

Adult Care Home Corrective Action Report (CAR)

I. Facility Name: Wilham Ridge
 Address: 30 Dalea Drive Asheville, NC 28805

County: Buncombe
 License Number: HAL011377

II. Date(s) of Visit(s): 05/28/2024

Purpose of Visit(s): Complaint Investigation

Instructions to the Provider (please read carefully):

Exit/Report Date: 07/29/2024

In column **III (b)** please provide a plan of correction to address *each of the rules* which were violated and cited in column **III (a)**. The plan must describe the steps the facility will take to achieve and maintain compliance. In column **III (c)**, indicate a specific completion date for the plan of correction.

*If this CAR includes a **Type B violation**, failure to meet compliance after the date of correction provided by the facility could result in a civil penalty in an amount up to \$400.00 for each day that the facility remains out of compliance.

*If this CAR includes a **Type A1 or an Unabated B violation**, this agency *will* plan to submit an Administrative Penalty Recommendation for the violation(s). If this CAR includes a **Type A2 violation**, this agency *may* submit an Administrative Penalty Recommendation for the violation(s). The facility has an opportunity to schedule an Informal Dispute Resolution (IDR) meeting within **15 working days** from the mailing or delivery of the Corrective Action Plan. If on follow-up survey the **Type A1 or Type A2** violations are not corrected, a civil penalty of up to \$1000.00 for each day that the facility remains out of compliance may be assessed. If on follow-up survey the **Unabated B** violations are not corrected, a civil penalty of up to \$400.00 for each day that the facility remains out of compliance may also be assessed.

III (a). Non-Compliance Identified <i>For each citation/violation cited, document the following four components:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rule/Statute violated (rule/statute number cited) • Rule/Statutory Reference (text of the rule/statute cited) • Level of Non-compliance (Type A1, Type A2, Type B, Unabated Type B, Citation) • Findings of non-compliance 	III (b). Facility plans to correct/prevent: <i>(Each Corrective Action should be cross-referenced to the appropriate citation/violation)</i>	III (c). Date plan to be completed
Rule/Statute Number: 13F.1004(a) MEDICATION ADMINISTRATION	<input type="checkbox"/> POC Accepted _____ <i>DSS Initials</i>	
Rule/Statutory Reference: An adult care home shall assure that the preparation and administration of medications, prescription and non-prescription, and treatments by staff are in accordance with: (1) orders by a licensed prescribing practitioner which are maintained in the resident's record; and (2) rules in this Section and the facility's policies and procedures.		
Level of Non-Compliance: Standard Deficiency		
Based on observations, interviews, and record reviews, the facility failed to ensure medications were administered as prescribed for 2 of 6 sampled residents (#1, #2) related to mental health (#1), pain management (#1) and medications used to control elevated blood glucose (#2). The findings are: 1.) a. Review of Resident #1's FL2 dated 04/18/24 revealed: -Diagnoses included multiple sclerosis, type 2 diabetes mellitus, hyperlipidemia, hypokalemia, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, and gastroesophageal reflux disease. -The resident was semi-ambulatory and required assistance with bathing and dressing. Review of Resident #1's Resident Register dated 04/15/24 revealed: -Resident #1 was admitted to the facility on 04/15/24. -He had a suprapubic catheter (a hollow, flexible tube used to drain		

urine from the bladder from a cut in the abdomen).

-He used a wheelchair.

-He required assistance with suprapubic catheter, bathing, ambulation, getting in/out of bed, skin care, and scheduling appointments.

Review of Resident #1's May 2024 electronic medication administration record (eMAR) revealed:

-There was an entry for Hydrocodone-acetaminophen 5-325mg - take 1 tablet by mouth every 6 hours as needed for pain.

-There was documentation this medication was not administered after the 05/27/24 at 5:21am dose.

-There was no documentation that the provider or pharmacy was notified the resident had run out of medications.

Interview with Resident #1 on 05/29/24 at 9:40am revealed:

-He was without his pain medication as they had run out.

-Medication was not available for "a day or two but I have MS, when I need pain medication, I really need it".

-He spoke with staff about medication and they just blamed one another.

-One staff told him it had not been ordered.

-Another staff reported the medication had been thrown away.

-Resident does not know what actually happened, but "it did not seem appropriate".

