schedule of fines promulgated by rule of the Minnesota Department of Health.

Determination of whether a violation has been corrected requires compliance with all requirements of the rule provided in the section entitled "TO COMPLY." Where a rule contains several items, failure to comply with any of the items may be considered lack of compliance and subject to a fine.

You may request a hearing on any assessments that may result from non-compliance with these orders provided that a written request is made to the Department within 15 days of receipt of a notice of assessment for non-compliance.

NO VIOLATIONS NOTED

cc: Anoka County Social Services Ron Drude, Minnesota Department of Human Services Sherilyn Moe, Office of the Ombudsman



Protecting, Maintaining and Improving the Health of Minnesotans

Certified Mail # 7004 1160 0004 8711 8192

November 9, 2005

Laurie Anderson, Administrator Epiphany Assisted Living LLC 10955 Hanson Boulevard Coon Rapids, MN 55433

Re: Licensing Follow Up Revisit

Dear Ms Anderson:

This is to inform you of the results of a facility visit conducted by staff of the Minnesota Department of Health, Case Mix Review Program, on July 21 and 22, 2005.

The documents checked below are enclosed.

- X Informational Memorandum Items noted and discussed at the facility visit including status of outstanding licensing correction orders.
- <u>MDH Correction Order and Licensed Survey Form</u> Correction order(s) issued pursuant to visit of your facility.
- <u>Notices Of Assessment For Noncompliance With Correction Orders For Home Care Providers</u>

Feel free to call our office if you have any questions at (651) 215-8703.

Sincerely,

Jean Johnston, Program Manager Case Mix Review Program

Enclosure(s)

cc: Dawn Mannella, President Governing Board Gloria Lehnertz, Minnesota Department of Human Services Anoka County Social Services Sherilyn Moe, Office of Ombudsman for Older Minnesotans Case Mix Review File

10/04 FPC1000CMR

Minnesota Department Of Health Health Policy, Information and Compliance Monitoring Division Case Mix Review Section

INFORMATIONAL MEMORANDUM

PROVIDER: EPIPHANY ASSISTED LIVING LLC

DATE OF SURVEY: J	July 21 and 22, 2005	5
--------------------------	----------------------	---

BEDS LICE	INSED:					
HOSP:	NH:	BCH:	SLFA:	SLFB:	_	
CENSUS:						
HOSP:	NH:	BCH:	SLF:			
BEDS CER	FIFIED:					
SNF/18:	SNF 18/	19: N	FI:NI	FII: ICF/	MR: OTHER:	
ALHCP						
NAMES AN	D TITLES	OF PERSON	NS INTERVII	EWED:		
1. Mary	Donofrio, R	N/Case Mana	ger			
2. Susar	n Taylor, VI	P Health Servi	ce Innovations			
	ra Lammert.					
4	x 1 x					

4. Kathy Johnson, Family Member

SUBJECT: Licensing Survey Licensing Order F	ollow Up <u>X</u>
---	-------------------

ITEMS NOTED AND DISCUSSED:

1) An unannounced visit was made to followup on the status of state licensing orders issued as a result of a visit made on March 4, 7, 8 and 9, 2005. The results of the survey were delineated during the exit conference. Refer to Exit Conference Attendance Sheet for the names of individuals attending the exit conference. The status of the Correction orders is as follows:

1. MN Rule 4668.0815 Subp. 2.	Corrected
2. MN Rule 4668.0845 Subp. 2.	Corrected
3. MN Rule 4668.0865 Subp. 9.	Corrected
4. MN Statute 144A.44 Subdivision 1. (2)	Corrected



Protecting, Maintaining and Improving the Health of Minnesotans

Certified Mail # 7004 1160 0004 8714 4061

April 5, 2005

Laurie Anderson, Administrator Epiphany Assisted Living 10955 Hanson Boulevard Coon Rapids, MN 55433

Re: Results of State Licensing Survey

Dear Ms. Anderson:

The above agency was surveyed on March 4, 7, 8, and 9, 2005, for the purpose of assessing compliance with state licensing regulations. State licensing deficiencies, if found, are delineated on the attached Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) correction order form. The correction order form should be signed and returned to this office when all orders are corrected. We urge you to review these orders carefully, item by item, and if you find that any of the orders are not in accordance with your understanding at the time of the exit conference following the survey, you should immediately contact me, or the RN Program Coordinator. If further clarification is necessary, I can arrange for an informal conference at which time your questions relating to the order(s) can be discussed.

A final version of the Licensing Survey Form is enclosed. This document will be posted on the MDH website.

Also attached is an optional Provider questionnaire, which is a self-mailer, which affords the provider with an opportunity to give feedback on the survey experience.

Please feel free to call our office with any questions at (651) 215-8703.

Sincerely,

Jean Johnston, Program Manager Case Mix Review Program

Enclosures

cc: Dawn Manella, President Governing Board Case Mix Review File

CMR 3199 6/04



Assisted Living Home Care Provider LICENSING SURVEY FORM

Registered nurses from the Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) use the Licensing Survey Form during an on-site visit to evaluate the care provided by Assisted Living home care providers (ALHCP). The ALHCP licensee may also use the form to monitor the quality of services provided to clients at any time. Licensees may use their completed Licensing Survey Form to help communicate to MDH nurses during an on-site regulatory visit.

