



2020 Maryland Nursing Home Family Experience of Care Survey

Edenwald



Maryland Health Care Commission
4160 Patterson Avenue
Baltimore, MD 21215



Market Decisions Research
75 Washington Avenue, Suite 2C
Portland, ME 04101

Table of Contents

A. Background	1
B. Summary Results for Edenwald	2
C. Description of Sample	3
D. Summary of Survey Methods	4
E. Description of Survey Instrument	6
F. How to Read and Interpret the Results	7
G. Domain Ratings	9
Summary of Domain Ratings	9
Staff and Administration of the Nursing Home	10
Care Provided to Residents.....	12
Food and Meals.....	14
Autonomy and Resident Rights	16
Physical Aspects of the Nursing Home	18
Activities.....	20
Security and Resident’s Personal Rights	22
H. Overall Experience Ratings	24
Overall Rating of Care Received at the Nursing Home	24
Nursing Home Recommendation	26
I. COVID-19	28
Ratings of Nursing Home Response to COVID-19.....	28
J. Feedback	31
K. Item-Level Ratings	32

A. Background

The Maryland Health Care Commission (MHCC) family experience of care initiative began in 2005 with a pilot survey intended to guide the start of an annual process. The purpose of the initiative is to measure the experience and satisfaction of family members and other designated responsible parties of residents in Maryland's nursing homes. The project's specific objectives are to provide: 1) measures of responsible party experience and satisfaction; 2) comparisons on experience and satisfaction measures between nursing homes in Maryland; and 3) comparisons between nursing home peer groups, including geographical region, facility size, and ownership type.

The results of the survey are accessible to the public via the *MHHC Maryland Quality Reporting* website, an interactive web tool containing information about an array of long-term care services including nursing homes and community support services such as senior centers, transportation, and technology assistance. Facility-specific results will be posted on the *MHHC Maryland Quality Reporting* website to assist consumers in making informed decisions when selecting a nursing home for themselves, a family member, or a friend.

(Note: An Executive Summary containing statewide aggregate data has been issued separately and is available on the Maryland Health Care Commission website at:

<http://mhcc.maryland.gov/consumerinfo/longtermcare/Default.aspx>)

B. Summary Results for Edenwald

Table 1. Summary of 2020 Domain Scores for Edenwald¹

	Edenwald	Statewide
Staff and Administration of the Nursing Home	3.6	3.4
Care Provided to Residents	3.6	3.3
Food and Meals	3.5	3.1
Autonomy and Resident Rights	3.8	3.1
Physical Aspects of the Nursing Home	3.6	3.2
Activities	3.1	2.7
Security and Resident's Personal Rights	3.5	3.3
Overall rating of care received at the nursing home*	8.8	7.8
Percentage that said "Definitely Yes" or "Probably Yes" to "Would you recommend the nursing home?"	90%	80%

*Unlike the other domains which are calculated on a score from one to four, the overall rating of care received at the nursing home is calculated on a scale from one to ten.

¹ Scores are calculated based on the questions in each item. Questions are scored by assigning the most positive possible answer category a score of 4, and the least positive possible answer a score of 1. See Section F for more detail. The only exception to this is scores based on individual questions.

C. Description of Sample

All nursing facilities in Maryland with one or more residents that had a 100 day stay or longer as of October 2, 2020 were included in the sample. All nursing homes were asked to provide a list of the designated family members of each of their current residents. If no family member was listed as overseeing the resident's care, another responsible party was selected to contact.

It is important to note that family members of residents with a stay of less than 100 days did not participate in this survey, so the experience and satisfaction of the family members of nursing facility residents with short-term skilled nursing care or rehabilitation needs are not captured by the results of this survey.

D. Summary of Survey Methods

All eligible (223) nursing facilities throughout the State of Maryland submitted a family member list in 2020. Using the exclusion criteria below, programs were developed to identify which responsible parties and residents met the requirement for inclusion in the survey.