-He was told repeatedly that the facility forgot to order the medication beginning on 05/27.

-He did not know why the medication was a PRN as he took it multiple times per day.

Interview with a family member of Resident #1 on 05/28/24 at 3:30pm revealed:

-Resident #1 was in a lot of pain the previous night as the facility ran out of his PRN pain medication.

-He needed pain medication multiple times daily.

-She was unsure why the provider had not been asked for a routine order for pain medication due to her family members' high level of pain.

Interview with the pharmacist at the facility's contracted pharmacy on 06/25/24 at 3:00pm revealed:

-The facility received routine ordered medications on the same cycle each month.

-The medication pack cycle for this facility started on the 15th of each month for all pill form medications routinely ordered.

-It is the responsibility of the facility to reorder PRN medications.

-The medication was not reordered.

Interview with a medication aid (MA) on 06/28/24 and 7/12/24 at 10:00am revealed:

- She knew Resident #1 ran out of his pain medication.

-The resident reported pain the day he was out of his medication.

-She did not ask specifics about the nature of the resident's pain.

-The resident's family member also reported he was in pain.

-She believed the Resident Care Coordinator (RCC) was aware the resident was in pain.

Interviews with the RCC on 05/28/24 at 4:00pm and 06/28/24 at 3:15pm revealed:

- Resident #1 reported pain frequently.
- She knew Resident #1 had run out of medication.
- She was responsible for reordering medications.
- She requested refills from the provider if needed.
- She was responsible for contacting the appropriate medical providers as needed.
- She had no record of provider notification.

Interview with the Administrator on 06/28/24 on 3:45pm revealed:

- He was unaware of issues with Resident #1's medications.
- The RCC was responsible for contacting the providers and reordering medications.

b. Review of Resident #1's May 2024 eMAR revealed:

- There was an entry for Buspirone HCL 30mg tablet - 1 tablet by mouth twice daily, used to treat anxiety.
- Staff documented that the medication was "on order from pharmacy" for those missed administrations - however medication was documented as administered on 05/22/24 at 6:00pm and 05/23/24 at 6:00pm.
- The resident was not administered this medication on 9 out of 21 administration opportunities.
- There was no documentation that the provider was notified of the missed doses.

Review of Resident #1's file on 07/12/24 revealed no care notes present.

Interview with Resident #1 on 05/29/24 at 9:40am revealed:

- He was concerned about his medication.
- He talked with staff about medication and that they just blamed one another.
- He does not know what happened but that it did not seem appropriate.

Interview with a MA on 06/28/24 and 7/12/24 at 10:00am revealed:

- She followed the medication orders in the eMAR.
- She was not aware of issues with medication passes.

Interview with the pharmacist at the facility's contracted pharmacy on 06/25/24 at 3:00pm revealed:

- The facility received routine ordered medications on the same cycle each month.
- The medication pack cycle for this facility started on the 15th of each month for all pill form medications routinely ordered.
- The facility should have had this medication available to administer to Resident #1.

Interviews with RCC on 05/28/24 at 4:00pm and 06/28/24 at 3:15pm

revealed:

- She believed this medication had been administered but had not been documented correctly.
- She had no documentation that it had been administered correctly.
- She was responsible for contacting the appropriate medical providers as needed.
- She would have contacted provider via telehealth if needed.
- There was no record of provider notification.

Interview with the Administrator on 06/28/24 at 3:45pm revealed:

- The facility had a new medication passing computer system.
- The staff were trained on the new system.
- The RCC was responsible for contacting providers.
- The RCC was responsible for re-ordering medications.

2.) Review of Resident #2's FL2 dated 04/18/24 revealed:

- Diagnoses included type 2 diabetes, anemia, COPD, and obesity.
- The resident was semi-ambulatory and required assistance with bathing and dressing.