During an on-site visit, MDH nurses will interview ALHCP staff, make observations, and review some of the agency's documentation. The nurses may also talk to clients and/or their representatives. This is an opportunity for the licensee to explain to the MDH nurse what systems are in place to provide Assisted Living services. Completing the Licensing Survey Form in advance may expedite the survey process.

Licensing requirements listed below are reviewed during a survey. A determination is made whether the requirements are met or not met for each Indicator of Compliance box. This form must be used in conjunction with a copy of the ALHCP home care regulations. Any violations of ALHCP licensing requirements are noted at the end of the survey form.

Name of ALHCP: EPIPHANY ASSISTED LIVING LLC

HFID # (MDH internal use): 21113
Dates of Survey: March 4, 7, 8, and 9, 2005
Project # (MDH internal use): QL21113002

Indicators of Compliance	Outcomes Observed	Comments
1. The agency only accepts and retains clients for whom it can meet the needs as agreed to in the service plan. (MN Rules 4668.0050, 4668.0800 Subpart 3, 4668.0815, 4668.0825, 4668.0845, 4668.0865)	Each client has an assessment and service plan developed by a registered nurse within 2 weeks and prior to initiation of delegated nursing services, reviewed at least annually, and as needed. The service plan accurately describes the client's needs. Care is provided as stated in the service plan. The client and/or representative understands what care will be provided and what it costs.	Met X Correction Order(s) issued X Education provided

ALHCP Licensing Survey Form Page 2 of 8

		Page 2 of 8
Indicators of Compliance	Outcomes Observed	Comments
2. Agency staff promotes the clients' rights as stated in the Minnesota Home Care Bill of Rights. (MN Statute 144A.44; MN Rule 4668.0030)	No violations of the MN Home Care Bill of Rights (BOR) are noted during observations, interviews, or review of the agency's documentation. Clients and/or their representatives receive a copy of the BOR when (or before) services are initiated. There is written acknowledgment in the client's clinical record to show that the BOR was received (or why acknowledgment could not be obtained).	X Met Correction Order(s) issued Education provided
3. The health, safety, and well being of clients are protected and promoted. (MN Statutes 144A.44; 144A.46 Subd. 5(b), 144D.07, 626.557; MN Rules 4668.0065, 4668.0805)	Clients are free from abuse or neglect. Clients are free from restraints imposed for purposes of discipline or convenience. Agency staff observes infection control requirements. There is a system for reporting and investigating any incidents of maltreatment. There is adequate training and supervision for all staff. Criminal background checks are performed as required.	X Met Correction Order(s) issued X Education provided
4. The agency has a system to receive, investigate, and resolve complaints from its clients and/or their representatives. (MN Rule 4668.0040)	There is a formal system for complaints. Clients and/or their representatives are aware of the complaint system. Complaints are investigated and resolved by agency staff.	X Met Correction Order(s) issued Education provided
5. The clients' confidentiality is maintained. (MN Statute 144A.44; MN Rule 4668.0810)	Client personal information and records are secure. Any information about clients is released only to appropriate parties. Permission to release information is obtained, as required, from clients and/or their representatives.	X Met Correction Order(s) issued Education provided
6. Changes in a client's condition are recognized and acted upon. (MN Rules 4668.0815, 4668.0820, 4668.0825)	A registered nurse is contacted when there is a change in a client's condition that requires a nursing assessment or reevaluation, a change in the services and/or there is a problem with providing services as stated in the service plan. Emergency and medical services are contacted, as needed. The client and/or representative are informed when changes occur.	Met X Correction Order(s) issued X Education provided

ALHCP Licensing Survey Form Page 3 of 8

		Page 3 of 8
Indicators of Compliance	Outcomes Observed	Comments
7. The agency employs (or contracts with) qualified staff. (MN Statutes 144D.065; 144A.45, Subd. 5; MN Rules 4668.0070, 4668.0820, 4668.0825, 4668.0030, 4668.0835, 4668.0840)	Staff has received training and/or competency evaluations as required, including training in dementia care, if applicable. Nurse licenses are current. The registered nurse(s) delegates nursing tasks only to staff who are competent to perform the procedures that have been delegated. The process of delegation and supervision is clear to all staff and reflected in their job descriptions.	X Met Correction Order(s) issued Education provided
8. Medications are stored and administered safely. (MN Rules 4668.0800 Subpart 3, 4668.0855, 4668.0860)	The agency has a system for the control of medications. Staff is trained by a registered nurse prior to administering medications. Medications and treatments administered are ordered by a prescriber. Medications are properly labeled. Medications and treatments are administered as prescribed. Medications and treatments administered are documented.	Met X Correction Order(s) issued X Education provided N/A
9. Continuity of care is promoted for clients who are discharged from the agency. (MN Statute 144A.44, 144D.04; MN Rules 4668.0050, 4668.0170, 4668.0800,4668.0870)	Clients are given information about other home care services available, if needed. Agency staff follows any Health Care Declarations of the client. Clients are given advance notice when services are terminated by the ALHCP. Medications are returned to the client or properly disposed of at discharge from a HWS.	X Met Correction Order(s) issued X Education provided N/A
 10. The agency has a current license. (MN Statutes 144D.02, 144D.04, 144D.05, 144A.46; MN Rule 4668.0012 Subp.17) <u>Note</u>: MDH will make referrals to the Attorney General's office for violations of MN Statutes 144D or 325F.72; and make other referrals, as needed. 	The ALHCP license (and other licenses or registrations as required) are posted in a place that communicates to the public what services may be provided. The agency operates within its license(s).	X Met Correction Order(s) issued Education provided

