STATEMENT OF DEFICIENCIES AND PLAN OF CORRECTION	(X1) PROVIDER / SUPPLIER / CLIA IDENNTIFICATION NUMBER	(X2) MULTIPLE CONSTRUCTION	(X3) DATE SURVEY COMPLETED
	345270	A. BUILDING _____ B. WING _____	03/05/2020

NAME OF PROVIDER OF SUPPLIER	STREET ADDRESS, CITY, STATE, ZIP
BRIAN CTR HEALTH & REHAB/SPRUCE PINES	218 LAUREL CREEK COURT SPRUCE PINE, NC 28777

For information on the nursing home's plan to correct this deficiency, please contact the nursing home or the state survey agency.

(X4) ID PREFIX TAG	SUMMARY STATEMENT OF DEFICIENCIES (EACH DEFICIENCY MUST BE PRECEDED BY FULL REGULATORY OR LSC IDENTIFYING INFORMATION)
F 0561 **Level of harm** - Minimal harm or potential for actual harm **Residents Affected** - Few	**Honor the resident's right to and the facility must promote and facilitate resident self-determination through support of resident choice.** **NOTE- TERMS IN BRACKETS HAVE BEEN EDITED TO PROTECT CONFIDENTIALITY** Based on record review, resident and staff interviews, the facility failed to provide scheduled showers for 2 of 4 residents (Resident #3 and Resident #44) reviewed for activities of daily living. The findings included: 1. Resident #3 was admitted to the facility on [DATE] with [DIAGNOSES REDACTED]. The quarterly Minimum Data Set (MDS) assessment dated [DATE] indicated Resident #3 had intact cognition, was totally dependent on one-person physical assist for bathing and had impairment to both upper extremities. Resident #3's Treatment Administration Record (TAR) for February 2020 was not initialed for Resident #3 to indicate he received a shower on 2/15/20, 2/22/20 and 2/29/20. On 3/4/20 at 2:40 PM, an interview with Resident #3 revealed he had not received his scheduled showers for the past 3 Saturdays. Resident #3 stated he was scheduled to receive a shower on Wednesdays and Saturdays but had only received one shower a week on Wednesday for the past 3 weeks. Resident #3 further stated the facility had one nurse aide (NA) assigned to his hall on the weekends for the past 3 weeks. He said the NA who worked this past weekend stayed past the time her shift ended on 3/1/20 in order to give him a shower since he had not received a shower for 3 consecutive Saturdays. He shared that they did offer to make up his other missed Saturday showers on Tuesdays, but he did not want to take 2 showers on back-to-back days. On 3/4/20 at 4:03 PM, a phone interview with NA #5 revealed she worked with Resident #3 on 2/15/20 and 2/29/20 during the day shift and did not have time to give him his scheduled shower. NA #5 stated she could not leave the hall for 45 minutes to give any resident a shower. NA #5 had been assigned to work on 300 hall by herself on 2/15/20 and 2/29/20, and had 26 residents to take care of. NA #5 shared she stayed over on 3/1/20 past the time her shift ended to give Resident #3 his scheduled shower since he had not received one for the past 3 Saturdays. NA #5 further stated the facility had been understaffed for at least a month. On 3/4/20 at 4:16 PM, an interview with Nurse #3 revealed she worked as the weekend supervisor and worked on 2/15/20, 2/22/20 and 2/29/20. Nurse #3 stated she was unaware that Resident #3 had missed his scheduled showers on those dates (2/15/20, 2/22/20 and 2/29/20). Nurse #3 stated Nurse #1 should have notified her so they could have made up Resident #3's scheduled shower on the next day. Nurse #3 further stated they usually had 1 NA per hall and a floater NA on the weekends but did not know that showers were missed due to not having enough staff. On 3/4/20 at 4:42 PM, a phone interview conducted with Nurse #1 revealed she worked with NA #5 on 2/29/20 and verified that NA #5 worked as the only NA on the 300 hall on 2/29/20. Nurse #1 also worked on 2/22/20 and confirmed that Resident #3 did not get his scheduled shower on 2/22/20 and 2/29/20. Nurse #1 stated there was another NA who floated among the halls and helped with meals and incontinence care, but this NA did not have time to do resident showers. Nurse #1 could not remember if she had notified the weekend supervisor that Resident #3 had missed his scheduled showers on the past 3 Saturdays but shared that Resident #3 would let staff members know if he did miss his showers. On 3/4/20 at 5:34 PM, an interview conducted with NA #7 revealed she worked with Resident #3 on 2/15/20 and 2/29/20 during the evening shift and was unaware that Resident #3 had not received his scheduled shower for those days. NA #7 stated she did not give Resident #3 his shower because she did not know he did not receive them during the day shift. NA #7 shared Resident #3 never refused his scheduled showers. On 3/5/20 at 9:23 AM, a phone interview with NA #4 revealed she worked on 2/15/20 and 2/29/20 and was assigned to be a floater NA. NA #4 stated she had to help on 200 hall, 300 hall and 400 hall as the floater NA. She further stated she had helped NA #5 on 300 hall with incontinence care, passing meal trays, feeding assistance and charting. NA #4 stated she did not provide any resident showers with NA #5 because they did not have enough time. NA #4 shared she only worked on Saturdays and they were supposed to have 2 NAs per hall but during the last 3 to 4 weeks, they have had to work with only 1 NA per hall and a floater NA. On 3/5/20 at 9:30 AM, an interview conducted with NA #6 revealed she worked with Resident #3 on 2/22/20 on day shift and did not provide his scheduled shower on that day. NA #6 stated she worked on 300 hall by herself and did not have time to do all the showers that were scheduled for the day. NA #6 shared she had meant to offer Resident #3 a make-up shower on 2/23/20 but he had been in activities that day and she did not have the opportunity to ask him. On 3/5/20 at 3:46 PM, an interview with the Director of Nursing (DON) revealed Resident #3 should have received his showers as scheduled. The DON was unsure if Resident #3 had been offered a make-up shower for the showers he missed. The DON stated the facility had challenges with the staffing due to callouts and unexpected situations but have been trying to obtain staff to provide care for the residents. On 3/5/20 at 4:40 PM, an interview with the Administrator revealed all residents should receive at least 2 showers a week. She stated she was unaware that Resident #3 had missed his scheduled showers during the past 3 Saturdays, but the next shift should have made it up or a shower should have been offered the next day if they did not have time to get his shower done on the day it was scheduled. 2. Resident #44 was admitted to the facility on [DATE] with [DIAGNOSES REDACTED]. The quarterly Minimum Data Set (MDS) assessment dated [DATE] indicated Resident #44 had intact cognition and required physical help from one person in part of bathing activity. Resident #44's Treatment Administration Record (TAR) for February 2020 was not initialed for Resident #44 to indicate that he received a shower on 2/15/20, 2/22/20 and 2/29/20. On 3/2/20 at 3:20 PM, an interview with Resident #44 revealed he was scheduled to receive a shower on Wednesdays and Saturdays but had not received his Saturday showers during the past 3 weeks. Resident #44 stated they did not have enough staff on Saturdays and had only 1 nurse aide (NA) working on his hall. Resident #44 shared the NA did not have enough time to give him his scheduled shower on Saturdays. On 3/4/20 at 4:03 PM, a phone interview with NA #5 revealed she worked with Resident #44 on 2/15/20 and 2/29/20 during the day shift and did not have time to give him his scheduled shower. NA #5 stated she could not leave the hall for 45 minutes to give any resident a shower. NA #5 had been assigned to work on 300 hall by herself on 2/15/20 and 2/29/20, and had 26 residents to take care of. NA #5 shared she stayed over on 3/1/20 past the time her shift ended to give Resident #44 his shower. NA #5 further stated the facility had been understaffed for at least a month. On 3/4/20 at 4:16 PM, an interview with Nurse #3 revealed she worked as the weekend supervisor and worked on 2/15/20, 2/22/20 and 2/29/20. Nurse #3 was unaware that Resident #44 had missed his scheduled showers on those dates (2/15/20, 2/22/20 and 2/29/20). Nurse #3 stated Nurse #1 should have notified her so they could have made up his shower on the next day. Nurse #3 further stated they usually had 1 NA per hall and a floater NA on the weekends but did not know that showers were missed due to not having enough staff. On 3/4/20 at 4:42 PM, a phone interview conducted with Nurse #1 revealed she worked with NA #5 on 2/29/20 and verified that NA #5 worked as the only NA on the 300 hall on 2/29/20. Nurse #1 also worked on 2/22/20 and confirmed that Resident #44 did not get his scheduled shower on 2/22/20 and 2/29/20. Nurse #1 stated there was another NA who floated among the halls and helped with meals and incontinence care, but they did not have time to do showers. Nurse #1 could not remember if she had notified the weekend supervisor that Resident #44 had missed his showers on the past 3 Saturdays. On 3/4/20 at 5:34 PM, an interview conducted with NA #7 revealed she worked with Resident #44 on 2/15/20 and 2/29/20 on evening shift and was unaware that Resident #44 had not received his scheduled shower for those days. NA #7 stated she did not give Resident #44 his shower because she did