Review of Resident #2's Resident Register dated 07/21/23 revealed:

- The resident required assistance with dressing, bathing, nail care, hair/skin care and scheduling appointments.
- She used both a walker and wheelchair PRN for ambulation.

a.)Review of Resident #2's May 2024 eMAR revealed:

- There was an entry for Insulin Lispro 100 unit/ml pen ordered sliding scale as directed at meals and before bed: inject subcutaneous before meals and before bedtime: fingerstick blood sugar (FSBS) checks less than 100 = hold and initiate hypoglycemia protocol, less than 250 = 0 unit, 250-299 = 4 units, 300-350 = 6 units, greater than 350 - 8 units, greater than 500 - call provider.
- There was no documentation on 05/03/24 at 8:00pm, 05/06/24 at 8:00pm, 05/07/24 at 4:00pm and 8:00pm, 05/08/24 at 4:00pm, and 05/09/24 at 8:00am.
- On 05/03/24 at 12:00pm FSBS was measured at 294 but 8 units were documented as administered.
- On 05/03/24 at 4:00pm FSBS was measured at 220 but 37 units were documented as administered.
- On 05/06/24 at 12:00pm FSBS was measured at 252 but 12 units were documented as administered.
- On 05/21/24 at 8:00am FSBS was measured at 168 but 8 units were documented as administered.
- On 05/21/24 at 12:00pm FSBS was measured at 209 but 8 units were documented as administered.
- On 05/21/24 at 4:30pm FSBS was measured at 203 but 8 units were documented as administered.
- On 05/22/24 at 12:00pm FSBS was measured at 334 but 14 units were documented as administered.
- On 05/22/24 at 4:30pm FSBS was measured at 232 but 8 units were documented as administered.
- On 05/23/24 at 12:00pm FSBS was measured at 256 but 12 units were documented as administered.

Interview with Resident #2 on 05/28/24 at 10:00am revealed:

- She was unaware her medications were not administered correctly.
- She was unaware of issues with blood sugar.

Interviews with a MA on 06/28/24 and 7/12/24 at 10:00am revealed:

- She followed the medication orders in the eMAR.
- She was unaware Resident #2's insulin was being administered incorrectly.

Interviews with the RCC on 05/28/24 at 4:00pm and 06/28/24 at 3:15pm revealed:

- She was not aware of issue with insulin or FSBS.
- She was responsible for contacting the appropriate medical providers as needed.
- She would have contacted provider via telehealth if needed.
- There was no record of provider notification.

Interview with the Administrator on 06/28/24 revealed:

- He was unaware that Resident #2's insulin was being administered incorrectly.
- The facility had a new medication passing computer system.
- The staff were trained on the new system.
- The RCC was responsible for contacting providers when needed.

b. Review of Resident #2's May 2024 eMAR revealed:

There was an entry for Insulin Lispro 100 unit/ml pen ordered 8 units sub-q with meals (order discontinued on 05/24/24):

- Per MAR, documentation for each pass should include time administered, site given, and FSBS as taken before administration.
- MAR showed no documentation on 05/03/24 at 11:30am, 05/07/24 at 4:30pm, 05/08/24 at 4:30pm, 05/09/24 at 8:00am, 05/09/24 at 11:30am, 05/22/24 at 11:30am, and 05/23/24 at 11:30am.

Interview with Resident #2 on 05/28/24 at 10:00am revealed:

- She was unaware of any medication administration errors.
- She was unaware of issues with blood sugar.

Interview with a MA on 06/28/24 and 7/12/24 at 10:00am revealed:

- She followed the medication orders in the eMAR.
- She was not aware that Resident #2's insulin was not administered correctly.

Interviews with the RCC on 05/28/24 at 4:00pm and 06/28/24 at 3:15pm revealed:

- She was not aware of issue with insulin or FSBS.
- She was responsible for contacting the appropriate medical providers as needed.
- She would have contacted provider via telehealth if needed.
- She may have contacted the provider but have no record of provider notification.

Interview with the Administrator on 06/28/24 at 3:45pm revealed:

- He was not aware that Resident #2's insulin was being administered incorrectly.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The facility had a new medication passing computer system. -Staff were trained on the new system. -The RCC was responsible for contacting providers when needed. 		
<p>III (a). Non-Compliance Identified <i>For each citation/violation cited, document the following four components:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Rule/Statute violated (rule/statute number cited)</i> • <i>Rule/Statutory Reference (text of the rule/statute cited)</i> • <i>Level of Non-compliance (Type A1, Type A2, Type B, Unabated Type B, Citation)</i> • <i>Findings of non-compliance</i> 	<p>III (b). Facility plans to correct/prevent: <i>(Each Corrective Action should be cross-referenced to the appropriate citation/violation)</i></p>	<p>III (c). Date plan to be completed</p>
<p>Rule/Statute Number: 13F.0902(b) HEALTH CARE</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> POC Accepted _____ <i>DSS Initials</i></p>	
<p>Rule/Statutory Reference: The facility shall assure referral and follow-up to meet the routine and acute health care needs of residents.</p>		
<p>Level of Non-Compliance: A1 Violation</p>		
<p>Based on interviews and record reviews, the facility failed to ensure referral and follow-up to meet the routine and acute health care needs for 2 of 6 sampled residents (#1, #2) as evidenced by failure to follow-up on referral for routine suprapubic catheter care and wound care for the catheter site (#1) resulting in a wound on Resident #1 and failure to notify the provider of elevated blood glucose (#2).</p> <p>The findings are:</p> <p>1. Review of Resident #1's current FL2 dated 04/18/24 revealed: - Diagnoses included multiple sclerosis (MS) and type 2 diabetes mellitus. -The resident was semi-ambulatory and required assistance with bathing and dressing.</p> <p>Review of Resident #1's Resident Register dated 04/15/24 revealed: - Resident #1 was admitted to the facility on 04/15/24. - He had a suprapubic catheter (a hollow, flexible tube used to drain urine from the bladder from a cut in the abdomen). - He required assistance with suprapubic catheter care.</p> <p>Review of Resident #1's emergency room (ER) discharge note dated 04/17/24 at 07:30am: -The resident was sent to the ER from the facility at 3:15am via ambulance. - He was seen in the ER for possible blood in his urine "secondary to a dirty suprapubic catheter" and required replacement of the catheter. - Discharge diagnoses included urinary tract infection (UTI). - He was discharged with orders for a course of oral antibiotics, additional urine culture to identify specific bacteria, and an order to return if symptoms worsen. - He was discharged back to the assisted living facility at 7:30am.</p> <p>Interviews with the Resident Care Coordinator (RCC) on 05/28/24 at 4:00pm, 06/28/24 at 3:15pm, 07/12/24 at 10:34am, and 07/29/24 at 1:35pm revealed: - Resident #1 informed her he was in a lot of pain while completing admission paperwork on 04/17/24.</p>		

-The resident was unable to complete the paperwork with the RCC due to the pain.

-He was sent to the Emergency Room (ER) for a second time on 04/17/24 due to the increasing pain and discomfort.

Review of Resident #1's hospital discharge summary dated 04/17/24 revealed:

-On 04/17/24 at 5:23pm, he was transferred to the ED for a second time for reports of "mild to moderate distress with left-sided flank pain and low-grade fever".

-His laboratory test results showed "multi-drug resistant bacteria present" in the previously diagnosed urinary tract infection (UTI).

-He was diagnosed with sepsis and admitted to the hospital unit on 04/17/24.

-He stated to providers he had been experiencing UTI symptoms for over two weeks.

-He was discharged to a skilled nursing facility (SNF) for short term rehab on 04/24/24 with a plan to return to the facility after the course of IV antibiotic treatment.

Interviews with the RCC on 05/28/24 at 4:00pm, 06/28/24 at 3:15pm, 07/12/24 at 10:34am, and 07/29/24 at 01:35pm revealed:

-Resident #1 returned from SNF on 05/16/24.

-The resident was sent to the ER again on 05/17/24 at 6:00pm due to him being concerned about his catheter.

-He told RCC the catheter was leaking from the site on his lower abdomen.

-She was not aware of any catheter care orders when he returned to the facility from the SNF.

Review of Resident #1's ER discharge summary dated 05/17/24 revealed:

-He was seen in ER on 05/17/24 for leaking from the suprapubic catheter.

-Laboratory test results showed presence of multi drug resistant bacteria, and he was prescribed antibiotic course.

-He was discharged back to the facility on 05/17/24.

Review of Resident #1's hospital discharge record dated 05/23/24 revealed:

-He presented to the hospital on 05/23/24 due to "urine culture showed multidrug resistant organisms" and he complained of malaise and "increased suprapubic pain".

-A new wound was found near suprapubic catheter site on 05/23/24 that was not present at previous hospitalizations.