<u>Please note</u>: Although the focus of the licensing survey is the regulations listed in the Indicators of Compliance boxes above, other violations may be cited depending on what systems a provider has or fails to have in place and/or the severity of a violation. Also, the results of the focused licensing survey may result in an expanded survey where additional interviews, observations, and documentation reviews are conducted. Survey Results:

_____ All Indicators of Compliance listed above were met.

For Indicators of Compliance not met and/or education provided, list the number, regulation number, and example(s) of deficient practice noted:

Indicator of		Correction Order	Education	
Compliance	Regulation	Issued	provided	Statement(s) of Deficient Practice/Education:
1.	MN Rule	Х	Х	Based on record reviews and
	4668.0815 Subp. 2.			interviews, the agency failed to have a
	Service plan reevaluation			registered nurse review and revise two
				of four clients (#2 and #4) service plan
				or conduct their annual evaluation. The findings include:
				mangs menuae.
				Clients #2 and #4 had nursing
				assessments and evaluations conducted
				upon admission on November 10, 2003.
				Client #2 and #4's medical records
				were reviewed March 7, 2005 and did
				not contain an annual nursing
				evaluation or an annual review of the
				service plan. When interviewed March 4, 2005 the registered nurse stated that
				the annual nursing assessments and
				evaluations had not been completed
				r
				Education: Provided
1.	MN Rule	Х	Х	Based on record review and interview,
	4668.0845 Subp. 2			the agency failed to have supervisory
	Services that require			visits of unlicensed persons who were
	supervision by a registered			performing delegated nursing services
	nurse			for two of four (#1 and #2) clients' reviewed. The findings include:
				reviewed. The infanigs include.
				Client #1 was admitted September 3,
				2004. A registered nurse conducted
				nursing evaluations on July 29 2004
				and September 8, 2004. The next
				documented supervisory visit was
				March 4, 2005, 175 days later. There
				was no documentation of monitoring
				visits by a licensed practical nurse
				between September 8, 2004 and March 4, 2005.
				Client #2's medical record indicated
				that an initial nursing evaluation was