Exclusion criteria:

- Date of admission is after June 24, 2020
- Resident and family member are the same individual
- No family member is listed
- Address for family member is incomplete or insufficient for mailing
- The contact address for the family member is a nursing home. In cases where the family member resides in an independent living facility associated with a nursing home, they were not excluded.
- The family member's address is outside the United States

The list obtained after exclusions became the mailing list used to contact potential respondents. In all, 14,926 family members were eligible to participate, including 583 that did not have a valid mailing address but had a telephone number. An initial invitation letter containing a link to the online survey and a unique respondent passcode was mailed to 14,343 family members with valid mailing addresses on October 2, 2020. The online survey module is a new survey mode in 2020 intended to improve response rates and provide respondents with more options to complete the survey. Beginning October 7, 2020, telephone prompt calls were made to respondents from nursing homes with historically low response rates and those who did not receive a letter but had a telephone number. Respondents were prompted to visit and complete the survey and were offered an email invitation if they provided an email address to the interviewer.

The first survey packet was mailed on November 9, 2020 to those who did not respond to the initial online or telephone survey. The survey packet included instructions on how to complete the survey online if they preferred. A second survey packet was sent on December 8, 2020. Follow-up telephone calls were made to responsible parties from specific facilities with a response rate of 50% or less to maximize the response rates and obtain completed surveys. Follow-up calls began on November 19, 2020 and ended on February 20, 2021. Calls were conducted from 9 AM to 9 PM on weekdays and 10 AM to 6 PM on Saturdays.

A total of 5,455 eligible surveys were completed through March 1, 2021 out of 14,926 eligible family members, resulting in a final response rate of 40% for all facilities. Table 2 summarizes the final 2020 Maryland Nursing Home Family Experience of Care Survey sample.

Table 2: 2020 Maryland Nursing Home Family Experience of Care Survey Sample Summary

2020 Nursing Facility Family Survey	Total Participating Facilities	Total Eligible Family Members	Total Surveys Completed	Response Rate*	Undeliverable
Overall	223	14,926	5,455	40%	1,294
Edenwald	--	34	22	65%	0

*The response rate is calculated by dividing the total number of surveys *completed* by the total number of eligible family members minus the number of undeliverable surveys.

E. Description of Survey Instrument

The designated family members were asked to complete a survey about their experience and satisfaction with the facility and care provided to residents. The 2020 survey contained two overall measures of satisfaction and 31 items which assessed seven domains or aspects of residents' life and care:

1. Staff and Administration of the Nursing Home
2. Care Provided to Residents
3. Food and Meals
4. Autonomy and Residents' Rights
5. Physical Aspects of the Nursing Home
6. Activities
7. Security and Resident's Personal Rights

Within each domain, respondents rated different aspects of the resident's life and care.

A new section addressing facility response to COVID-19 was added to the 2020 survey instrument. The section consists of 3 questions, including a rating of how the respondent would rate the nursing home's response to the outbreak overall on a scale of 1 to 10.

An open-ended question was added to the end of the survey asking respondents if there was any feedback about the facility they would like to share.

For more detail on the methods and survey instrument changes, please request the complete technical documentation for this research by contacting Stacy Howes at stacy.howes@maryland.gov or 410-764-3575.

F. How to Read and Interpret the Results

This report contains tables and charts that display results for this nursing home, the average statewide ratings and ratings for each of the facility's peer groups for each of the seven domains and the two overall measures. For each domain, a trending line chart displays ratings within the home over time and a bar chart displays ratings by peer group. The ratings were calculated by adding the rating given by each individual who responded to the question divided by the total number of responses.