LABORATORY DIRECTOR'S OR PROVIDER/SUPPLIER REPRESENTATIVE'S SIGNATURE | TITLE | (X6) DATE

Any deficiency statement ending with an asterisk (*) denotes a deficiency which the institution may be excused from correcting providing it is determined that other safeguards provide sufficient protection to the patients. (See instructions.) Except for nursing homes, the findings stated above are disclosable 90 days following the date of survey whether or not a plan of correction is provided. For nursing homes, the above findings and plans of correction are disclosable 14 days following the date these documents are made available to the facility. If deficiencies are cited, an approved plan of correction is requisite to continued program participation.

STATEMENT OF DEFICIENCIES AND PLAN OF CORRECTION	(X1) PROVIDER / SUPPLIER / CLIA IDENNTIFICATION NUMBER	(X2) MULTIPLE CONSTRUCTION	(X3) DATE SURVEY COMPLETED
	345270	A. BUILDING _____ B. WING _____	03/05/2020

NAME OF PROVIDER OF SUPPLIER	STREET ADDRESS, CITY, STATE, ZIP
BRIAN CTR HEALTH & REHAB/SPRUCE PINES	218 LAUREL CREEK COURT SPRUCE PINE, NC 28777

For information on the nursing home's plan to correct this deficiency, please contact the nursing home or the state survey agency.