ALHCP Licensing Survey Form Page 5 of 8

Indicator of ComplianceCorrection ItsuedEducation providedStatement(s) of Deficient Practice#Jucation: Statement(s) of Deficient Practice#Jucation: November 10, 2003. There were no further supervisory visits from the registered nurse. On November 22, 2004, 377 days later, there was a monitoring visit conducted by a rejected nurse. On November 22, 2004, 377 days later, there was a monitoring visit conducted when it was reviewed March 4, 2005. When interviewed on March 4, 2005. When interviewed on March 4, 2005 the registered nurse. On Control of the registered nurse of domain of the supervisory visit source not dome.6.MN Statute 144A.44 Subdivision 1. (2) Bill of rightsXXBased on record review and interview the assisted living care and services according to a suitable and up-to-date plan for one of four client's (#3) record reviewed. The findings include:Client #3 was admitted to the memory care unit October 21, 2004, a registered nurse (NN) conducted initial nursing assessments on October 21, and 23, 2004. On October 21, 2004, a registered nurse (RN) conducted initial nursing assessments on October 21, and 23, 2004. On October 21, 2004, a registered nurse (RN) conducted initial nursing assessments on October 21, and 23, 2004. On October 21, 2004, a registered nurse (RN) conducted initial nursing assessments on October 21, 2004, a registered nurse ond with toileting, transferring and ambulation with a walker, Client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3					Page 5 of 8
ComplianceRegulationIssuedprovidedStatements) of Deficient Practice Education: conducted by a registered nurse on November 10, 2003. There were no further supervisory visits from the registered nurse. On November 22, 2004, 377 days later, there was a monitoring visit conducted by a licensed practical nurse. There were no further supervisory or monitoring visits documented when it was reviewed March 4, 2005. When interviewed On March 4, 2005 the registered nurse. On November 20, 2004, 377 days later, there was a monitoring visit documented when it was reviewed March 4, 2005. When interviewed On March 4, 2005 the registered nurse stated that the supervisory visits were not done.6.MN Statute 144A.44 Subdivision 1. (2) Bill of rightsXXBased on record review and interview the assisted living home care provider failed to provide care and services according to a suitable and up-to-date plan for one of four client's (#3) record reviewed. The findings include:7.Client #3 was admitted to the memory care unit October 21, 2004, A registered nurse on October 21, and 23, 2004. On October 21, 2004, a "RESIDENT CARE PLAN" was established, and indicated client #3 was independent with toileting, transferring and ambuation with a walker. Client #3 had falls on December 19, 24 and 28, 2004. On December 29, 2004, a registered nurse conducted a supervisory visit and nuted client #3 was not registered nurse conducted a supervisory visit and and client #3 was not registered nurse optior right head with "significant bleccing" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider thad a 					
conducted by a registered nurse on November 10, 2003. There were no November 10, 2003. There were no further supervisory visits from the registered nurse. On November 22, 2004, 377 days later, there was a monitoring visit conducted by a licensed practical nurse. There were no further supervisory or monitoring visits documented when it was reviewed March 4, 2005 the registered nurse stated that the supervisory visits were not done.6.MN Statute 144A.44 Subdivision 1. (2) Bill of rightsXX8.Based on record review and interview the assisted living home care provider failed to provide care and services according to a suitable and up-to-date plan for one of four client's (#3) record reviewed. The findings include:Client #3 was admitted to the memory care unit October 21, 2004. A registered nurse conducted initial nursing assessments on October 21, and 23, 2004. On October 21, 2004, a "RESIDENT CARE PLAN" was established, and indicated client #3 was independent with toilcent #3 was not registered nurse conducted a supervisory visit and note client #3 was having an increased number of fails. Documentation on the fail assessments indicated client #3 was not registered nurse (Client #3 had fails on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laccration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received cleven staples to the laceration on anuary 7, 2005. The provider had a					
November 10, 2003. There were no further supervisory visits from the registered nurse. On November 22, 2004, 377 days later, there was a monitoring visit conducted by a licensed practical nurse. There were no further supervisory or monitoring visits documented when it was reviewed March 4, 2005. When interviewed March 4, 2005. The provider interviewed March 4, 2005. The provider had a	Compliance	Regulation	Issued	provided	
further supervisory visits from the registered nurse. On Novomber 22, 2004, 377 days later, there was a monitoring visit conducted by a licensed practical nurse. There were no further supervisory or monitoring visits documented when it was reviewed March 4, 2005 the registered nurse stated that the supervisory visits were not done. 6. MN Statute 144A.44 X X Based on record review and interview the assisted living home care provider failed to provide are and services according to a suitable and up-to-date plan for one of four client's (#3) record reviewed. The findings include: 6. MN Statute 144A.44 X X Based on record review and interview the assisted living home care provider failed to provide care and services according to a suitable and up-to-date plan for one of four client's (#3) record reviewed. The findings include: 7. Client #3 was admitted to the memory care unit October 21, 2004, A registered nurse (RN) conducted initial nursing assessments on October 21, and 23, 2004. On October 21, 2004, a "RESIDENT CARE PLAN" was established, and indicated client #3 was independent with toileting, transferring and ambulation with a walker. Client #3 had falls on December 19, 24 and 28, 2004. On December 28, 2004, a registered nurse conducted a supervisory visit and noted client #3 was having an increased number of falls. Documentation on the fall assessments indicated client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laccartion to the postrior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a supervisory wisit and note lacer tardin on anuary 7, 2005. The provider had a supervisory distributes and and and and an					
registered nurse. On November 22, 2004, 377 days later, there was a monitoring visit conducted by a licensed practical nurse. There were no further supervisory or monitoring visits documented when it was reviewed March 4, 2005 the registered nurse stated that the supervisory visits were not done. 6. MN Statute 144A.44 X X 8. Based on record review and interview the assisted living home care provider failed to provide care and services according to a suitable and up-to-date plan for one of four client's (#3) record reviewed. The findings include: Client #3 was admitted to the memory care unit October 21, and 23, 2004. On October 23, 2004, a registered nurse conducted initial nursing assessments indicated client #3 was independent with toileting, transferring and ambulation with a walker. Client #3 had falls on December 19, 24 and 28, 2004, a registered nurse conducted a supervisory visit and noted client #3 was independent with toileting #3 was not assessments indicated client #3 was not reguesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a lancards 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a lancards of and 7, 2005. The provider had a lad ceiver of a lanuary 7, 2005. The provider					