-The wound was noted to be "ulceration of skin at 3o'clock location".

-The provider noted the new wound could be the source of the increase in pain.

-Discharge orders included "Needs outpatient urology follow-up ASAP and regular exchange of suprapubic catheter at facility".

-The provider called the RCC at the facility to ensure the catheter care and changing would be done.

-Received verbal confirmation from the RCC that catheter care would be provided by a home health nurse if ordered.

-Discharge orders "recommend wound care be implemented locally to the suprapubic cath insertion site as he does have an erosion/ulceration forming and this is potentially a source of infection as well as a source of his pain".

-The provider noted "Suprapubic catheter in place with ulcerated erosion wound extending left laterally approximately 3:00, tender to touch, no significant drainage or surrounding redness other than this local wound".

-The resident was discharged back to the facility on 05/23/24.

Review of Resident #1's ER discharge summary dated 05/28/24 revealed:

-He was seen in the ER on 05/28/24 for generalized weakness and dizziness.

-The provider also noted "erosion at 3:00, purulent drainage coming out around the catheter, mild erythema in the area is tender".

-The provider consulted with urology regarding the skin breakdown and wound care was ordered.

-The resident reported to the provider that family member was providing all care while at the assisted living facility.

-The resident was given orders to discharge to a SNF.

Review of Resident #1's record at the facility on 05/28/24 revealed:

- There was no documentation related to Resident #1's suprapubic catheter on 05/17/24 when he was readmitted to the facility from the SNF.

- There was also no care plan, no Licensed Health Professional Support (LHPS) documentation, and no staff progress notes.

Interview with Resident #1 at the hospital on 05/29/24 at 9:40am revealed:

-He was in the hospital due to "not doing well" at the facility as the staff were not providing him catheter care.

-He had ongoing issues with a UTI and his catheter.

-His family member who also resided at the facility had to provide catheter care and empty his catheter bag.

-He was experiencing frequent pain, both related to catheter and his MS.

Interview with Resident #1's family member on 05/28/24 at 3:30pm revealed:

-She shared a room with Resident #1 at the facility.

-She stated she had to empty his catheter bag as the staff did not do this task.

-The facility staff never informed her Resident #1 was referred to home health to assist with care.

-Resident #1 was never seen by home health in this facility for catheter care or wound care.

-She stated that Resident #1 was frequently in pain.

Review of an email from the home health representative dated 07/09/24 revealed:

-Resident #1 had been referred by the Primary Care Provider (PCP) for concerns about his catheter on 05/27/24.

-The resident was seen by the provider on 05/27/24 via telehealth and was approved for home health care for catheter care and wound care services.

-There was no record of a referral for catheter care or wound care for Resident #1 prior to 05/27/24.

Interviews with the RCC on 05/28/24 at 4:00pm, 06/28/24 at 3:15pm, 07/12/24 at 10:34am and 07/29/24 at 1:35pm revealed:

-She completed Resident #1's admission.

-She was aware the resident required assistance with emptying his catheter when he was admitted.

-She believed home health would need to be present for all other catheter care.

-She believed she made a referral for home health before 05/27/24 and the resident was not present when home health came to assess.

-She could not provide documentation showing a referral had been made prior to 05/27/24.

-After Resident #1 returned to the facility on 05/17/24, he continued to complain of pain.

-She knew this because he was asking for his PRN pain medications.

-She was aware of orders for antibiotics following the 05/17/24 and 05/23/24 hospitalizations.

-She was unaware of orders for wound care.

-She observed no wounds when assisting Resident #1 with his catheter.

-She was responsible for contacting the PCP for clarification on orders.

-She was responsible for reading discharge orders and processing any new treatment orders.

-She would have contacted the provider to clarify the orders if she had known about the wound care order.

-The medical provider contracted for the facility did not see the resident during his stay because the resident was at the hospital during the days the provider was present.

- She could provide any documentation she had spoke with Resident #1's PCP about catheter care.

Interview with a medication aid (MA) on 05/31/24 at 10:30am and 07/12/24 at 10:00am revealed:

-Prior to his hospitalization on 05/28/24, Resident #1 verbalized pain but would not state where the pain was located as he was not speaking much.

-A family member of the resident also stated he was in pain.