(X4) ID PREFIX TAG	SUMMARY STATEMENT OF DEFICIENCIES (EACH DEFICIENCY MUST BE PRECEDED BY FULL REGULATORY OR LSC IDENTIFYING INFORMATION)
F 0561 **Level of harm** - Minimal harm or potential for actual harm **Residents Affected** - Few	(continued... from page 1) not know he did not get them during the day shift. On 3/5/20 at 9:23 AM, a phone interview with NA #4 revealed she worked on 2/15/20 and 2/29/20 and was assigned to be a floater NA. NA #4 stated she had to help on 200 hall, 300 hall and 400 hall as a floater. She further stated she had helped NA #5 on 300 hall with incontinence care, passing meal trays, feeding assistance and charting. NA #4 stated she did not provide any resident showers with NA #5 because they did not have enough time. NA #4 shared she only worked on Saturdays and they were supposed to have 2 NAs per hall but during the last 3 to 4 weeks, they have had to work with only 1 NA per hall and a floater NA. On 3/5/20 at 9:30 AM, an interview conducted with NA #6 revealed she worked with Resident #44 on 2/22/20 during the day shift and did not provide his scheduled shower on that day. NA #6 stated she worked on 300 hall by herself and did not have time to do all the showers that were scheduled for the day. NA #6 shared she provided Resident #44 a make-up shower on 2/23/20. On 3/5/20 at 3:46 PM, an interview with the Director of Nursing (DON) revealed Resident #44 should have received his showers as scheduled. The DON was unsure if Resident #44 had been offered a make-up shower for the showers he missed. The DON stated the facility had challenges with the staffing due to callouts and unexpected situations but have been trying to obtain staff to provide care for the residents. On 3/5/20 at 4:40 PM, an interview with the Administrator revealed all residents should receive at least 2 showers a week. She stated she was unaware that Resident #44 had missed his scheduled showers during the past 3 Saturdays, but the next shift should have made it up or a shower should have been offered the next day if they did not have time to get his shower done on the day it was scheduled.
F 0641 **Level of harm** - Minimal harm or potential for actual harm **Residents Affected** - Some	**Ensure each resident receives an accurate assessment.** **NOTE- TERMS IN BRACKETS HAVE BEEN EDITED TO PROTECT CONFIDENTIALITY** Based on observations, record review and resident and staff interviews, the facility failed to accurately code Minimum Data Set (MDS) assessments in the areas of behaviors (Residents #16 and #17), oxygen use (Resident #16), influenza immunization (Residents #50, #56, #22, #42 and #33) and prognosis (Resident #88) for 8 of 24 sampled residents reviewed for MDS accuracy. The findings included: 1. a. Resident #16 was admitted to the facility on [DATE] and readmitted on [DATE] with [DIAGNOSES REDACTED]. Resident #16's Treatment Administration Record (TAR) dated February 2020 revealed she refused her continuous positive airway pressure ([MEDICAL CONDITION]) treatments on the following dates: 2/4/20, 2/5/20, [DATE], 2/7/20, 2/11/20, 2/17/20, 2/19/20, 2/21/20, 2//25/20, 2/26/20 and 2/27/20. Resident #16's quarterly Minimum Data Set (MDS) assessment dated [DATE] coded the resident as being cognitively intact. Resident #16 was coded under behaviors for no rejection of care. An interview was conducted on 3/2/20 at 8:24 AM with Resident #16. She stated she wore a continuous positive [MEDICAL CONDITION] at night, but had been refusing it for the past month because of the mask bothering her. The interview revealed staff had attempted to changer her mask to better fit her face however she felt like it was suffocating her and had continued to refuse the machine. An interview was conducted on 3/3/20 at 4:42 PM with Nurse #4. Nurse #4 stated Resident #16 had refused to wear her [MEDICAL CONDITION] on a nightly basis. She stated a staff member from the [MEDICAL CONDITION] company had came in the week prior to assist in finding a solution to the mask fitting however the resident had continued to refuse the machine. An interview was conducted on 3/03/20 at 4:35 pm with MDS Coordinator #1. During the interview, the MDS Coordinator reviewed Resident #16's 2/21/20 quarterly MDS assessment along with her February 2020 TAR. He confirmed rejection of care was marked no on the MDS assessment. MDS Coordinator #1 stated the MDS was coded inaccurately based on the TAR provided. He stated he answered thousands of MDS assessment questions for residents in the facility and mistakes happen. An interview was conducted with the Director of Nursing (DON) on 3/05/20 at 3:46 pm who indicated the MDS assessment should be accurate and correspond with the residents needs or what she was doing. The DON stated she also understood it was missed out of human error not by intention. b. A physician's orders [REDACTED].#16 had a order for oxygen therapy a 2 liters via nasal cannula as needed to keep oxygen saturation greater than 90%. Resident #16's quarterly Minimum Data Set (MDS) assessment dated [DATE] coded the resident as being cognitively intact. Resident #16 was coded for no oxygen therapy use. A MDS note dated 2/21/20 stated Resident #16 wore oxygen at 2 liters especially at night with a continuous positive airway pressure ([MEDICAL CONDITION]). An interview was conducted on 3/2/20 at 8:24 AM with Resident #16. She stated she wore a continuous positive airway pressure ([MEDICAL CONDITION]) at night but had been refusing it for the past month because of the mask bothering her. She stated instead of wearing the [MEDICAL CONDITION] she wore oxygen via a nasal cannula at 2 liters every night. An interview was conducted on 3/05/20 at 11:32 AM with MDS Coordinator #1. During the interview, the MDS Coordinator reviewed Resident #16's 2/21/20 quarterly MDS assessment. He confirmed oxygen therapy was marked no. The MDS Coordinator #1 stated the MDS was coded inaccurately because he knew the resident wore oxygen. An interview was conducted with the Director of Nursing (DON) on 3/05/20 at 3:46 pm who indicated the MDS assessment should be accurate and correspond with the residents needs or what she was doing. The DON stated she also understood it was missed out of human error not by intention. 