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More than 75,000 Transitions by the End of 2016

Cumulative Total Number of MFP Transitions, June 2008 to December 2016

Average Time From Assessment to Transition Varies Widely Across Grantees

Average number of days from time of initial assessment to actual transition in 2016

MFP Participants
Largest Group in 2016 was Younger Adults Transitioning from Nursing Homes

Distribution of MFP participants transitioned by targeted population 2015 and 2016


Note: The analysis is based on data from 44 grantee states.

ID/DD = intellectual or developmental disabilities; MI = mental illness; PD = physical disabilities.
Majority of MFP Participants Move to Apartments and Homes

Percentage of new MFP participants who transitioned to each type of qualified residence, January to December 2016


N = 44 grantee states.
Type of Housing Varies by Targeted Population

Type of qualified residence by targeted population, January to December 2016

N = 44 grantee states.
PD = physical disabilities; ID/DD = intellectual or developmental disabilities; MI = mental illness.
Expenditures on Community-Based Long-Term Services and Supports (LTSS)
Grantees Spent $84 Billion on Community-Based LTSS in 2016

Projected and actual qualified community-based LTSS expenditures, December 2008 to December 2016

Putting the MFP Grant Funds in Perspective

• $4 billion ≈ 0.5 percent of total grantee spending on community-based LTSS in 2016

• Funding spread across several years
  – Funding allotments started in 2007 and ended in 2016 – 10 years
  – States have until 2020 to spend their allotments – 14 years

• Funding spread across a large number of grantees
  – 44 states and the District of Columbia, plus Oregon
Nearly $1 Billion in Reported Spending of Rebalancing Funds

Total annual expenditures of state rebalancing funds between December 2009 and December 2015


State Approaches to Using MFP Rebalancing Funds

Types of rebalancing initiatives in 2015


Note: States may spend rebalancing funds on multiple types of initiatives and can be counted in multiple categories.

N = 35 grantee states.
Learnings from the Demonstration Applicable to the Future
Factors Associated with Strong Transition Programs

• Strong and close working relationships
  – Facilities
  – Local housing agencies
  – Local service providers

• Ongoing outreach
  – Steady or growing volume of referrals
Strategies for Addressing the Housing Challenge

• Increasing the supply of affordable and accessible housing
  – Advocating for more state and federal investment
  – Reaching out to property owners
  – Supporting the modification of existing homes and apartments and the development of qualified small group homes

• Promoting long-term collaboration between health and housing

• Increasing housing supports to facilitate transitions
  – Housing coordinators

• Providing tenant assistance and support
Large Improvements in Quality of Life

Quality of life of MFP participants pre- and post-transition

Source: Mathematica’s analysis of MFP Quality-of-Life surveys and program participation data submitted to CMS through May 2016.
Large Improvements in Quality of Life

Quality of life of MFP participants pre- and post-transition

Source: Mathematica’s analysis of MFP Quality-of-Life surveys and program participation data submitted to CMS through May 2016.

Note: Lower percentages indicates an improvement. Unmet care needs include bathing, eating, medication management, or toileting. Barriers to participating in the community are measured as an affirmative response to “Is there anything you want to do outside [the facility/your home] that you cannot do now?”
Notable Increases in Sleep Quality

Percentage of participants reporting they can get needed sleep by target population

Source: Mathematica’s analysis of MFP Quality-of-Life surveys submitted through December 2016.

Note: Excludes data from Minnesota, South Dakota, and West Virginia.

Based on a sample of 16,445 survey respondents.
Important Increases in Community Integration

Community integration components by length of time in community

Source: Mathematica’s analysis of MFP Quality-of-Life surveys submitted through December 2016.

Note: Excludes data from Minnesota, South Dakota, and West Virginia.

Based on a sample of 16,445 survey respondents.
Summary

• The changes in the quality of life are remarkable
  – *The MFP demonstration has had positive impacts on participants’ lives*

• Any dollar value placed on these improvements would not adequately reflect what it means for people with significant disabilities when they can live in and contribute to their local communities.
For More Information

– CMS MFP website
  • https://www.medicaid.gov/medicaid/ltss/money-follows-the-person/index.html

– Mathematica MFP website