

Georgia State University

ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University

GHPC Reports

Georgia Health Policy Center

7-30-2016

Semiannual Analytic Results of The Money Follows The Person Program Evaluation Executive Summary

Georgia Health Policy Center

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/ghpc_reports

Recommended Citation

Georgia Health Policy Center, "Semiannual Analytic Results of The Money Follows The Person Program Evaluation Executive Summary" (2016). *GHPC Reports*. 37.

https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/ghpc_reports/37

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Georgia Health Policy Center at ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in GHPC Reports by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gsu.edu.

GEORGIA HEALTH POLICY CENTER



Executive Summary

The Money Follows the Person (MFP) program is a Medicaid demonstration program that was awarded to the Georgia Department of Community Health (DCH) in 2008. This executive summary, combined with the Chartbook and Data Tables, is a summary of the evaluation provided by the Georgia Health Policy Center (GHPC) for cumulative data collected between January 2009 and June 2016. Included is an analysis of Quality of Life (QoL) surveys conducted pre-transition (baseline), approximately 11 months post-transition (year one), and approximately 24 months post-transition (year two). The data examined in this report include a description of respondent characteristics, an analysis of cumulative matched surveys, Georgia-specific supplemental questions that were phased in between June 2012 and November 2012, and open-ended, qualitative comments. In addition, the demonstration funds used for pre- and post-transition services were analyzed.

The MFP program has five target populations: persons with developmental disabilities; persons with physical disabilities (and under age 65); persons with a Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI); older adults; and youth with a mental health diagnosis.¹ The largest percentage of survey respondents were persons with developmental disabilities (year one: 47 percent; year two: 55 percent), followed by persons with physical disabilities or a TBI (year-one: 38 percent; year-two: 32 percent) and older adults (year-one: 15 percent; year-two: 13 percent). A slight majority of the respondents were male (year one: 55 percent; year two: 54 percent); on average respondents were 55 years old and had an average length of stay in a facility of nine years prior to transition, though there is striking variation among the target populations. The average length of stay prior to transitioning from a facility was approximately one year for older adults, about two years for people with physical disabilities, and slightly more than 21 years for people with developmental disabilities.

Survey respondents were significantly more likely to report liking where they lived, having a choice in selecting their residence, feeling safe, and sleeping without disturbances at follow-up compared to the baseline. Significantly fewer respondents lived in a group home or nursing facility post-transition (year one: 46 percent; year two: 55 percent). More detailed information regarding housing type post-transition reveals that approximately 62 percent of the respondents lived in either an apartment or a house at year one. A larger percentage of participants lived in a group or personal care home at year two, which is primarily driven by a larger share of respondents being individuals with a developmental disability. The majority of respondents indicated that they live where they want to (year one: 78 percent; year two: 83 percent). In addition, 43 percent of respondents at year one and 40 percent of year two respondents stated that they currently live with family or friends.

¹Most youth with a mental health diagnosis do not complete the QoL survey due to being under the age of 18, thus the results for the target population are not indicated separately.

Post-transition respondents indicated significantly higher levels of choice and control in their lives, including choosing when and what they ate, when they went to bed, watched television, and talked on the phone with privacy. Approximately the same percentage of respondents reported receiving help with selected activities of daily living before and after transition, with more than 95 percent of the individuals receiving some help that is from paid caregivers. Of those who do receive help from someone who is paid, there was a significant average increase observed at follow-up of those who stated they had a choice in the people paid to help them (year one: 34 percent; year two: 32 percent).

The majority of older adults and persons with physical disabilities reported that they received informal support provided by family or friends. When asked if the participant needed more help with things around the house than they were currently receiving, fewer respondents stated that they needed more help at year two (15 percent) than at the year one (23 percent). Post-transition, significantly more respondents reported that the individuals who helped them treated them the way they wanted and listened to what was asked of them.

Participants' ability to do fun activities in the community and to see friends and family decreased slightly between the baseline and year one. However, improvement was measured in these two questions at year two. Important differences among the target populations were identified on participants' ability to go out independently. Nearly all of the respondents with a developmental disability needed help to go out in the community at follow-up, while significantly more older adults and people with physical disabilities reported going out independently at year two when compared to the baseline. Of those who needed help, 34 percent of respondents at year one reported needing more help than they were receiving, though at year two, the percentage fell to 19 percent. Significantly more participants were able to get to the places they needed to go post-transition, and of those who reported not being able to get to desired destinations, the majority reported that transportation was the barrier.

Very few MFP participants reported working for pay (year one: two percent; year two: four percent) or doing volunteer work (year one: 10 percent; year two: 11 percent). Of those who were not working or volunteering, more than 41 percent of the people with physical disabilities were interested in doing so at year two. The most common barriers to working or volunteering reported by respondents included their health condition, not finding an opportunity that fits, and transportation.

A significant increase in participants' happiness with the help they received was measured at year one and year two. At baseline, 79 percent of respondents reported they were happy with the help they received with tasks around the house or with getting around

the community as compared with 88 percent and 94 percent at year one and year two, respectively. When asked if respondents were happy with the way they live their life, a significant increase was measured at follow-up (year one: 10 percent; year two: 15 percent). Participants generally reported similar levels of sadness, irritability, and pain at follow-up when compared to the baseline.

Cumulative open-ended, qualitative comments from 143 different participants documented during follow-up interviews were analyzed. The comments were coded into four key themes: positive transition and overall experience with MFP, challenges with the MFP program, post-transition challenges, and better quality of life post-transition. Participants expressed their happiness working with MFP staff as well as the promptness and quality of the services they received. Many participants commented on the diligence of the program staff. For example, one participant said “They have been very good. They have not taken long to get me what I need. I didn’t feel like they pitied me.”

During the follow-up interview some participants also described problems they experienced with the MFP program. A participant described her experience, stating she was told she could get dental, vision and hearing services but no one followed-up so she was not able to receive those services. Another participant described that she was unaware that the money was available for one year and what it was being spent on. Further a few other participants conveyed they felt there was a lack of communication with program staff which affected their ability to get everything they needed.

Post-transition participants reported both negative and positive changes. Challenges centered on staffing, inadequate housing, a lack of access to social activities, medical care, information, and transportation. For example, one participant’s son stated, “[The] aides were not too great, they needed to be instructed a lot and tend to slack off.” Positive comments included participants’ feeling happier, healthier, more independent, having better living conditions, a sense of community, and relief to be out of a nursing home. As an illustration of this theme, a participant’s wife said that “being at home is so much better. I can sleep beside him. His care is attended to better at home.”

Before and after transition from an institution, participants have access to MFP grant funds to help pay for things not typically covered by Medicaid. From 2009 to 2015, approximately \$8.7 million MFP supplemental grant funds were disbursed for care to support participant transitions. An observed decrease in spending on demonstration services has occurred since 2012, which was the year with the largest enrollment to date. The service categories that accounted for the largest expenditures continue to be Environmental Modifications, Equipment and Supplies and Household Furnishings. The service accessed most frequently was the Home Care Ombudsman.