



Protecting, Maintaining and Improving the Health of All Minnesotans

State Rapid Response Investigative Public Report

Office of Health Facility Complaints

Maltreatment Report #: HL306317702M
Compliance #: HL306313166C

Date Concluded: February 3, 2025

Name, Address, and County of Licensee

Investigated:

Edgewood EGF Senior Living
608 5th Avenue NW
East Grand Forks, MN 56721
Polk County

Facility Type: Assisted Living Facility with
Dementia Care (ALFDC)

Evaluator's Name: Barbara Axness, RN
Special Investigator

Finding: Substantiated, facility and individual responsibility

Nature of Investigation:

The Minnesota Department of Health investigated an allegation of maltreatment, in accordance with the Minnesota Reporting of Maltreatment of Vulnerable Adults Act, Minn. Stat. 626.557, and to evaluate compliance with applicable licensing standards for the provider type.

Initial Investigation Allegation(s):

The facility and the alleged perpetrators (AP), both registered nurses (RN) at the facility, neglected the resident when they failed to have a system in place to ensure availability of medication refills. The resident's medications were not delivered immediately after new orders were received. AP/RN1 and AP/RN2 failed to notify the resident's provider that medications were not available. The resident was hospitalized after missing ten days of prescribed medications.

Investigative Findings and Conclusion:

The Minnesota Department of Health determined neglect was substantiated. The facility and AP/RN1 and AP/RN2 were responsible for the maltreatment. The resident had been hospitalized and treated for congestive heart failure and was started on nine new medications. After returning to the facility, the new medications did not immediately arrive. AP/RN1 and AP/RN2 were aware of this but failed to contact the pharmacy to follow up and failed to notify the primary care provider (PCP) that new medications to treat heart failure had not been started.

The facility did not have a process in place to ensure the family and primary care provider were updated or a process to ensure new orders were followed up on to ensure the medications arrived. The resident missed ten days of essential medications. The resident was re-hospitalized with exacerbation of congestive heart failure.

The investigator conducted interviews with facility staff members, including administrative staff, nursing staff, and unlicensed staff. The investigator contacted the primary care provider. The investigation included review of the resident record, hospital records, pharmacy records, facility incident reports, personnel files, staff schedules, and related facility policy and procedures. Also, the investigator observed the medication procedures and storage for residents using outside pharmacies at the facility.

The resident resided in an assisted living memory care unit. The resident's diagnoses included vascular dementia, Alzheimer's disease, and congestive heart failure. The resident's service plan included assistance with medication administration. The resident's assessment indicated the resident's medications were ordered by facility staff through an outside pharmacy.

Progress notes in the resident's record indicated the resident returned to the facility with orders for nine new medications after he was treated for heart failure. New medications included treatment for fluid retention, high blood pressure, heart failure, and other heart problems. The resident's medication administration record (MAR) indicated over a ten-day period, the medications were marked as not given. Progress notes documented by AP/RN2 indicated she was aware the orders were being sent to an outside pharmacy and would be mailed to the facility. AP/RN1 and AP/RN2 failed to notify the PCP that medications would not arrive for 7 to 10 days and failed to offer alternatives to the resident's family to obtain medications in a more timely manner. The facility failed to follow up and ensure the outside pharmacy received the new orders and progress notes later indicated the outside pharmacy never received the orders and were not processing them as they were not sent. The facility failed to document a change in condition for the resident or why he was sent to the hospital again.

Hospital records indicated the resident came to the emergency room after having shortness of breath for two days, as well as chest pain. The resident's oxygen in the emergency room was noted to be 88% (normal is above 95%). The resident was admitted for congestive heart failure exacerbation and spent four days in the hospital.

During an interview, a facility nurse stated she was responsible for passing the resident's medications and when she noticed the resident did not have the new medications he needed to treat his heart failure, she told both AP/RN1 and AP/RN2 that he didn't have any medications and they needed to do something as he should not be missing so many doses. The nurse stated she was told they were looking into it and that the medication was being sent. The nurse stated she voiced concerns about not giving the medications was neglect because the medications were for heart failure, but nursing management kept telling her the medications were ordered.

The nurse stated she got into an argument with AP/RN2 because she didn't feel like they were doing any follow up to see if the resident's medications were coming.

During an interview, the resident's son stated the facility did not call to tell him his dad wasn't getting medications. The resident's son stated he only found out about it after the resident was hospitalized and the hospital told him the resident hadn't received his medications which caused fluid buildup. The resident's son stated he spoke with both AP/RN1 and AP/RN2 after he was re-hospitalized and they said the hospital screwed up and didn't send the prescriptions and was under the impression his dad had only missed a few medications. The resident's son stated if he would have been made aware of the medications never arriving, he would have called the pharmacy himself or found a way to get the medications for his dad.

