







IMPACT OF COMMUNITY CARE MODELS ON QUALITY OF LIFE

Presented To: The American Public Health Association 3423.0 "Healthcare Outcomes, Quality of Life and Innovations in Aging Practice"







MONEY FOLLOWS THE PERSON

Once we lived in a nursing home.



Now we live in our own homes.





RESEARCH QUESTION

Which variables predict quality of life in Money Follows the Person program participants?





PREDICTORS

- Age
- Sex
- Length of Stay in an Institutional Facility at Baseline
- Home Setting
- Rurality
- Target Population





WHAT IS QUALITY OF LIFE?

Reinhard et. al (2001)

- 1. Safe and effective
- 2. Personal dignity and preferences respected
- Comprehensive and trained workforce
- 4. Community engagement
- 5. Standards of care

Mathematica (2008)

- 1. Living arrangement
- 2. Personal care
- 3. Respect & dignity
- 4. Choice & control
- 5. Community integration
- 6. Life satisfaction
- 7. Psychosocial health status





QUALITY OF LIFE



Respect

 α = 0.73

Community Integration $\alpha = 0.61$





DEMOGRAPHICS

- 54.8% male
- Average age of 53.1 years
- 48.9% Group Home/Nursing Facility
- 84.0% Metro
- Average of 7.4 years in an institution prior to transition

Target Population	
Developmentally Disabled	52.3%
Physically Disabled	34.4%
Older Adult	13.4%





BIVARIATE RESULTS

Factors Associated with Total Quality of Life Scale Scores Post-Transition

Predictors	n	Pearson r
Length of Stay in Facility at Baseline	246	0.177**
Home Setting	242	0.147*
Target Population	246	
Developmental Disability		0.355**
Physical Disability		-0.262***
Older Adult		-0.166**

^{*, **, ***} indicates significance at with p < 0.05, p < 0.01, p < 0.001 respectively.





REGRESSION MODELS

Quality of Life = β_0 + β_1 length of stay + β_2 age + β_3 home setting + β_4 sex + β_5 rurality+ β_6 target population



DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITY

Regression Between Predictors and Total Quality of Life Scale Scores of Persons with a Developmental Disability Post-Transition

	β(SE)
Length of Stay in Facility at Baseline	.058 (.566)
Age at Discharge	002 (.009)
Group Home/Nursing Facility	.024 (.230)
Female	.112 (.216)
Metro	.001 (.292)
Developmental Disability	.329 (.254)***

^{*, **, ***} indicates significance at with p < 0.05, p < 0.01, p < 0.001 respectively.





PHYSICAL DISABILITY

Regression Between Predictors and Total Quality of Life Scale Scores of Persons with a Physical Disability Post-Transition

	β(SE)
Length of Stay in Facility at Baseline	.117 (.009)
Age at Discharge	-1.528 (.009)
Group Home/Nursing Facility	.786 (.232)
Female	1.904 (.220)
Metro	.114 (.297)
Physical Disability	230 (.247)**

^{*, **, ***} indicates significance at with p < 0.05, p < 0.01, p < 0.001 respectively.





OLDER ADULT

Regressions Between Predictors and Total Quality of Life Scale Scores of Older Adults Post-Transition

	β(SE)
Length of Stay in Facility at Baseline	.154 (.009) *
Age at Discharge	011 (.011)
Group Home/Nursing Facility	.118 (.226)
Female	.094 (.225)
Living Environment	002 (.303)
Older Adult	113 (.445)

^{*, **, ***} indicates significance at with p < 0.05, p < 0.01, p < 0.001 respectively.





FINDINGS

Three predictors of quality of life once transitioned into a community setting:

- 1. Being a person with a developmental disability
- 2. Being a person with a physical disability
- 3. Total length of stay in a facility prior to transition for the older adult population





IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY, DELIVERY, PRACTICE

- Need for Year 2 Results
- Targeting of Programs
- Service Delivery





CONTACT INFORMATION

Brittney Romanson

BRomanson@GSU.edu

404-413-0281



