

Brief Analysis of Disposition of Residents due to the Closure on Highview of Northampton

Based on “de-identified” data provided by the Massachusetts Department of Public Health

Prepared by Dignity Alliance Massachusetts February 28, 2025

Contact: Paul Lanzikos, paul.lanzikos@gmail.com

Facility location: 222 River Road, Leeds, MA

Owner and Manager: Athena Health Care Systems

Date of notice of closure letter to the Department of Public Health: October 7, 2024

Proposed closure date: February 6, 2025

Public hearing date: November 6, 2024

Date of notice of approval of Closure Plan: November 20, 2024

Number of licensed beds: 120

Number of residents discharged: 80

Discharge Period: October through December 2024

Summary of data from accompanying spreadsheet

Disposition:

68 were transferred to other Massachusetts nursing homes

6 were discharged to other settings; one each to:

An assisted living residence

A motel

A group home

A hospice

A nursing home in another state

Home

One resident left Against Medical Advice (AMA)

5 dispositions were not publicly disclosed

Distance:

7 residents transferred to facilities up to 25 miles distance

24 residents transferred to facilities 26-50 miles distance

37 residents transferred to facilities more than 50 miles distance

Number of residents transferred together

- 2 facilities received 11 residents each
- 3 facilities received between 5 and 9 residents each
- 7 facilities received between 2 and 4 residents each
- 5 facilities received 1 resident

Receiving facilities by ownership

- 7 facilities owned by Athena Health Care Systems (which also owned Highview)
- 2 facilities owned by Agawam
- 8 facilities are owned by various individual entities

Receiving facilities by ownership

- 7 facilities are managed by Athena Health Care Systems (which also managed Highview)
- 2 facilities are managed by BaneCare Management
- 2 facilities are managed by Stern Consultants
- 6 facilities are managed by various individual entities

Quality Rating by the Star System (1 is the lowest and 5 is the highest rating)

- 7 facilities are rated 1
- 7 facilities are rated 2
- 3 facilities are rated 3
- No facilities were rated 4 or 5

Staffing in the receiving facility: Hours per resident day (HPRD)

- 5 facilities reported up to 2.99 HPRD
 - 8 facilities reported between 3.00 and 3.57 HPRD
 - 4 facilities reported 3.58 or more HPRD
- Note: HPRD: state average 3.8; state minimum 3.58

Direct Care Cost Quotient (DCC-Q) of receiving facility:

- 1 facility had a DCC-Q under 75%
- 6 facilities had a DCC-Q from 75% to 79%
- 6 facilities had a DCC-Q from 80% to 89%
- 4 facilities had a DCC-Q of 90% or more

Note: The DCC-Q is calculated by dividing certain direct care workforce expenses, such as nursing, dietary, restorative therapy, or social worker staff expenses, by the facility's total revenue. Penalties are assessed below 75%.

Occupancy level in receiving facilities:

- 5 facilities reported an occupancy of under 80%
- 5 facilities reported an occupancy from 80% to 89%
- 7 facilities reported an occupancy of 90% and greater

Nursing turnover:

- 8 facilities reported a nursing turnover rate under the state average (44.4%)
- 6 facilities reported a nursing turnover rate between 44.4% and 59%
- 2 facilities reported a nursing turnover rate between 60% and 69%
- 1 facility reported a nursing turnover of 99.1%

Deficiencies incurred over a three-year period

- 4 facilities incurred 30 or fewer deficiencies
- 2 facilities incurred 31 to 40 deficiencies
- 4 facilities incurred 41 to 50 deficiencies
- 3 facilities incurred 51 to 60 deficiencies
- 2 facilities incurred 61 to 70 deficiencies
- 1 facility incurred 79 deficiencies
- 1 facility incurred 108 deficiencies

Infection related deficiencies incurred over a three-year period

- 9 facilities incurred 4 or fewer deficiencies
- 7 facilities incurred 5 to 9 deficiencies
- 1 facility incurred 13 deficiencies

Financial penalties assessed over a three-year period

- 1 facility had no assessments
- 2 facilities had assessments under \$25,000
- 4 facilities had assessments between \$25,000 and \$49,999
- 3 facilities had assessments between \$50,000 and \$99,999
- 4 facilities had assessments between \$100,000 and \$150,000
- 2 facilities had assessments between \$200,000 and \$299,000

1 facility had an assessment of \$452,000