2004, 377 days later, there was a monitoring visit conducted by a licensed practical nurse. There were no further supervisory or monitoring visits documented when it was reviewed March 4, 2005. When interviewed on March 4, 2005 the registered nurse stated that the supervisory visits were not done.6.MN Statute 144A,44 Subdivision 1. (2) Bill of rightsXX8Based on record review and interview the assisted living home care provider failed to provide care and services according to a suitable and up-to-date plan for one of four client's (#3) record reviewed March 21, 2004. A registered nurse (RN) conducted initial nursing assessments on October 21, and 23, 2004. On October 21, 2004, a "RESIDENT CARE PLAN" was established, and indicated client #3 was independent with toileting, transferring and ambulation with a walker. Client #3 had falls on December 19, 24 and 28, 2004. On December 28, 2004, a registered nurse conducted a supervisory visit and noted client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a direction on January 7, 2005. The provider had a direction on January 7, 2005. The provider had a ceived eleven staples to the laceration on January 6 and 7, 2005. The provider had a vas having a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 6 and 7, 2005. The provider had a direction on fragenting and sets to the laceration on stanger 7, 2005. The provider had a sets to be laceration on stanger 7, 2005. The provider had a sets to be laceration on stanger 7, 200					1 5
Image: Second					registered nurse. On November 22,
6. MN Statute 144A.44 X X Based on record review and interview the supervisory visits were not done. 6. MN Statute 144A.44 X X Based on record review and interview the assisted lixing home care provider failed to provide care and services according to a suitable and up-to-date plan for one of four client's (#3) record reviewed. The findings include: 7. Client #3 was admitted to the memory care unit October 21, 2004. A registered nurse (NM) conducted initial nursing assessments on October 21, and 23, 2004. On October 21, 2004, a "RESIDENT CARE PLAN" was established, and indicated client #3 was independent with toileting, transferring and ambulation with a walker. Client #3 had falls on December 19, 24 and 28, 2004. On December 28, 2004, a registered nurse (RM) conducted a supervisory visit and noted client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating a linercast on the fall assessments indicated client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 bad falls on January 6 and 7, 2005. The provider had a with "significant bleeding" and received client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 bad falls on January 7, 2005. The provider bad avait and preceived client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 bad falls on January 7, 2005. The provider bad avait or significant bleeding" and received client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Cl					2004, 377 days later, there was a
Icensed practical nurse. There were no further supervisory or monitoring visits documented when it was reviewed March 4, 2005. When interviewed on March 4, 2005 the registered nurse stated that the supervisory visits were not done.6.MN Statute 144A,44 Subdivision 1. (2) Bill of rightsXXBased on record review and interview the assisted living home care provider failed to provide care and services according to a suitable and up-to-date plan for one of four client's (#3) record reviewed. The findings include:Client #3 was admitted to the memory care unit October 21, 2004. A registered nurse (RN) conducted initial nursing assessments on October 21, and 23, 2004. On October 21, 2004, a "RESIDENT CARE PLAN" was established, and indicated client #3 was independent with toileting, transferring and ambulation with a walker. Client #3 had falls on December 19, 24 and 28, 2004. On December 28, 2004, a registered nurse conducted a supervisory visit and noted client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received client #3 had falls on January 7, 2005. The provider had a vas having to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a vas having a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received client blaceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a vas having blaceration to a many 7, 2005. The provider had a vas having and and preceived client blaceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a vas having and haceration to haceration on valuery 7, 2005. The provider had a value of particle had a vith "significant bleeding" and received client #3 was not requesting assistance priory					monitoring visit conducted by a
6.MN Statute 144A.44 Subdivision 1. (2) Bill of rightsXX8Based on record review and interview the assisted living home care provider failed to provide care and services according to a suitable and up-to-date plan for one of four client's (#3) record reviewed. The findings include:6.MN Statute 144A.44 Subdivision 1. (2) Bill of rightsXX8Based on record review and interview the assisted living home care provider failed to provide care and services according to a suitable and up-to-date plan for one of four client's (#3) record reviewed. The findings include:Client #3 was admitted to the memory care unit October 21, 2004. A registered nurse (RN) conducted initial nursing assessments on October 21, and 23, 2004. On October 21, 2004, a "RESIDENT CARE PLAN" was independent with toileting, transferring and ambulation with a walker. Client #3 had falls on December 19, 24 and 28, 2004. Chieft #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a vith "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on unany 7, 2005. The provider had a<					e ,
6. MN Statute 144A.44 X X Based on record review and interview and and any to-date plan for one of four client's (#3) record reviewed. The findings include: Client #3 was admitted to the memory care unit October 21, 2004. A registered nurse (RN) conducted initial nursing assessments on October 21, 2004, a "RESIDENT CARE PLAN" was established, and indicated client #3 was independent with toileting, transferring and ambulation with a walker. Client #3 had falls on December 28, 2004. On December 28, 2004, a registered nurse conducted a supervisory visit and noted client #3 was stating an interview and the fall assessments indicated client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a supervisory for the and provide and and provide fall asusex stating and ambulation with a walker.					-
6. MN Statute 144A.44 X X Based on record review and interview the assisted living home care provider failed to provide care and services according to a suitable and up-to-date plan for one of four client's (#3) record reviewed. The findings include: 6. MN Statute 144A.44 X X Based on record review and interview the assisted living home care provider failed to provide care and services according to a suitable and up-to-date plan for one of four client's (#3) record reviewed. The findings include: Client #3 was admitted to the memory care unit October 21, 2004. A registered nurse (RN) conducted initial nursing assessments on October 21, and 23, 2004. On October 21, 2004, a "RESIDENT CARE PLAN" was established, and indicated client #3 was independent with toileting, transferring and ambulation with a walker. Client #3 had falls on December 19, 24 and 28, 2004. On December 19, 24 and 28, 2004. On December 19, 24 and 28, scout, and care site of uurse conducted a supervisory visit and noted client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulation on the fall assessments indicated lient #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received cleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a					