During an interview, the resident's daughter stated she wasn't aware the resident missed any medications until a nurse at the hospital told her the facility had reported he didn't get his new medications filled. The resident's daughter stated she spoke with AP/RN1 after the resident was hospitalized and asked why someone didn't call somebody to see if they could get medications filled elsewhere while they were waiting on the outside pharmacy instead of just marking it down as not available the whole time. The resident's daughter stated if the facility had notified her that the medications never arrived, she would have taken action to get them filled immediately. The resident's daughter stated she was not told about the outstanding bill at the local pharmacy that prevented them from being able to fill there but as soon as she was aware of it, she paid it and was able to get the medications filled until the outside pharmacy could send the medications.

During an interview, AP/RN1 stated he was not sure why there was no documentation leading up to the resident's rehospitalization or when nursing was notified of concerns. AP/RN1 confirmed the facility did not reach out to the primary care provider about the new medications not being able to be started and the resident's family was not notified about the issues with obtaining the new prescriptions that had been started to treat the resident's congestive heart failure. AP/RN1 stated the hospital should have sent the new orders to the outside pharmacy but they never followed up or called the outside pharmacy in the days after he returned to the facility. AP/RN1 stated this was the first time he had worked with the outside pharmacy before and confirmed they did not have a process in place for when a new order was initiated but the outside pharmacy wasn't able to deliver for 7 to 10 days.

During an interview, AP/RN2 stated the son was "well aware" the resident was not receiving the new medications to treat his heart failure because the son chose to use an outside pharmacy that took a while to deliver. AP/RN2 confirmed the PCP was not notified the medications would not be able to be started immediately and she was not aware they could ask to get a hold order and thought they were to just mark it as medication not available. AP/RN2 stated the resident's son would have been educated in the hospital about the risks of not starting the medications and that he was aware they did not have the medications. AP/RN2 stated she never followed up

to see if the pharmacy got the new orders because the hospital said they sent it, and the outside pharmacy would take a few days to send it.

During an interview, a registered nurse (RN) with the resident's primary care provider's office stated they had reviewed the resident's clinic record and visited with the PCP and did not see any evidence they were notified the resident's new medications could not be started immediately. The RN stated they would expect the facility to contact them to either hold the medication or find alternatives until the medications could be delivered. The RN stated they weren't even aware the resident had been sent back to the hospital and only found out after the fact.

In conclusion, the Minnesota Department of Health determined neglect was substantiated.

Substantiated: Minnesota Statutes, section 626.5572, Subdivision 19.

"Substantiated" means a preponderance of evidence shows that an act that meets the definition of maltreatment occurred.

Neglect: Minnesota Statutes, section 626.5572, subdivision 17

"Neglect" means neglect by a caregiver or self-neglect.

(a) "Caregiver neglect" means the failure or omission by a caregiver to supply a vulnerable adult with care or services, including but not limited to, food, clothing, shelter, health care, or supervision which is:

(1) reasonable and necessary to obtain or maintain the vulnerable adult's physical or mental health or safety, considering the physical and mental capacity or dysfunction of the vulnerable adult; and

(2) which is not the result of an accident or therapeutic conduct.

Vulnerable Adult interviewed: No; due to cognitive impairment

Family/Responsible Party interviewed: Yes

Alleged Perpetrator interviewed: Yes AP/RN1 and AP/RN2

Action taken by facility:

No action taken.

Action taken by the Minnesota Department of Health:

The facility was found to be in noncompliance. To view a copy of the Statement of Deficiencies and/or correction orders, please visit:

<https://www.health.state.mn.us/facilities/regulation/directory/provcompselect.html>

If you are viewing this report on the MDH website, please see the attached Statement of Deficiencies.

You may also call 651-201-4200 to receive a copy via mail or email

The responsible party will be notified of their right to appeal the maltreatment finding. If the maltreatment is substantiated against an identified employee, this report will be submitted to the nurse aide registry for possible inclusion of the finding on the abuse registry and/or to the Minnesota Department of Human Services for possible disqualification in accordance with the provisions of the background study requirements under Minnesota 245C.

cc:

The Office of Ombudsman for Long Term Care

The Office of Ombudsman for Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities

Polk County Attorney

East Grand Forks City Attorney

East Grand Forks Police Department

Minnesota Board of Nursing

Minnesota Board of Executives for Long Term Services and Supports