Domain level ratings in the report are presented as averages on a scale of 1 to 4. The domain ratings are calculated by averaging the ratings on the 4-point scale, where 1 represents the most negative possible response and 4 represents the most positive possible response. The exact definition of responses is contextual, based on the phrasing of the question; however, the most positive response is generally 'Yes' or 'Always'. These scores are averaged across all the valid questions within that domain. The overall experience rating is presented as an average on a 1 to 10 scale. The overall recommendation rating is presented by percentage of respondents recommending the nursing home.

For negatively worded questions, where "Never" was the positive answer, for the purposes of reporting results, the responses were recorded so that 4=Never, 3=Sometimes, 2=Usually, and 1=Always, so the higher number represents greater satisfaction. An example of such a question is Question 18: "In the past 6 months, how often, if at all, did you help with toileting because the nurses or nursing assistants either were not available or made him or her wait too long?"

The survey item ratings are the average of a sample of respondents (that is, not the entire population of respondents) and, as in any survey, there is a margin of error associated with the estimates. Determination of the actual average rating would require surveying the entire population of responsible parties.

To assist facilities in better understanding results, this report also includes tests of statistically significant differences. These tests are designed to help determine: 1) whether the facility's scores are higher or lower than statewide scores; 2) how the facility compares to peers; and 3) if there has been an increase or decrease in scores over time. You can see this statistic under the table "Significant Difference" in each domain score. Areas where the facility's score is significantly higher than the state, peer group or compared to previous years will contain an up arrow (↑). Areas where the facility has a significantly lower score will contain a down arrow (↓). Areas which have no significant difference are marked with a dash (-). These comparisons are made using 95% confidence intervals.

A low domain score indicates a low level of experience or satisfaction within a particular aspect of care and life, such as physical aspects of the nursing home, while a high score indicates a high level of experience or satisfaction. For example, a domain with a low score relative to a peer group or other domains may identify a high priority improvement opportunity. Domains with high scores identify areas where the facility exhibits a high level of performance. Comparing your facility’s scores to peer groups can help your facility to identify opportunities for incremental improvements.

The majority of scores presented in this report are on the high end of the rating scale (above a 3). The obvious question is, “is a score good or bad?” It is not unusual for scores to be skewed to the positive because consumers are generally satisfied with the personal care their relatives receive. However, there is always room for improvement, especially when comparing scores in relation to one another. To identify meaningful differences, we suggest that readers look at top rated items and domains and compare them to lower rated items. We also suggest comparing your facility scores to other facilities in your geographic area, peer size groups, and to your facility scores in previous years (if applicable). Please note, the survey was not conducted in 2017, and trending scores for that year are not presented in the results.

Family member feedback about the home was reviewed for context and has been coded into themes. The results are presented in a table with the labels indicating the theme and the percentage indicating the proportion of those whose feedback fit that theme. Feedback from one person may be coded into as many as three different themes.

For comparison purposes, the peer groups for Edenwald are:

Type of Peer Group Comparison	
Region of the State:	Central Maryland
Licensed Bed Size Counts:	81 - 120 beds
Ownership Type:	Non-Profit


Results for these peer groups will be displayed in the charts and tables throughout this report.

Note: For confidentiality purposes, any domain scores containing less than 4 total responses have not been reported (denoted in tables as “NR”). Where domain scores are omitted from charts, a footnote mentions their omission. This is done to prevent the possible identification of individual respondents and because the results may not be representative of the larger population of family members.

G. Domain Ratings

Summary of Domain Ratings

Figure 1. Summary of 2020 Domain Scores for Edenwald



Staff and Administration of the Nursing Home

Figure 2. 2015-2020 Domain Scores for Staff and Administration of the Nursing Home




Table 3. 2015-2020 Significant Differences for Staff and Administration of the Nursing Home Trending

2020 Edenwald Score Measured Against		
	Score	2020 Difference
2020	3.6	
2019	3.5	-
2018	3.7	-
2016	3.7	-
2015	3.7	-

A difference marked ↑ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly higher than the comparison year. A difference marked ↓ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly lower than the comparison year. Areas which have no statistically significant difference are marked with a dash (-).