Interviewed on March 4, 2005 the registered nurse stated that the supervisory visits were not done.Education: Provided6.MN Statute 144A.44 Subdivision 1. (2) Bill of rightsXXBased on record review and interview the assisted living home care provider failed to provide care and services according to a suitable and up-to-date plan for one of four client's (#3) record reviewed. The findings include:Client #3 was admitted to the memory care unit October 21, 2004. A registered nurse (RN) conducted initial nursing assessments on October 21, and 23, 2004. On October 21, 2004, a "RESIDENT CARE PLAN" was established, and indicated client #3 was independent with toileting, transferring and ambulation with a walker. Client #3 had falls on December 19, 24 and 28, 2004. On December 28, 2004, a registered nurse conducted a supervisory visit and noted client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant blecding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a					
6. MN Statute 144A.44 X X Based on record review and interview bill of rights X X Based on record review and interview bill of rights X X Based on record review and interview bill of rights X X Based on record review and interview cording to a suitable and up-to-date plan for one of four client's (#3) record reviewed. The findings include: Client #3 was admitted to the memory care unit October 21, 2004. A registered nurse (RN) conducted initial nursing assessments on October 21, and 23, 2004. On October 21, 2004, a "RESIDENT CARE PLAN" was established, and indicated client #3 was independent with toileting, transferring and ambulation with a walker. Client #3 had falls on December 19, 24 and 28, 2004. On December 19, 24 and 28, 2004. On December 19, 24 and 28, 2004. On December 19, 24 and 29, sessments indicated client #3 was having an increased number of falls. Documentation on the fall assessments indicated client #3 was having an increased number of falls. Documentation on the fall assessments indicated client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating					
6. MN Statute 144A.44 X X Based on record review and interview the assisted living home care provider failed to provide care and services according to a suitable and up-to-date plan for one of four client's (#3) record reviewed. The findings include: Client #3 was admitted to the memory care unit October 21, 2004. A registered nurse (RN) conducted initial nursing assessments on October 21, and 23, 2004. On October 21, 2004, a "RESIDENT CARE PLAN" was established, and indicated client #3 was independent with toileting, transferring and ambulation with a walker. Client #3 had falls on December 19, 24 and 28, 2004. On December 19, 24 and 28, 2004. On December 19, 24 and 28, 2004. On December 19, 24 and 28, stored nurse conducted a supervisory visit and noted client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a					
6. MN Statute 144A.44 X X Based on record review and interview the assisted living home care provider failed to provide care and services according to a suitable and up-to-date plan for one of four client's (#3) record reviewed. The findings include: Client #3 was admitted to the memory care unit October 21, 2004. A registered nurse (RN) conducted initial nursing assessments on October 21, and 23, 2004. On October 21, 2004, a "RESIDENT CARE PLAN" was established, and indicated client #3 was independent with toileting, transferring and ambulation with a walker. Client #3 was having an increased number of falls. Documentation on the fall assessments indicated client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a					-
6. MN Statute 144A.44 X X Bill of rights X X Based on record review and interview the assisted living home care provider failed to provide care and services according to a suitable and up-to-date plan for one of four client's (#3) record reviewed. The findings include: Client #3 was admitted to the memory care unit October 21, 2004. A registered nurse (RN) conducted initial nursing assessments on October 21, and 23, 2004. On October 21, 2004, a "RESIDENT CARE PLAN" was established, and indicated client #3 was independent with toileting, transferring and ambulation with a walker. Client #3 had falls on December 19, 24 and 28, 2004. On December 28, 2004, a registered nurse conducted a supervisory visit and noted client #3 was having an increased number of falls. Documentation on the fall assessments indicated client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a					supervisory visits were not done.
Subdivision 1. (2)the assisted living home care provider failed to provide care and services according to a suitable and up-to-date plan for one of four client's (#3) record reviewed. The findings include:Client #3 was admitted to the memory care unit October 21, 2004. A registered nurse (RN) conducted initial nursing assessments on October 21, and 23, 2004. On October 21, 2004, a "RESIDENT CARE PLAN" was established, and indicated client #3 was independent with toileting, transferring and ambulation with a walker. Client #3 had falls on December 19, 24 and 28, 2004. On December 28, 2004, a registered nurse conducted a supervisory visit and noted client #3 was having an increased number of falls. Documentation on the fall assessments indicated client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a					Education: Provided
Subdivision 1. (2)the assisted living home care provider failed to provide care and services according to a suitable and up-to-date plan for one of four client's (#3) record reviewed. The findings include:Client #3 was admitted to the memory care unit October 21, 2004. A registered nurse (RN) conducted initial nursing assessments on October 21, and 23, 2004. On October 21, 2004, a "RESIDENT CARE PLAN" was established, and indicated client #3 was independent with toileting, transferring and ambulation with a walker. Client #3 had falls on December 19, 24 and 28, 2004. On December 28, 2004, a registered nurse conducted a supervisory visit and noted client #3 was having an increased number of falls. Documentation on the fall assessments indicated client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a	6	MN Statute 144A 44	X	X	Based on record review and interview
Bill of rightsfailed to provide care and services according to a suitable and up-to-date plan for one of four client's (#3) record reviewed. The findings include:Client #3 was admitted to the memory care unit October 21, 2004. A registered nurse (RN) conducted initial nursing assessments on October 21, and 23, 2004. On October 21, 2004, a "RESIDENT CARE PLAN" was established, and indicated client #3 was independent with toileting, transferring and ambulation with a walker. Client #3 had falls on December 19, 24 and 28, 2004. On December 28, 2004, a registered nurse conducted a supervisory visit and noted client #3 was having an increased number of falls. Documentation on the fall assessments indicated client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a	0.			21	
according to a suitable and up-to-date plan for one of four client's (#3) record reviewed. The findings include: Client #3 was admitted to the memory care unit October 21, 2004. A registered nurse (RN) conducted initial nursing assessments on October 21, and 23, 2004. On October 21, 2004, a "RESIDENT CARE PLAN" was established, and indicated client #3 was independent with toileting, transferring and ambulation with a walker. Client #3 had falls on December 19, 24 and 28, 2004. On December 19, 24 and 28, 2004. On December 28, 2004, a registered nurse conducted a supervisory visit and noted client #3 was having an increased number of falls. Documentation on the fall assessments indicated client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a					e 1
plan for one of four client's (#3) record reviewed. The findings include: Client #3 was admitted to the memory care unit October 21, 2004. A registered nurse (RN) conducted initial nursing assessments on October 21, and 23, 2004. On October 21, 2004, a "RESIDENT CARE PLAN" was established, and indicated client #3 was independent with toileting, transferring and ambulation with a walker. Client #3 had falls on December 19, 24 and 28, 2004. On December 28, 2004, a registered nurse conducted a supervisory visit and noted client #3 was having an increased number of falls. Documentation on the fall assessments indicated client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a		Diff of fights			-