2. Resident #17 was readmitted to the facility on [DATE] with [DIAGNOSES REDACTED]. Resident #17's care plan, most recently reviewed on 1/10/20, revealed a focus area which stated he was resistive to care such as therapy and often refused to let staff clean out old food from his nightstand drawers. The goal was for Resident #17 to cooperate with care and room cleaning through the next review date. Interventions listed included occupational therapy, education to the resident and allowing the resident to make his own decisions. The care plan did not include information regarding the resident's refusal of showers. Resident #17's shower log dated February 2020 revealed he had refused a shower on the following dates: 2/1/20, 2/5/20, 2/15/20, 2/19/20, 2/22/20 and 2/29/20. Resident #17 refused 6 of his 9 scheduled shower days for the month of February 2020. Resident #17's quarterly Minimum Data Set (MDS) assessment dated [DATE] coded the resident as being cognitively intact. Resident #17 was coded under behaviors for no rejection of care. An observation was conducted on 3/2/20 at 10:12 AM of Resident #17. At the time of the observation Resident #17 was laying in bed. Urinals were observed on the side of his bed with black debris around the inside of the urinal. Resident #17 had tan debris on his shirt and covers and an odor was present. An interview was conducted on 3/2/20 at 10:12 AM with Resident #17. He stated he often refused his showers due to not wanting to get out of the bed. The interview revealed it was the resident's choice to often refuse a shower despite encouragement from staff. An interview was conducted on 3/3/20 at 4:52 PM with Nurse #4. Nurse #4 stated Resident #17 had refused all care including showers. She stated no matter how many times nursing staff asked the resident he still would refuse to take a shower. An interview was conducted on 3/03/20 at 4:20 pm with MDS Coordinator #1. During the interview, the MDS Coordinator reviewed Resident #17's 2/23/20 quarterly MDS assessment along with his February 2020 shower log. He confirmed rejection of care was marked no on the quarterly MDS. MDS Coordinator #1 stated the MDS was coded inaccurately based on the shower log provided, however said the care plan reflected rejection of care. An interview was conducted with the Director of Nursing (DON) on 3/05/20 at 3:46 pm who indicated the MDS assessment should be accurate and correspond with the residents needs or what he was doing. The DON stated she also understood it was missed out of human error not by intention. 3. Resident #50 was admitted to the facility on [DATE] with [DIAGNOSES REDACTED]. The resident vaccination log for 2019 revealed Resident #50 received her influenza vaccination in the facility on the date of 11/5/19. Resident #50's quarterly Minimum Data Set (MDS) assessment dated [DATE] coded the resident as being severely cognitively impaired. Resident #50 was coded as receiving her influenza vaccination on 10/23/2018. An interview was conducted on 3/04/20 at 1:10 PM with MDS Coordinator #1. During the interview, the MDS Coordinator reviewed Resident #50's 1/8/20 quarterly MDS assessment and the vaccination record. He confirmed the date coded on the MDS was inaccurate. MDS Coordinator #1 stated he had not been provided with the resident vaccination log and was having to look in the resident charts to verify the date of when the residents received the vaccination. He stated from now on he would ask to see the vaccination log. An interview was conducted with the Director of Nursing (DON) on 3/05/20 at 8:57 AM who indicated the MDS assessment should be accurate and correspond with the residents needs and immunization record. The DON stated they had discussed the MDS vaccination issue and incorrect dates. She stated the MDS Coordinator had thought the point click care system was automatically pulling the dates over however that was not the case. 4. Resident #56 was admitted to the facility on [DATE] with [DIAGNOSES REDACTED]. The resident vaccination log for 2019 revealed Resident #56 received her influenza vaccination in the facility on the date of 11/6/19. Resident #56's quarterly Minimum Data Set (MDS) assessment dated [DATE] coded the resident as being cognitively intact. Resident #56 was coded as not eligible to receive the influenza vaccination. An interview was conducted on 3/04/20 at 1:10 PM with MDS Coordinator #1. During the interview, the MDS Coordinator reviewed Resident #56's 1/15/20 quarterly MDS assessment and the vaccination record. He confirmed the information coded on the MDS was inaccurate. MDS Coordinator #1 stated he had not been provided with the resident vaccination log and was having to look in the resident charts to verify the date of when the residents received the vaccination. He stated from now on he would ask to see the vaccination log. An interview was conducted with the Director of Nursing (DON) on 3/05/20 at 8:57 AM who indicated the MDS assessment should be accurate and correspond with the residents needs and immunization record. The DON stated they had discussed the