Figure 3. 2020 Peer Group Scores for Staff and Administration of the Nursing Home




Table 4. 2020 Significant Differences for Staff and Administration of the Nursing Home vs Peers

2020 Edenwald Score Measured Against Peer Group		
	Score	2020 Difference
2020 Score	3.6	
Statewide	3.4	-
Central Maryland	3.3	↑
81 - 120 beds	3.4	-
Non-Profit	3.5	-

A difference marked ↑ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly higher than the comparison peer group. A difference marked ↓ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly lower than the comparison peer group. Areas which have no statistically significant difference are marked with a dash (-).

Care Provided to Residents

Figure 4. 2015-2020 Domain Scores for Care Provided to Residents




Table 5. 2015-2020 Significant Differences for Care Provided to Residents Trending

2020 Edenwald Score Measured Against		
	Score	2020 Difference
2020	3.6	
2019	3.5	-
2018	3.7	-
2016	3.5	-
2015	3.5	-

A difference marked ↑ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly higher than the comparison year. A difference marked ↓ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly lower than the comparison year. Areas which have no statistically significant difference are marked with a dash (-).

Figure 5. 2020 Peer Group Scores for Care Provided to Residents




Table 6. 2020 Significant Differences for Care Provided to Residents vs Peers

2020 Edenwald Score Measured Against Peer Group		
	Score	2020 Difference
2020 Score	3.6	
Statewide	3.3	↑
Central Maryland	3.2	↑
81 - 120 beds	3.3	-
Non-Profit	3.5	-

A difference marked ↑ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly higher than the comparison peer group. A difference marked ↓ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly lower than the comparison peer group. Areas which have no statistically significant difference are marked with a dash (-).

*Food and Meals**

Figure 6. 2018-2020 Domain Scores for Food and Meals




Table 7. 2018-2020 Significant Differences for Food and Meals Trending

2020 Edenwald Score Measured Against		
	Score	2020 Difference
2020	3.5	
2019	3.4	-
2018	3.4	-

A difference marked ↑ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly higher than the comparison year. A difference marked ↓ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly lower than the comparison year. Areas which have no statistically significant difference are marked with a dash (-).

**Food and Meals Domain was redefined in the 2018 survey administration.*

Figure 7. 2020 Peer Group Domain Scores for Food and Meals




Table 8. 2020 Significant Differences for Food and Meals vs Peers

2020 Edenwald Score Measured Against Peer Group		
	Score	2020 Difference
2020 Score	3.5	
Statewide	3.1	↑
Central Maryland	3.0	↑
81 - 120 beds	3.2	-
Non-Profit	3.3	-

A difference marked ↑ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly higher than the comparison peer group. A difference marked ↓ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly lower than the comparison peer group. Areas which have no statistically significant difference are marked with a dash (-).

Autonomy and Resident Rights

Figure 8. 2015-2020 Domain Scores for Autonomy and Resident Rights




Table 9. 2015-2020 Significant Differences for Autonomy and Resident Rights Trending

2020 Edenwald Score Measured Against		
	Score	2020 Difference
2020	3.8	
2019	3.6	-
2018	3.7	-
2016	3.8	-
2015	3.8	-

A difference marked ↑ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly higher than the comparison year. A difference marked ↓ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly lower than the comparison year. Areas which have no statistically significant difference are marked with a dash (-).

Figure 9. 2020 Peer Group Domain Scores for Autonomy and Resident Rights




Table 10. 2020 Significant Differences for Autonomy and Resident Rights vs Peers

2020 Edenwald Score Measured Against Peer Group		
	Score	2020 Difference
2020 Score	3.8	
Statewide	3.1	↑
Central Maryland	3.1	↑
81 - 120 beds	3.2	↑
Non-Profit	3.4	↑

A difference marked ↑ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly higher than the comparison peer group. A difference marked ↓ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly lower than the comparison peer group. Areas which have no statistically significant difference are marked with a dash (-).