reviewed. The findings include: Client #3 was admitted to the memory care unit October 21, 2004. A registered nurse (RN) conducted initial nursing assessments on October 21, and 23, 2004. On October 21, 2004, a "RESIDENT CARE PLAN" was established, and indicated client #3 was independent with toileting, transferring and ambulation with a walker. Client #3 had falls on December 19, 24 and 28, 2004. On December 28, 2004, a registered nurse conducted a supervisory visit and noted client #3 was having an increased number of falls. Documentation on the fall assessments indicated client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a					
Client #3 was admitted to the memory care unit October 21, 2004. A registered nurse (RN) conducted initial nursing assessments on October 21, and 23, 2004. On October 21, 2004, a "RESIDENT CARE PLAN" was established, and indicated client #3 was independent with toileting, transferring and ambulation with a walker. Client #3 had falls on December 19, 24 and 28, 2004. On December 28, 2004, a registered nurse conducted a supervisory visit and noted client #3 was having an increased number of falls. Documentation on the fall assessments indicated client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a					
care unit October 21, 2004. A registered nurse (RN) conducted initial nursing assessments on October 21, and 23, 2004. On October 21, 2004, a "RESIDENT CARE PLAN" was established, and indicated client #3 was independent with toileting, transferring and ambulation with a walker. Client #3 had falls on December 19, 24 and 28, 2004. On December 28, 2004, a registered nurse conducted a supervisory visit and noted client #3 was having an increased number of falls. Documentation on the fall assessments indicated client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a					reviewed. The findings include:
care unit October 21, 2004. A registered nurse (RN) conducted initial nursing assessments on October 21, and 23, 2004. On October 21, 2004, a "RESIDENT CARE PLAN" was established, and indicated client #3 was independent with toileting, transferring and ambulation with a walker. Client #3 had falls on December 19, 24 and 28, 2004. On December 28, 2004, a registered nurse conducted a supervisory visit and noted client #3 was having an increased number of falls. Documentation on the fall assessments indicated client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a					Client #3 was admitted to the memory
registered nurse (RN) conducted initial nursing assessments on October 21, and 23, 2004. On October 21, 2004, a "RESIDENT CARE PLAN" was established, and indicated client #3 was independent with toileting, transferring and ambulation with a walker. Client #3 had falls on December 19, 24 and 28, 2004. On December 28, 2004, a registered nurse conducted a supervisory visit and noted client #3 was having an increased number of falls. Documentation on the fall assessments indicated client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a					5
nursing assessments on October 21, and 23, 2004. On October 21, 2004, a "RESIDENT CARE PLAN" was established, and indicated client #3 was independent with toileting, transferring and ambulation with a walker. Client #3 had falls on December 19, 24 and 28, 2004. On December 28, 2004, a registered nurse conducted a supervisory visit and noted client #3 was having an increased number of falls. Documentation on the fall assessments indicated client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a					r
23, 2004. On October 21, 2004, a "RESIDENT CARE PLAN" was established, and indicated client #3 was independent with toileting, transferring and ambulation with a walker. Client #3 had falls on December 19, 24 and 28, 2004. On December 28, 2004, a registered nurse conducted a supervisory visit and noted client #3 was having an increased number of falls. Documentation on the fall assessments indicated client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a					-
"RESIDENT CARE PLAN" was established, and indicated client #3 was independent with toileting, transferring and ambulation with a walker. Client #3 had falls on December 19, 24 and 28, 2004. On December 28, 2004, a registered nurse conducted a supervisory visit and noted client #3 was having an increased number of falls. Documentation on the fall assessments indicated client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a					•
established, and indicated client #3 was independent with toileting, transferring and ambulation with a walker. Client #3 had falls on December 19, 24 and 28, 2004. On December 28, 2004, a registered nurse conducted a supervisory visit and noted client #3 was having an increased number of falls. Documentation on the fall assessments indicated client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a					
independent with toileting, transferring and ambulation with a walker. Client #3 had falls on December 19, 24 and 28, 2004. On December 28, 2004, a registered nurse conducted a supervisory visit and noted client #3 was having an increased number of falls. Documentation on the fall assessments indicated client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a					
and ambulation with a walker. Client #3 had falls on December 19, 24 and 28, 2004. On December 28, 2004, a registered nurse conducted a supervisory visit and noted client #3 was having an increased number of falls. Documentation on the fall assessments indicated client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a					
#3 had falls on December 19, 24 and 28, 2004. On December 28, 2004, a registered nurse conducted a supervisory visit and noted client #3 was having an increased number of falls. Documentation on the fall assessments indicated client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a					
28, 2004. On December 28, 2004, a registered nurse conducted a supervisory visit and noted client #3 was having an increased number of falls. Documentation on the fall assessments indicated client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a					
registered nurse conducted a supervisory visit and noted client #3 was having an increased number of falls. Documentation on the fall assessments indicated client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a					
supervisory visit and noted client #3 was having an increased number of falls. Documentation on the fall assessments indicated client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a					
was having an increased number of falls. Documentation on the fall assessments indicated client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a					registered nurse conducted a
was having an increased number of falls. Documentation on the fall assessments indicated client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a					
falls. Documentation on the fall assessments indicated client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a					1 1
assessments indicated client #3 was not requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a					
requesting assistance prior to ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a					
ambulating. Client #3 had falls on January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a					
January 6 and 7, 2005, sustaining a laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a					
laceration to the posterior right head with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a					
with "significant bleeding" and received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a					
received eleven staples to the laceration on January 7, 2005. The provider had a					1 0
on January 7, 2005. The provider had a					
document titled "Planned Services"					
which indicated that additional safety					which indicated that additional safety