STATEMENT OF DEFICIENCIES AND PLAN OF CORRECTION	(X1) PROVIDER / SUPPLIER / CLIA IDENNTIFICATION NUMBER	(X2) MULTIPLE CONSTRUCTION	(X3) DATE SURVEY COMPLETED
	345270	A. BUILDING _____ B. WING _____	03/05/2020

NAME OF PROVIDER OF SUPPLIER	STREET ADDRESS, CITY, STATE, ZIP
BRIAN CTR HEALTH & REHAB/SPRUCE PINES	218 LAUREL CREEK COURT SPRUCE PINE, NC 28777

For information on the nursing home's plan to correct this deficiency, please contact the nursing home or the state survey agency.

(X4) ID PREFIX TAG	SUMMARY STATEMENT OF DEFICIENCIES (EACH DEFICIENCY MUST BE PRECEDED BY FULL REGULATORY OR LSC IDENTIFYING INFORMATION)
F 0641 **Level of harm -** Minimal harm or potential for actual harm **Residents Affected -** Some	(continued... from page 2) MDS vaccination issue and incorrect dates. She stated the MDS Coordinator had thought the point click care system was automatically pulling the dates over however that was not the case. 5. Resident #22 was readmitted to the facility on [DATE] with [DIAGNOSES REDACTED]. The resident vaccination log for 2019 revealed Resident #22 received his influenza vaccination in the facility on the date of 11/5/19. Resident #22's quarterly Minimum Data Set (MDS) assessment dated [DATE] coded the resident as being cognitively intact. Resident #22 was coded as receiving his influenza vaccination outside of the facility. An interview was conducted on 3/04/20 at 1:10 PM with MDS Coordinator #1. During the interview, the MDS Coordinator reviewed Resident #22's 12/6/19 quarterly MDS assessment and the vaccination record. He confirmed the date coded on the MDS was inaccurate. MDS Coordinator #1 stated he had not been provided with the resident vaccination log and was having to look in the resident charts to verify the date of when the residents received the vaccination. He stated from now on he would ask to see the vaccination log. An interview was conducted with the Director of Nursing (DON) on 3/05/20 at 8:57 AM who indicated the MDS assessment should be accurate and correspond with the residents needs and immunization record. The DON stated they had discussed the MDS vaccination issue and incorrect dates. She stated the MDS Coordinator had thought the point click care system was automatically pulling the dates over however that was not the case. 6. Resident #42 was admitted to the facility on [DATE] with [DIAGNOSES REDACTED]. and diabetes mellitus. The resident vaccination log for 2019 revealed Resident #42 received her influenza vaccination in the facility on the date of 11/6/19. Resident #42's annual Minimum Data Set (MDS) assessment dated [DATE] coded the resident as being severely cognitively impaired. Resident #42 was coded as receiving her influenza vaccination on 10/23/2018. An interview was conducted on 3/04/20 at 1:10 PM with MDS Coordinator #1. During the interview, the MDS Coordinator reviewed Resident #42's 1/2/20 annual MDS assessment and the vaccination record. He confirmed the date coded on the MDS was inaccurate. MDS Coordinator #1 stated he had not been provided with the resident vaccination log and was having to look in the resident charts to verify the date of when the residents received the vaccination. He stated from now on he would ask to see the vaccination log. An interview was conducted with the Director of Nursing (DON) on 3/05/20 at 8:57 AM who indicated the MDS assessment should be accurate and correspond with the residents needs and immunization record. The DON stated they had discussed the MDS vaccination issue and incorrect dates. She stated the MDS Coordinator had thought the point click care system was automatically pulling the dates over however that was not the case. 7. Resident #33 was readmitted to the facility on [DATE] with [DIAGNOSES REDACTED]. The resident vaccination log for 2019 revealed Resident #33 received her influenza vaccination in the facility on the date of 11/5/19. Resident #33's quarterly Minimum Data Set (MDS) assessment dated [DATE] coded the resident as being severely cognitively impaired. Resident #33 was coded as receiving her influenza vaccination on 11/1/2018. An interview was conducted on 3/04/20 at 1:10 PM with MDS Coordinator #1. During the interview, the MDS Coordinator reviewed Resident #33's 1[DATE] quarterly MDS assessment and the vaccination record. He confirmed the date coded on the MDS was inaccurate. MDS Coordinator #1 stated he had not been provided with the resident vaccination log and was having to look in the resident charts to verify the date of when the residents received the vaccination. He stated from now on he would ask to see the vaccination log. An interview was conducted with the Director of Nursing (DON) on 3/05/20 at 8:57 AM who indicated the MDS assessment should be accurate and correspond with the residents needs and immunization record. The DON stated they had discussed the MDS vaccination issue and incorrect dates. She stated the MDS Coordinator had thought the point click care system was automatically pulling the dates over however that was not the case. 8. Resident #88 was admitted to the facility on [DATE] with [DIAGNOSES REDACTED]. Resident #88 was admitted to Hospice on 11/27/19 and had a Hospice Certificate dated 11/27/19, with a documented life expectancy of six months or less signed by the Hospice Medical Director. The resident's Significant Change Minimum Data Set ((MDS) dated [DATE] revealed the resident was coded for the area of Prognosis as not having a condition or chronic disease that may result in a life expectancy of less than 6 months. The resident was coded as having received Hospice Care while a resident. An interview was conducted on 3/03/20 at 4:35 pm with MDS Coordinator #1. During the interview, the MDS Coordinator reviewed Resident #88's 12/07/19 Significant Change MDS assessment and her Hospice Certificate dated 11/27/19. He confirmed Prognosis was coded inaccurately on the 12/07/19 MDS assessment based on the Hospice Certificate provided. He stated he answered thousands of MDS assessment questions for residents in the facility and mistakes happen. An interview was conducted with the Director of Nursing (DON) on 3/05/20 at 3:46 pm who indicated the MDS assessment should be accurate and correspond with the residents' prognosis and programs. The DON stated she also understood it was missed out of human error not by intention.
F 0656 **Level of harm -** Minimal harm or potential for actual harm **Residents Affected -** Few	**Develop and implement a complete care plan that meets all the resident's needs, with timetables and actions that can be measured.** **NOTE- TERMS IN BRACKETS HAVE BEEN EDITED TO PROTECT CONFIDENTIALITY** Based on record review, and resident and staff interviews, the facility failed to develop a care plan with goals and interventions for a resident who rejected treatments for 1 of 2 residents reviewed for behaviors (Resident #16). The finding included: Resident #16 was readmitted to the facility on [DATE] with [DIAGNOSES REDACTED]. Review of a physician order [REDACTED].#16 was to wear her [MEDICAL CONDITION] at nighttime per home settings at bedtime related to obstructive sleep apnea. Review of Resident #16's care plan dated 1/3/19 revealed no focus area related to rejection of care. Resident #16's Treatment Administration Record (TAR) dated February 2020 revealed she had refused her continuous positive airway pressure ([MEDICAL CONDITION]) treatments on the following dates: 2/4/20, 2/5/20, [DATE], 2/7/20, 2/11/20, 2/17/20, 2/19/20, 2/21/20, 2/25/20, 2/26/20 and 2/27/20. Resident #16's quarterly Minimum Data Set (MDS) assessment dated [DATE] coded the resident as being cognitively intact. Resident #16 was coded under behaviors for no rejection of care. An interview was conducted on 3/2/20 at 8:24 AM with Resident #16. She stated she wore a continuous positive airway pressure ([MEDICAL CONDITION]) at night but had been refusing it for the past month because of the mask bothering her. The interview revealed staff had attempted to changer her mask to better fit her face however she felt like it was suffocating her and had continued to refuse the machine. An interview was conducted on 3/3/20 at 4:42 PM with Nurse #4. Nurse #4 stated Resident #16 had refused to wear her [MEDICAL CONDITION] on a nightly basis. She stated a staff member from the [MEDICAL CONDITION] company had came in the week prior to assist in finding a solution to the mask fitting however the resident had continued to refuse the machine. An interview was conducted on 3/03/20 at 4:35 pm with MDS Coordinator #1. During the interview, the MDS Coordinator reviewed Resident #16's 2/21/20 quarterly MDS assessment along with her February 2020 TAR and care plan. He confirmed rejection of care was marked no on the resident's 2/21/20 quarterly MDS assessment and the resident did not have a focus area on her care plan for rejection of care prior to 3/3/20 when the surveyor asked for a copy of the resident's care plan. MDS Coordinator #1 stated resident should have had a care plan reflecting her refusals of her [MEDICAL CONDITION] treatments. An interview was conducted with the Director of Nursing (DON) on 3/05/20 at 3:46 pm who indicated the care plan should be accurate and correspond with the residents needs or what she was doing. The DON stated she also understood it was missed out of human error not by intention.
F 0657 **Level of harm -** Minimal harm or potential for actual harm **Residents Affected -** Few	**Develop the complete care plan within 7 days of the comprehensive assessment; and prepared, reviewed, and revised by a team of health professionals.** **NOTE- TERMS IN BRACKETS HAVE BEEN EDITED TO PROTECT CONFIDENTIALITY** Based on record review, observations and resident and staff interviews, the facility failed to revise a care plan with interventions and goals for a resident who rejected showers for 1 of 2 residents reviewed for rejection of care. (Resident #17) The finding included: Resident #17 was readmitted to the facility on [DATE] with [DIAGNOSES REDACTED]. Resident #17's care plan, most recently reviewed on 1/10/20, revealed a focus area indicating he was resistive to care such as therapy and often refused to let staff clean out old food from his nightstand drawers. The goal was to cooperate with care and room cleaning through the next review date. Interventions listed included occupational therapy, education to the resident and allowing the resident to make his own decisions. The care plan did not include information regarding the refusal of showers. Resident #17's shower log dated February 2020 revealed he had refused 6 of his 9 scheduled shower days for the month of February. Resident #17's quarterly Minimum Data Set (MDS) assessment dated [DATE] indicated he was cognitively intact. No rejection of care was noted. An observation was conducted on 3/2/20 at 10:12 AM of Resident #17. At the time of the observation Resident #17 smelled of a foul odor, was lying in bed and had tan debris on his shirt and