Physical Aspects of the Nursing Home

Figure 10. 2015-2020 Domain Scores for Physical Aspects of the Nursing Home




Table 11. 2015-2020 Significant Differences for Physical Aspects of the Nursing Home Trending

2020 Edenwald Score Measured Against		
	Score	2020 Difference
2020	3.6	
2019	3.6	-
2018	3.6	-
2016	3.5	-
2015	3.5	-

A difference marked ↑ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly higher than the comparison year. A difference marked ↓ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly lower than the comparison year. Areas which have no statistically significant difference are marked with a dash (-).

Figure 11. 2020 Peer Group Domain Scores for Physical Aspects of the Nursing Home




Table 12. 2020 Significant Differences for Physical Aspects of the Nursing Home vs Peers

2020 Edenwald Score Measured Against Peer Group		
	Score	2020 Difference
2020 Score	3.6	
Statewide	3.2	↑
Central Maryland	3.2	↑
81 - 120 beds	3.2	↑
Non-Profit	3.4	-

A difference marked ↑ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly higher than the comparison peer group. A difference marked ↓ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly lower than the comparison peer group. Areas which have no statistically significant difference are marked with a dash (-).

*Activities**

Figure 12. 2018-2020 Domain Scores for Activities




Table 13. 2018-2020 Significant Differences for Activities Trending

2020 Edenwald Score Measured Against		
	Score	2020 Difference
2020	3.1	
2019	3.5	-
2018	3.6	-

A difference marked ↑ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly higher than the comparison year. A difference marked ↓ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly lower than the comparison year. Areas which have no statistically significant difference are marked with a dash (-).

**Activities Domain was added to the survey in 2018.*

Figure 13. 2020 Peer Group Domain Scores for Activities




Table 14. 2020 Significant Differences for Activities vs Peers

2020 Edenwald Score Measured Against Peer Group		
	Score	2020 Difference
2020 Score	3.1	
Statewide	2.7	↑
Central Maryland	2.7	↑
81 - 120 beds	2.8	-
Non-Profit	2.8	-

A difference marked ↑ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly higher than the comparison peer group. A difference marked ↓ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly lower than the comparison peer group. Areas which have no statistically significant difference are marked with a dash (-).

*Security and Resident's Personal Rights**

Figure 14. 2018-2020 Domain Scores for Security and Resident's Personal Rights




Table 15. 2018-2020 Significant Differences for Security and Resident's Personal Rights Trending

2020 Edenwald Score Measured Against		
	Score	2020 Difference
2020	3.5	
2019	3.5	-
2018	3.6	-

A difference marked ↑ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly higher than the comparison year. A difference marked ↓ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly lower than the comparison year. Areas which have no statistically significant difference are marked with a dash (-).

**Security and Resident's Personal Rights Domain was added to the survey in 2018.*

Figure 15. 2020 Peer Group Domain Scores for Security and Resident’s Personal Rights




Table 16. 2020 Significant Differences for Security and Resident’s Personal Rights vs Peers

2020 Edenwald Score Measured Against Peer Group		
	Score	2020 Difference
2020 Score	3.5	
Statewide	3.3	-
Central Maryland	3.3	-
81 - 120 beds	3.4	-
Non-Profit	3.6	-

A difference marked ↑ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly higher than the comparison peer group. A difference marked ↓ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly lower than the comparison peer group. Areas which have no statistically significant difference are marked with a dash (-).

H. Overall Experience Ratings

Overall Rating of Care Received at the Nursing Home

Figure 16. 2015-2020 Scores for Overall Rating of Care Received at the Nursing Home*

*Rated on a scale from 1 to 10 where 1 is the worst care and 10 is the best care possible.