-He was grimacing and groaning at times.

-She informed the RCC of increasing pain that was not helped by the medication per resident.

-Resident #1 had been out of the facility for long periods of time but received assistance with emptying urine from the catheter bag when he requested.

-She was unaware the resident had a wound.

Interview with one of the facility Owners on 07/05/24 at 9:40am revealed:

-She was also a registered nurse (RN).

- She was working on-site at the facility in May 2024 reviewing LHPS assessments.
- She had minimal interactions with Resident #1.
- Resident #1 was only in the facility for 7-10 days over a two-month period.
- She saw Resident #1 for a few minutes when administering his IM antibiotic.
- She was unaware of any catheter care concerns.
- Any catheter care would have been provided by the home health nurse.
- She stated any issues with home health nurse referrals were the responsibility of the RCC.

Interview with the Administrator on 06/28/24 at 3:45pm revealed:

- The RCC was responsible for reviewing discharge notes for new orders.
- The RCC would have to be asked why the resident was not seen by home health.
- The RCC would have to be asked questions regarding the provision of care.
- Resident #1 was in and out of the facility due to the frequent hospitalizations.
- According to information provided by the RCC, the resident was only in facility for 6 days due to hospitalizations.

Attempted interview with Resident #1's Primary Care Provider (PCP) on 05/28/24 at 4:00pm was unsuccessful.

2.)Review of Resident #1's current FL2 dated 04/18/24 revealed:

- Diagnoses included multiple sclerosis (MS) and type 2 diabetes mellitus.
- The resident was semi-ambulatory and required assistance with bathing and dressing.
- The resident had an order for Hydrocodone-acetaminophen 5-325mg, take 1 tablet every 6 hours as needed for pain.

a. Review of Resident #1's May 2024 electronic medication administration record (eMAR) revealed:

- There was an entry for Hydrocodone-acetaminophen 5-325mg - take 1 tablet by mouth every 6 hours as needed for pain.
- There was no documentation hydrocodone-acetaminophen was administered after the 05/27/24 at 5:21am dose.
- There was no documentation that the provider or pharmacy was notified the resident had run out of medications.

Review of Resident #1's facility record on 05/28/24 revealed no care notes for the resident since his admission on 04/17/24.

Interview with Resident #1 on 05/29/24 at 9:40am revealed:

- He had gone without his pain medication as they had run out.
- Had no doses after early morning on 05/27/24.
- Was only "a day or two but I have MS, when I need pain medication, I really need it".
- He was brought to the hospital on 5/28/24 at 2am.

- Facility staff told him his medication had run out.
- One staff told him it had not been ordered.
- Another staff reported it had been thrown away.
- He does not know what actually happened but that it did not seem appropriate.
- He was told repeatedly that the facility forgot to order the medication beginning on 05/27.

Interview with the facility's contracted pharmacy on 06/25/24 at 3pm revealed:

- The facility received routine ordered medications on the same cycle each month.
- The medication pack cycle for this facility started on the 15th of each month for all pill form medications routinely ordered.
- The pharmacist stated that it is the responsibility of the facility to reorder PRN medications.
- The medication was not reordered since the resident arrived at the facility on 05/17/24.

Interview with a MA on 06/28/24 and 7/12/24 at 10:00am revealed:

- The resident ran out of his pain medication.
- Resident #1 reported pain after he ran out of medication.
- The resident's family member also reported he was in pain.
- She could not reorder controlled medications on the eMAR system, so she told the RCC the resident was out of his pain medication.

Interviews with the RCC on 05/28/24 at 4:00pm, 06/28/24 at 3:15pm, and 07/12/24 at 10:34am revealed:

- The resident reported pain frequently.
- She knew Resident #1 had run out of medication.
- She was responsible for reordering medications.
- She requested refills from the provider if needed.
- She was responsible for contacting the appropriate medical providers as needed.
- She could not say why she had not re-ordered the medication or contacted the PCP.