STATEMENT OF DEFICIENCIES AND PLAN OF CORRECTION	(X1) PROVIDER / SUPPLIER / CLIA IDENNTIFICATION NUMBER	(X2) MULTIPLE CONSTRUCTION	(X3) DATE SURVEY COMPLETED
	345270	A. BUILDING _____ B. WING _____	03/05/2020

NAME OF PROVIDER OF SUPPLIER	STREET ADDRESS, CITY, STATE, ZIP
BRIAN CTR HEALTH & REHAB/SPRUCE PINES	218 LAUREL CREEK COURT SPRUCE PINE, NC 28777

For information on the nursing home's plan to correct this deficiency, please contact the nursing home or the state survey agency.

(X4) ID PREFIX TAG	SUMMARY STATEMENT OF DEFICIENCIES (EACH DEFICIENCY MUST BE PRECEDED BY FULL REGULATORY OR LSC IDENTIFYING INFORMATION)
F 0657 **Level of harm** - Minimal harm or potential for actual harm **Residents Affected** - Few	(continued... from page 3) covers. An interview was conducted on 3/2/20 at 10:12 AM with Resident #17. He stated he often refused his showers due to not wanting to get out of the bed. The interview revealed it was the resident's choice to often refuse a shower despite encouragement from staff. An interview was conducted on 3/3/20 at 4:52 PM with Nurse #4. Nurse #4 stated Resident #17 had refused all care including showers. She stated no matter how many times nursing staff asked the resident he still would refuse to take a shower. An interview was conducted on 3/03/20 at 4:20 pm with MDS Coordinator #1. During the interview, the MDS Coordinator reviewed Resident #17's shower log. He stated the resident's care plan did not include his refusals to take showers. He further explained that based on the shower log provided, the care plan should have reflected Resident #17's preference to not take showers. An interview was conducted with the Director of Nursing (DON) on 3/05/20 at 3:46 pm who indicated the MDS assessment and care plan should be accurate and correspond with the residents needs. The DON stated she also understood it was missed.
F 0690 **Level of harm** - Minimal harm or potential for actual harm **Residents Affected** - Few	**Provide appropriate care for residents who are continent or incontinent of bowel/bladder, appropriate catheter care, and appropriate care to prevent urinary tract infections.** **NOTE- TERMS IN BRACKETS HAVE BEEN EDITED TO PROTECT CONFIDENTIALITY** Based on record review, observations, resident and staff interviews, the facility failed to prevent a urinary catheter bag from touching the shower room floor for 1 of 2 residents (Resident #3) reviewed for urinary catheters. The findings included: Resident #3 was admitted to the facility on [DATE] with [DIAGNOSES REDACTED]. Resident #3's care plan initiated on 5/24/18 and last revised on 3/26/19 indicated Resident #3 had a urinary catheter related to obstructive and reflux [MEDICAL CONDITION]. The goals listed were for Resident #3 to be/remain free from catheter-related trauma and for Resident #3 to show no signs and symptoms of urinary infection. The following interventions were listed: position catheter bag and tubing below the level of the bladder, handwashing before and after delivery of care, anchor catheter to prevent excess tension, observe/record/report to the doctor signs and symptoms of UTI (urinary tract infection) and perineal care as indicated. The quarterly Minimum Data Set (MDS) assessment dated [DATE] indicated Resident #3 was cognitively intact and had an indwelling urinary catheter. A review of a Physician order [REDACTED]. On 3/2/20 at 3:32 PM, an observation of Resident #3 revealed him sitting inside his room with an IV fluid running through his right arm. During this observation, an interview with Resident #3 revealed he was currently receiving IV antibiotics for UTI. Resident #3 stated it was common for him to get UTI because he had a urinary catheter. On 3/4/20 at 10:35 AM, an observation of Resident #3 in the shower room revealed him sitting in the shower chair with the curtain pulled in the first shower stall. Resident #3's urinary catheter bag was observed laying flat on the floor, under the curtain, outside the shower stall and under the sink. There were two trash barrels and two dirty linen barrels right next to where the urinary catheter bag was observed laying flat on the shower room floor. Nurse aide (NA) #2 was assisting Resident #3 with his shower and both NA #1 and Nurse #2 were also present in the shower room. On 3/4/20 at 10:51 AM, an interview with NA #2 revealed this was her first time to give Resident #3 a shower and he had requested her to place his urinary catheter bag on the floor around the corner under the sink so it won't get wet during his shower. NA #2 stated she did not want to upset Resident #3 if she did not do as he asked. NA #2 further stated if Resident #3 had not made a request to place his urinary catheter bag on the floor, she would have hung it on the shower chair behind Resident #3 so that it did not touch the floor. On 3/4/20 at 10:59 AM, an interview with Nurse #2 revealed she did not notice Resident #3's urinary catheter bag being on the shower room floor. Nurse #2 stated she was focused on his urinary catheter insertion site and had not paid attention to where his catheter bag was placed. Nurse #2 stated that it was unacceptable for Resident #3's urinary catheter bag to be laying on the shower room floor and would change it right after the interview. On 3/4/20 at 11:07 AM, an interview with NA #1 revealed she had given Resident #3 a shower before and she usually hung his urinary catheter bag on the shower chair so that it did not touch the floor. NA #1 stated Resident #3 did not want his urinary catheter bag to get wet during showers and she tried her best for it not to, but she never placed it flat on the shower room floor. On 3/4/20 at 1:09 PM, a follow-up interview with Resident #3 revealed the nurse aides usually hung his urinary catheter bag on the side while he gets a shower. Resident #3 stated he had asked NA #2 to place the catheter bag on the floor this morning and admitted he had requested them to do so before sometimes to keep water from getting on the bag. On 3/5/20 at 3:46 PM, an interview conducted with the Director of Nursing (DON) revealed NA #2 had placed Resident #3's urinary catheter bag on the floor because he was upset and would not let her hang it on the shower chair but it was unacceptable to place it on the floor. The DON stated she could have placed it on a wash basin or put a bag around it to prevent it from touching the floor. On 3/5/20 at 4:40 PM, an interview with the Administrator revealed NA #2 should have followed the standards of clinical practice regarding urinary catheter care. The Administrator stated she understood NA #2 did what Resident #3 wanted but she could have found another solution to accommodate Resident #3's choice and maintain the standards of clinical practice.