Table 17. 2015-2020 Significant Differences for Overall Rating of Care Received at the Nursing Home Trending

2020 Edenwald Score Measured Against		
	Score	2020 Difference
2020	8.8	
2019	8.5	-
2018	9.1	-
2016	8.8	-
2015	8.8	-

A difference marked ↑ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly higher than the comparison year. A difference marked ↓ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly lower than the comparison year. Areas which have no statistically significant difference are marked with a dash (-).

Figure 17. 2020 Peer Group Scores for Overall Rating of Care Received at the Nursing Home




Table 18. 2020 Significant Differences for Overall Rating of Care Received at the Nursing Home vs Peers

2020 Edenwald Score Measured Against Peer Group		
	Score	2020 Difference
2020 Score	8.8	
Statewide	7.8	↑
Central Maryland	7.7	↑
81 - 120 beds	8.0	↑
Non-Profit	8.5	-

A difference marked ↑ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly higher than the comparison peer group. A difference marked ↓ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly lower than the comparison peer group. Areas which have no statistically significant difference are marked with a dash (-).

Nursing Home Recommendation

Figure 18. 2015-2020 Scores for Nursing Home Recommendation




Table 19. 2015-2020 Significant Differences for Nursing Home Recommendation Trending

2020 Edenwald Score Measured Against		
	Score	2020 Difference
2020	90%	
2019	85%	-
2018	100%	↓
2016	100%	↓
2015	97%	-

A difference marked ↑ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly higher than the comparison year. A difference marked ↓ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly lower than the comparison year. Areas which have no statistically significant difference are marked with a dash (-).

Figure 19. 2020 Peer Group Domain Scores for Nursing Home Recommendation




Table 20. 2020 Significant Differences for Nursing Home Recommendation vs Peers

2020 Edenwald Score Measured Against Peer Group		
	Score	2020 Difference
2020 Score	90%	
Statewide	80%	-
Central Maryland	78%	-
81 - 120 beds	82%	-
Non-Profit	91%	-

A difference marked ↑ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly higher than the comparison peer group. A difference marked ↓ indicates the 2020 score was statistically significantly lower than the comparison peer group. Areas which have no statistically significant difference are marked with a dash (-).

I. COVID-19

Ratings of Nursing Home Response to COVID-19

Figure 20. 2020 Rating for Offering Timely Information to Loved Ones about How the Resident was Affected by the COVID-19 Outbreak




Figure 21. 2020 Rating for Involving Loved Ones in the Resident’s Care Decisions during the COVID-19 Outbreak





Figure 22. 2020 Rating for Overall Rating of the Nursing Home’s Response to the COVID-19 Outbreak



Nursing home response to COVID-19 was rated on a scale of 1 – 10 where 1 is the worst response possible and 10 is the best response.

J. Feedback

New in 2020, respondents were able to provide open-ended feedback about their experiences with the nursing home. Responses have been coded into categories, and the percentages of each response category are provided below.

	%
Staff is Caring, Friendly, Compassionate	33%
Nursing Home Informs Family of COVID Updates, Resident's Health/Status (Call, Zoom, FaceTime, Emails)	33%
Resident Receives Great Care, Taken Care of During COVID (Even if Infected)	33%
Unable to Visit Inside Due to COVID, Hard to Answer Questions	22%
Happy with COVID Visitation Policy (Window, Outdoors, Compassionate Care)	22%
Staff is Professional, Helpful, Responsive	11%
Overall Satisfied, Would Recommend	11%
Nursing Home is Clean, Well-Kept	11%
Residents Isolated During COVID, Affects Mental Health	11%
Total	100%

Percentages based on 9 respondents who provided an answer to the question. Percentages may not sum to 100 because multiple responses were accepted.