Interview with the Administrator on 06/28/24 at 3:45pm revealed:

- The Administrator stated they were unaware of issues with Resident's medications.
- The RCC is responsible for contacting the providers and reordering medications.

b. Review of Resident #1's May 2024 electronic medication administration record (eMAR) revealed:

- There was an entry for Buspirone HCL 30mg tablet - 1 tablet by mouth twice daily, used to treat anxiety.
- Staff documented the medication was "on order from pharmacy" for those missed administrations.
- Buspirone HCL was documented as administered on 05/22/24 at 6:00pm and 05/23/24 at 6:00pm.
- The resident was not administered this medication on 9 out of 21 administration opportunities.
- There was no documentation that the provider was notified of the

missed doses.

Review of Resident #1's facility record on 05/28/24 revealed no care notes for the resident since his admission on 04/17/24.

Interview with Resident #1 on 05/29/24 at 9:40am revealed:
-He was concerned about his medication.
-He spoke with staff about medication and that they just blamed one another.
-The resident reported that he does not know what happened but that it did not seem appropriate.

Interview with a MA on 06/28/24 and 7/12/24 at 10am revealed:
-She followed the medication orders in the eMAR.
-She was not aware of that Resident #1's Buspirone was not being administered correctly.

Interviews with the RCC on 05/28/24 at 4:00pm, 06/28/24 at 3:15pm, and 07/12/24 at 10:34am revealed:
-She did not think Resident #1 had missed any Buspirone.
-She was responsible for contacting the appropriate medical providers if medications were missed.
-She would have contacted provider via telehealth if needed.
-She had no record of provider notification.

Interview with the Administrator on 06/28/24 at 3:45pm revealed:
-The facility had a new medication passing computer system.
-The staff were trained on the new system.
-The RCC was responsible for contacting providers when needed.

b. Review of Resident #2's current FL2 dated 04/18/24 revealed:
-Diagnoses included type 2 diabetes, anemia, COPD, and obesity.
-The resident was semi-ambulatory and required assistance with bathing and dressing.

Review of physician signed endocrinology visit notes for Resident #2 dated 04/10/24 revealed:
-Fingerstick blood sugar checks were ordered to be taken 4 times daily before meals, 2 hours after meals, and before bedtime.
-Notify provider if fasting blood sugar was above 150 three days in a row.

Review of Resident #2's May 2024 electronic medication administration record (eMAR) revealed:
-There was no documentation of FSBS taken 2 hours after meals.
-Fasting blood sugar was above 150 on 24/28 opportunities.

Interview with Resident #2 on 05/28/24 at 10:00am revealed she was unaware of issues with blood sugar.

Interviews with the RCC on 05/28/24 at 4:00pm, 06/28/24 at 3:15pm, and 07/12/24 at 10:34am revealed:
-She was not aware there were any issues with Resident #2's FSBS or that it wasn't being measured as ordered.

- She was responsible for contacting the medical providers as needed.
- She would have contacted the provider via telehealth if needed.
- There was no record of provider notification.

Interview with the Administrator on 06/28/24 at 3:45pm revealed:

- He was not aware of any issues with Resident #2's FSBS orders.
- The facility had a new medication passing computer system.
- The staff were trained on the new system.
- The RCC was responsible for contacting providers when needed.

The facility failed to contact the provider for Resident #1 related to suprapubic catheter care which resulted in resident developing a UTI with multiple and frequent hospitalizations and wound at the catheter site. This failure resulted in serious physical harm and constitutes a Type A1 violation.

The facility provided a plan of protection in accordance with G.S. 131D-34 on 05/31/24 for this violation

DATE OF CORRECTION FOR THE A1 VIOLATION SHALL NOT EXCEED 08/28/2024

IV. Delivered Via: Email	Certified Mail #:	Date: 07/29/2024
DSS Signature: Emily R. Weinstein		Return to DSS By: 08/19/2024

V. CAR Received by:	Administrator/Designee (print name): Gage Boardingham	
	Signature:	Date:
	Title: Administrator	

VI. Plan of Correction Submitted by:	Administrator (print name):	
	Signature:	Date:

VII. Agency's Review of Facility's Plan of Correction (POC)		
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>POC Not Accepted</i>	By:	Date:

Comments:

<input type="checkbox"/> <i>POC Accepted</i>	By:	Date:
--	-----	-------

Comments:

VIII. Agency's Follow-Up	By:	Date:
	Facility in Compliance: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Date Sent to ACLS:

Comments:

** For follow-up to CAR, attach Monitoring Report showing facility in compliance.*