F 0693 **Level of harm** - Minimal harm or potential for actual harm **Residents Affected** - Few	**Ensure that feeding tubes are not used unless there is a medical reason and the resident agrees; and provide appropriate care for a resident with a feeding tube.** **NOTE- TERMS IN BRACKETS HAVE BEEN EDITED TO PROTECT CONFIDENTIALITY** Based on observations, record review, and staff interviews the facility failed to follow Physician's orders for administering the correct ordered amounts of tube feeding for 1 of 1 sampled resident reviewed for tube feeding (Resident #69). Findings included: Resident #69 was admitted to the facility 09/11/18 with [DIAGNOSES REDACTED]. Review of Resident #69's Physician orders dated 10/10/19 revealed she was to receive a tube feeding of [MEDICATION NAME] 1.2 at 50 milliliters an hour (ml/hr) via feeding pump with water flushes of 175 ml every 4 hours for a total of 1200 total calories in a 24-hour period. Review of the quarterly Minimum Data Set ((MDS) dated [DATE] revealed Resident #69 was severely cognitively impaired for decision making. The MDS also stated Resident #69 had a feeding tube and received 51% or more of her total calories from tube feeding. Review of Resident #69's care plan for tube feeding last updated 01/14/20 revealed she was to receive her tube feeding as ordered. The goal was for Resident #69 to remain free of aspiration through the next review date. Interventions included observation of any signs of aspiration, fever, shortness of breath, tube dysfunction or malfunction. Review of the Medication Administration Record [REDACTED]. The MAR indicated [REDACTED]. Record review from 09/06/19 through 03/05/20 revealed Resident #69's weights were stable with no weight loss noted. An observation of Resident #69 on 03/04/20 at 3:50 PM revealed her tube feeding was infusing at 60 milliliters an hour with flushes of 350 ml every 4 hours. An observation of Resident #69 on 03/05/20 at 2:00 PM revealed her tube feeding was infusing at 60 milliliters an hour with flushes of 175 ml every 4 hours. An interview with Nurse #6 on 03/05/20 at 2:10 PM revealed Resident #69's tube feeding was infusing at 60 milliliters an hour with flushes of 175 ml every 4 hours. When asked what the Physician's order stated for Resident #69 regarding her tube feeding Nurse #6 stated the order read for the resident to receive tube feeding infusing at 50 milliliters an hour with flushes of 175 ml every 4 hours. An observation was conducted of Nurse #6 entering Resident #68's room to change the settings on the Kangaroo pump from 60 ml/hr to infuse at 50 ml/hr per Physician orders. Nurse #6 stated the label on the [MEDICATION NAME] bottle read that Nurse #7 had written and administered on 03/05/20 at 12:00 AM for Resident #69 to receive tube feeding at 60 ml/hr. Nurse #6 stated she had not checked Resident #69's tube feeding settings or compared them with the Physician's orders during her shift. An interview with Nurse #4 on 03/05/20 at 2:16 PM revealed she had cared for Resident #69 from 2:30 PM to 11:00 PM on 03/04/20. Nurse #4 stated Resident #69's tube feeding was infusing at 60 ml/hr with flushes of 175 ml/hr every 4 hours on the date of 03/04/20. She stated she did not recall the flush running at 350 ml. A follow up interview with Nurse #4 revealed she had reviewed the Physician orders for Resident #69 and stated she had not verified the settings were correct on 03/04/20 and had made a mistake. Nurse #4 stated Resident #69's tube feeding should have been infusing at a rate of 50 ml/hr not 60 ml/hr. She stated she felt the feeding pump in which the tube feeding was delivered was malfunctioning and the flushes were recalculating and were not correct. The interview revealed she determined this after reviewing the Physician's order and going into Resident #69's room to check the pump. She stated she hadn't reported any issues with the feeding pump prior to 03/05/20 at 2:16 PM. An interview with Nurse #7 on 03/05/20 at 5:39 PM revealed she had cared for Resident #69 during third shift on the dates of 03/04/20 and 03/05/20. She stated she administered a new bottle of [MEDICATION NAME] 1.2 tube feeding for Resident #69 every night at midnight. Nurse #7 stated she had accidentally put the wrong setting on the label and infused Resident #69's tube feeding at the rate of 60 ml/hr instead of 50 ml/hr. She stated she could not recall what she had set Resident #69's flushes at or if it was set to 350 ml/hr. Nurse #7 stated this happened because another resident

STATEMENT OF DEFICIENCIES AND PLAN OF CORRECTION	(X1) PROVIDER / SUPPLIER / CLIA IDENNTIFICATION NUMBER	(X2) MULTIPLE CONSTRUCTION	(X3) DATE SURVEY COMPLETED
	345270	A. BUILDING _____ B. WING _____	03/05/2020

NAME OF PROVIDER OF SUPPLIER	STREET ADDRESS, CITY, STATE, ZIP
BRIAN CTR HEALTH & REHAB/SPRUCE PINES	218 LAUREL CREEK COURT SPRUCE PINE, NC 28777

For information on the nursing home's plan to correct this deficiency, please contact the nursing home or the state survey agency.