K. Item-Level Ratings

This section provides a summary of each of the items that are used in calculating the seven domain scores. Questions were evaluated using either a 4-point scale or as Yes/No options. In addition, there were two questions that evaluated the overall experience and level of care provided by the nursing home. Please note that:

- Item scores are calculated by providing the percent of respondents answering in a ‘top box’ score. The top box is the percentage of respondents rating an item in the two most positive response categories. For example, in questions rated Always to Never, the percentage of respondents assessing an item as Always or Usually if those are the most positive, or Sometimes and Never if those are the most positive responses.
- For Yes/No responses, only the percentage of respondents providing a positive response are displayed.
- For the overall rating of care question, the rate of individuals ranking the item as a 7 or higher out of 10 is displayed.

Low scoring items indicate a low level of satisfaction and experience and high scores indicate a high level of satisfaction and experience. These items can help you identify specific personal care categories or attributes that need further evaluation. Specific items can also help identify aspects of domain areas that received lower scores. For more details on the scoring metrics used, please refer to Section F.

Several items presented here are used as screening questions to determine the appropriateness of follow-up questions. These questions are presented here in the interest of completeness. They display the percentage at which respondents answered in such a way as to require any follow-up questions. These questions are presented in italicized text. They are not considered when calculating the domain score for which they are included under.

Table 21. 2020 Facility Item Level Scores and Peer Groups for Edenwald

	Edenwald 2020	Edenwald 2019	Statewide	Central Maryland	81 - 120 beds	Non-Profit
Staff and Administration of the Nursing Home						
In the last 6 months, how often did you receive timely notification of changes such as the resident's condition, medications, or emergencies?	86%	89%	80%	79%	81%	87%
In the last 6 months, if you asked for information about the resident, how often did you get the information within 48 hours?	85%	96%	79%	76%	81%	88%
In the last 6 months, how often did the nurses and nursing assistants treat <u>you</u> with courtesy and respect?	100%	93%	91%	90%	93%	94%
In the last 6 months, how often did the nurses and nursing assistants treat the <u>resident</u> with courtesy and respect?	100%	93%	86%	84%	87%	91%
In the last 6 months, how often did staff members respect the resident's privacy?	100%	96%	89%	88%	90%	94%
In the last 6 months, how often did you feel confident the staff was knowledgeable about the resident's medical condition(s) and treatment(s)?	82%	79%	79%	77%	80%	85%
In the last 6 months, how often were you able to find a nurse or aide when you wanted one?	86%	89%	71%	68%	74%	80%
In the last 6 months, did the nurses or nursing assistants ever discourage you from asking questions about the resident?	95%	96%	94%	93%	95%	95%

Italicized questions are not used in the domain score calculations.

**Table 21. 2020 Facility Item Level Scores and Peer Groups for Edenwald
(continued)**

	Edenwald 2020	Edenwald 2019	Statewide	Central Maryland	81 - 120 beds	Non-Profit
Care Provided to Residents						
Were you invited to participate in a care conference in the last 6 months?	100%	100%	83%	84%	86%	89%
In the last 6 months, how often were you involved as much as you wanted in care decisions?	90%	93%	79%	78%	81%	87%
<i>In the last 6 months, during any of your visits, did you help the resident with toileting?</i>	0%	43%	6%	7%	5%	5%
In the last 6 months, how often, if at all, did you help with toileting because the nurses or nursing assistants either were not available or made the resident wait too long?	-	73%	67%	65%	69%	71%
In the last 6 months, did the resident look and smell clean?	94%	93%	81%	79%	82%	90%
<i>In the last 6 months, did the resident use the nursing home's laundry service for his or her clothes?</i>	100%	68%	86%	85%	88%	92%
In the last 6 months, how often were you satisfied with the laundry services the resident received?	88%	82%	76%	72%	77%	85%
<i>In the last 6 months, did you see any resident, including this resident, behave in a way that made it hard for nurses or nursing assistants to provide care?</i>	33%	27%	11%	11%	11%	14%
How often did nurses/nursing aides handle the situation in a way that was acceptable to you?	86%	86%	81%	80%	83%	89%
<i>In the last 6 months, did you discuss any issues or concerns with the nursing home staff about the care the resident received in the nursing home?</i>	64%	82%	55%	58%	52%	52%

Italicized questions are not used in the domain score calculations.