	ALHCP Licensing Survey Form				
		Page 6 of 8			
Correction					
Order	Education				

				Page 6 of 8
		Correction		
Indicator of		Order	Education	
Compliance	Regulation	Issued	provided	Statement(s) of Deficient Practice/Education:
				checks were added at 4:00 p.m., 6:00
				p.m., 8:00 p.m., and 10:00 p.m. on
				January 8, 2005. Client #3 had eleven
				more falls between January 12, 2005
				and January 31, 2005. The care plan
				had not been revised since November 2,
				2004 and did not address the falls or
				identify any precautionary
				5 5 1 5
				interventions for client #3.
				On January 9, 2005 a nurse
				documented in client #3's record that
				client #3 was "Put on wkly wts [weekly
				weights], appears to be loosing Wt
				[weight]." When interviewed March 9,
				2005 the RN reviewed client #3's
				record and verified that it could not be
				determined if the weights were done
				because the weights were not recorded.
				She also confirmed the care plan was
				not amended to reflect the weekly
				5
				weights or the weight loss.
				On January 13, 2005, client #3 had two
				episodes of incontinence, which was
				new. Documentation in client #3's
				record indicated that at 12:40 p.m. on
				January 18 2005, client #3 stated that
				5
				he hit his head on the wall. At 9:30
				p.m. client #3 was found on the floor in
				the hallway and required the assistance
				of two employees to transfer back into
				the recliner. On January 19, 2005,
				client #3's record indicated that he
				continued to need assistance of two to
				transfer and was "unable to stand,
				Knees buckling." Follow-up
				documentation dated January 19, 2005
				at 5:00 p.m. indicated that client #3 had
				a CT scan of his head. Client #3
				continued to require the assistance of
				two staff and now used a wheelchair.
				On February 2, 2005, client #3's record
				indicated that client #3 was "less
				responsive today, difficult to arouse,
				pale, skin clammy to touch. Rubs all 4
				lobes, inspiratory/expiratory wheezing
				2 person transfer." Client #3's care

ALHCP Licensing Survey Form

unlocked cupboard in each client's room/apartment. Clients #5, #6 and #7, collectively had Darvon, Vicodin, Dilaudid, and Duragesic Patches in the tackle boxes. The tackle boxes were

not permanently affixed to the physical plant. When interviewed March 9, 2005 the licensed practical

				Page 7 of 8	
		Correction			
Indicator of		Order	Education		
Compliance	Regulation	Issued	provided	Statement(s) of Deficient Practice/Education:	
				plan dated October 21, 2004, had not	
				been updated to reflect the changes in	
				client #3's condition.	
				Education: Provided	
8.	MN Rule	X	X	Based on observation and interview,	
δ.		Λ	Λ		
	4668.0865 Subp. 9			the provider failed to provide a	
	Storage of schedule II			separately locked compartment, which	
	drugs			was permanently affixed to the	
				physical plant for three of three	
				client's (#5, #6, and #7) with central	
				storage of controlled drugs. The	
				findings include:	
				On March 7, 2005, central storage of	
				medication was observed. The agency	
				stored the original, main containers of	
				controlled medications for clients #5,	
				#6 and #7 in the nursing office in a	
				locked file cabinet, which was bolted	
				to the floor. The file cabinet was in a	
				locked nursing office. Clients #5, #6	
				and #7, collectively, received regularly	
				scheduled and PRN (as needed)	
				Darvon, Vicodin, Dilaudid, and	
				Duragesic Patches. From these	
				supplies weekly medications were set	
				up. When interviewed March 7, 2005	
				the licensed practical nurse indicated	
				the medications for clients receiving	
				medication administration assistance	
				are stored in weekly pill boxes. On	
				March 7, 2005 the scheduled drugs	
				were observed to be stored in the	
				tackle boxes, which were not	
				permanently affixed to the physical	
				plant. Pillboxes were locked inside	
				tackle boxes assigned to each client.	
				The locked tackle box was stored in an	
				The locked tackie box was stored in an	

ALHCP Licensing Survey Form Page 8 of 8

				1 age 8 01 8
		Correction		
Indicator of		Order	Education	
Compliance	Regulation	Issued	provided	Statement(s) of Deficient Practice/Education:
				nurse confirmed the tackle boxes were stored in an unlocked cupboards in each client's room and not permanently affixed to the physical plant. Education: Provided

A draft copy of this completed form was left with <u>Laurie Anderson</u>, <u>Residence Director</u>, at an exit conference on <u>March 9, 2005</u>. Any correction orders issued as a result of the on-site visit and the final Licensing Survey Form will arrive by certified mail to the licensee within 3 weeks of this exit conference (see Correction Order form HE-01239-03). If you have any questions about the Licensing Survey Form or the survey results, please contact the Minnesota Department of Health, (651) 215-8703. After supervisory review, this form will be posted on the MDH web site. General information about ALHCP is also available on the web site:

http://www.health.state.mn.us/divs/fpc/profinfo/cms/alhcp/alhcpsurvey.htm

Regulations can be viewed on the Internet: <u>http://www.revisor.leg.state.mn.us/stats</u> (for MN statutes) <u>http://www.revisor.leg.state.mn.us/arule/</u> (for MN Rules).

(Form Revision 7/04)