(X4) ID PREFIX TAG	SUMMARY STATEMENT OF DEFICIENCIES (EACH DEFICIENCY MUST BE PRECEDED BY FULL REGULATORY OR LSC IDENTIFYING INFORMATION)
F 0693 **Level of harm** - Minimal harm or potential for actual harm **Residents Affected** - Few	(continued... from page 4) who received tube feedings had been on the same hall and she had gotten the two residents confused. She stated she had been in a rush due to a nurse calling out on the date of 03/05/20 and wasn't paying attention. The interview revealed Nurse #7 did not know of any malfunctions with the feeding pump. An interview with the Director of Nursing (DON) on 03/05/20 at 3:04 PM revealed she expected Physician orders to be followed for Resident #69's tube feeding and she wasn't sure why the feeding was not on the correct setting so the resident received the correct amount of feeding as ordered by the Physician. The interview revealed she had completed an assessment of the incident, notified the Physician, Dietitian and family of Resident #69. The DON stated the facility was handling the situation as a medication error by Nurse #4 and had replaced the feeding pump in case of a malfunction with the pump itself.
F 0725 **Level of harm** - Minimal harm or potential for actual harm **Residents Affected** - Few	**Provide enough nursing staff every day to meet the needs of every resident; and have a licensed nurse in charge on each shift.** Based on record review and staff interviews, the facility failed to provide sufficient nursing staff to provide scheduled showers for 2 of 4 sampled residents (Resident #3 and Resident #44). The findings included: This tag was cross-referenced to F-561: F-561 - Based on record review, resident and staff interviews, the facility failed to provide scheduled showers for 2 of 4 residents (Resident #3 and Resident #44) reviewed for activities of daily living. A review of the Daily Staffing Assignment Sheets revealed: 1. 2/15/20 - 1 nurse aide (NA) per hall plus 1 floater on day shift 2. 2/22/20 - 1 NA per hall plus 1 floater on day shift 3. 2/29/20 - 1 NA per hall plus 1 floater on day shift 4. 3/1/20 - 1 NA per hall plus 1 floater on day shift On 3/2/20 at 3:08 PM, an interview conducted with NA #3 revealed she had worked on 3/1/20 from 7 AM to 12 PM by herself on 400 hall. NA #3 stated she couldn't get any of the showers done that were scheduled for 3/1/20. NA #3 stated she tried to get them on the next day but if she did not have time, the residents would just have to wait until the next scheduled day. On 3/4/20 at 5:28 PM, an interview conducted with NA #8 revealed she had worked at the facility for 3 months on the evening shift. NA #8 stated she had worked by herself on 200 hall on a weekend but she could not remember when. NA #8 stated she couldn't get the scheduled showers done but she had offered bed baths to the residents who were supposed to get a full shower. NA #8 shared she has never been asked to make up a shower that did not get completed on day shift. On 3/4/20 at 5:47 PM, an interview with Nurse #5 revealed she had worked with just 1 NA on an evening shift on 2/1/20 but she couldn't remember who the NA she worked with. The NA couldn't get a shower done because the resident required 2-person assistance. Nurse #5 shared it was impossible for the evening shift to pick up extra showers that did not get done on day shift because they had at least five showers to do each evening. On 3/4/20 at 8:33 AM, an interview with the Scheduler revealed the facility currently had 14 open NA positions which consisted of 2 12-hour full-time and 1 part-time position for day shift, 5 full-time positions for evening shift, 2 full-time positions for night shift and 4 prn (as needed) positions. The Scheduler stated the facility was supposed to have at least 2 NA per hall on both day and evening shifts and 1 NA per hall on night shift. The facility has had some challenges with not having enough staff to work due to callouts and unexpected situations affecting the scheduled staff members. The Scheduler stated they tried to call other staff members to come in and called the staffing agency for help. She continued to utilize agency staffing who worked 250-300 hours per week. They had posted their open positions online and on social media, had offered a sign-on bonus for new hires and had advertised in every newspaper. On 3/5/20 at 3:46 PM, an interview with the Director of Nursing (DON) revealed the staffing number depended on the census but the facility needed at least 2 NAs per hall. The DON recognized that the staffing was an issue and that it was frustrating because it was hard for them to keep good help. The supervisors tried to call other staff members to come in when there were callouts and they offered a shift bonus for staff members who worked an extra shift. The DON shared the facility relied heavily on agency staffing which currently filled 10 to 11 open NA positions. On 3/5/20 at 4:40 PM, an interview with the Administrator revealed they could not control the callouts, but they covered them as quickly as they could and tried to get other staff members to come in. The Administrator stated they conducted job fares every quarter, shared on social media, advertised on papers, put up signs and offered sign-on bonuses for new hires. They also improved their orientation process to increase new employee retention. The Administrator shared she also went to the local colleges and talked to potential applicants.
F 0761 **Level of harm** - Minimal harm or potential for actual harm **Residents Affected** - Few	**Ensure drugs and biologicals used in the facility are labeled in accordance with currently accepted professional principles; and all drugs and biologicals must be stored in locked compartments, separately locked, compartments for controlled drugs.** Based on observations and staff interviews, the facility failed to dispose of an expired medication stored in 1 of 3 medication carts (300 Hall medication cart). The findings included: During an observation of the 300 Hall medication cart on 03/03/20 at 4:39 PM, the following medication was found in the cart and available for use: Sodium Chloride tablets, 1 gram tablets 100 count with 57 tablets remaining in the bottle with an expired date of 01/2020. An interview with the Nurse #2 on the 300 Hall on 03/03/20 at 4:45 PM revealed the medication was expired and should have been removed from the 300 Hall medication cart. An interview with the Director of Nursing (DON) on 03/05/20 at 4:34 PM revealed the medication should have been removed from the 300 Hall cart and sent back to pharmacy. She went on to say, the medication carts were supposed to be checked for expired medications by all the nurses. According to the DON, the pharmacy representative had recently gone through the medication carts twice and had missed the expired medication as well. An interview with the Administrator on 03/05/20 at 5:24 PM revealed she expected expired medications to be removed from the medication carts and returned to the pharmacy.