**Table 21. 2020 Facility Item Level Scores and Peer Groups for Edenwald
(continued)**

	Edenwald 2020	Edenwald 2019	Statewide	Central Maryland	81 - 120 beds	Non-Profit
Care Provided to Residents (continued)						
In the last 6 months, were you satisfied with the way the nursing home staff handled issues or concerns that you brought to their attention?	77%	74%	63%	62%	67%	75%
In the last 6 months, did you ever stop yourself from talking to any nursing home staff about your concerns because you thought they might take it out on the resident?	89%	81%	85%	85%	87%	90%
How often did you help with eating or drinking because the nurses or nursing assistants were not available to help or made him or her wait too long?	100%	90%	85%	85%	88%	90%
Food and Meals						
In the last 6 months, how often was the resident served a variety of food (e.g., fresh vegetables and fruits, lean meats, fish)?	93%	92%	79%	77%	81%	87%
In the last 6 months, how often was the food served to the resident high quality (i.e., attractive, appetizing, and nutritious)?	92%	83%	68%	66%	73%	78%
Activities						
In the last 6 months, how often were meaningful activities offered most days of the week?	82%	88%	60%	59%	61%	66%
In the last 6 months, how often were physical activities (i.e., activities that encourage some movement) offered most days of the week?	69%	88%	55%	53%	59%	61%

Italicized questions are not used in the domain score calculations.

**Table 21. 2020 Facility Item Level Scores and Peer Groups for Edenwald
(continued)**

	Edenwald 2020	Edenwald 2019	Statewide	Central Maryland	81 - 120 beds	Non-Profit
Autonomy and Resident Rights						
If the resident desires private space for visits such as with clergy or family, how often is private space available?	89%	95%	74%	70%	77%	85%
In the last 6 months, how often did you observe that the resident's or other residents' privacy was protected when the resident was dressing, showering, bathing, or in a public area?	100%	95%	83%	83%	86%	91%
In the last 6 months, how often were the resident's preferences about daily routine carried out (e.g. time and place for meals and time and type of bath)?	100%	83%	71%	70%	74%	80%
Physical Aspects of the Nursing Home						
In the last six months, how often was the resident's room bright and cheerful?	92%	96%	73%	72%	75%	85%
In the last 6 months, how often did the public areas of the nursing home look and smell clean?	100%	96%	85%	84%	86%	95%
In the last 6 months, how often did the resident's room look and smell clean?	90%	96%	80%	79%	81%	90%
In the last 6 months, how often was the noise level around the resident's room acceptable to you?	90%	82%	79%	79%	80%	87%

Italicized questions are not used in the domain score calculations.

**Table 21. 2020 Facility Item Level Scores and Peer Groups for Edenwald
(continued)**

	Edenwald 2020	Edenwald 2019	Statewide	Central Maryland	81 - 120 beds	Non-Profit
Security and Resident's Personal Rights						
In the last 6 months, how often was there enough security for the facility (e.g., alarms, security guard, locked doors)?	100%	96%	91%	92%	92%	96%
In the last 6 months, how often did the nursing home take sufficient steps to protect the resident's personal items?	90%	83%	70%	66%	71%	82%
In the last 6 months, how often did the nursing home take sufficient steps to protect the resident's personal safety?	93%	92%	87%	87%	89%	93%
Satisfaction with Overall Experience						
Using any number from 1 to 10, where 10 is the best care possible and 1 is the worst care possible, what number would you use to rate the care at this nursing home?	90%	96%	78%	76%	80%	88%
If someone needed nursing home care, would you recommend this nursing home to them?	90%	85%	80%	78%	82%	91%

Italicized questions are not used in the domain score calculations.