

DRC BRIEF

DRC BRIEF NUMBER: 2017-05

Demonstration to Maintain Independence and Employment in Texas: Long-Term Follow-Up of Health Services Utilization and Employment Outcomes

September 2017

Judith A. Cook*
Jane K. Burke-Miller
Thomas M. Bohman

*Corresponding author's contact information:

Center on Mental Health Services Research and Policy

Department of Psychiatry

University of Illinois at Chicago

1601 West Taylor Street

Chicago, IL 60612

Telephone: (312) 355-3921

Email: jcook@uic.edu

Reference Number: 40112.MPR14-10

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the U.S. Social Security Administration (SSA) funded as part of the Disability Research Consortium. The opinions and conclusions expressed are solely those of the authors and do not represent the opinions or policy of SSA or any agency of the Federal Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, expressed or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of the contents of this report. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply endorsement, recommendation or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof.

Introduction

The Demonstration to Maintain Independence and Employment (DMIE) was authorized under the Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Improvement Act of 1999 and awarded funds to states to develop, implement, and evaluate interventions for workers with potentially disabling health conditions. These interventions were designed to prevent participants' conditions from becoming severely disabling, and to maintain their employment, health status, and independence from public assistance programs. From 2007 through 2009, Texas implemented a multi-component intervention aimed at providing comprehensive health insurance coverage, expedited access to services, healthcare navigators, and vocational supports for working adults with serious mental illness or co-occurring behavioral and physical health disorders. Compared to control participants in a randomized trial, intervention participants reported greater access to and utilization of health and mental health services, and were significantly less likely to be receiving SSI/DI than controls after one year of service delivery (6% vs. 8%, respectively) although there was no difference in employment retention (Bohman et al., 2011). In this policy brief we report on the long-term effects of these early-intervention services by evaluating health services use, Medicaid disability enrollment, and employment among DMIE participants from 2010-2014, the 5 years following the program.

Background and Methods

The Texas DMIE project, called Working Well, was designed to address the health, employment, and social needs of employed adults in the hopes of forestalling or preventing application for federal disability benefits. The program was based on a model which posits that using a person-centered approach incorporating motivational interviewing, along with enhanced access to healthcare and employment supports, will improve individuals' physical and mental health, enhance quality of life, and promote sustained employment. In the longer term, these factors were expected to bolster participants' independence and help them avoid reliance on government support. To qualify for the Working Well study, participants had to have a diagnosis of either serious mental illness (bipolar disorder, schizophrenia or major depression) or a combination of a behavioral condition with a physical health condition that put them at risk of disability. Other criteria for participation included being employed for an average of at least 40 hours per month, not receiving Medicaid, and not currently having applied for or been certified as eligible for Social Security disability benefits (SSI, SSDI) according to self-report. Texas DMIE participants were working adults aged 21–60, most living at or below federal poverty level and without access to employer-based health insurance. Participants were all enrolled in the Harris County Health Department's "Gold Card" program, which provides Medicaid-like health services to Harris County residents on a sliding-scale basis, based on household income (Bohman et al., 2011).

Data Sources

The University of Texas at Austin Institutional Review Board reviewed and approved use of the Texas DMIE evaluation baseline data obtained during the original study recruitment period between April 2007 and May 2008, including demographic and diagnostic information. In addition, participants' Social Security number and Medicaid number were matched to DMIE participants' administrative data regarding healthcare utilization, Medicaid eligibility, and wage information for the 5-year period between January 2010 and December 2014. Data used in the

long-term follow-up includes county-level indigent care and Medicaid health services utilization data, state-level Medicaid eligibility information, and state employment wage records.

Outcome Analysis

We addressed the problem of uncertain loss to follow-up status among DMIE participants by adjusting for baseline characteristics in multivariable models and by analyzing the outcome data in three ways: 1) looking at the first year of long term follow-up only (2010); 2) looking at all long term follow-up years combined; and 3) looking at longitudinal models including time and time by study condition interaction effects. In the first two approaches, we used multivariable logistic regression models to predict each binary outcome variable: use of any outpatient services; use of any pharmacy prescriptions; use of any inpatient or emergency room services; Medicaid eligible due to disability; and any earned income. In the third approach, we used random effects logistic regression models to predict the same 5 outcomes over time with additional covariates for time (year) and a time by study condition interaction.

Results

The Texas DMIE had 1,616 study participants, including 904 (56%) intervention condition participants and 712 (44%) control condition participants. DMIE intervention and control participants were enrolled from April 2007 up until the first week of June 2008, and intervention participants received services for an average of 21 months. As shown in Table 1, participants did not differ significantly by study condition on demographic characteristics measured at baseline. Study participants tended to be unmarried, middle-aged, female, black and Hispanic/Latino, with at least a high school degree. Most participants had been recruited for the study by mail rather than in-person (57.6%). By occupational category, health care support workers made up the largest single occupational group (13.9%); many of these health care support workers were home health aides (Bohman et al., 2008).

Participants also were equivalent across study condition in terms of enrollment diagnosis group. Around a third (34.7%) had co-occurring mental and physical health diagnoses. A tenth (9.8%) had mental, physical, and substance use diagnoses. Two-fifths (22.6%) had co-occurring behavioral and physical health diagnoses, while another 6.7% had co-occurring behavioral health, physical health, and substance use diagnoses. Substance use and physical health diagnoses co-occurred for 15.2%. Finally, 7.5% had a serious mental illness diagnosis, and another 3.4% had co-occurring serious mental illness and substance use diagnoses.

Table 1. Participant baseline characteristics by study condition

	Total % (N) 100% (1,616)	Intervention % (n) 56% (904)	Comparison % (n) 44% (712)	Chi-square, p-value
Race/ethnic group				
Black	41.2% (665)	43.5% (393)	38.2% (272)	5.05, p=.282
Hispanic/Latino	30.9% (500)	30.1% (272)	32.0% (228)	
White	23.1% (374)	21.8% (197)	24.9% (177)	
Asian	1.5% (24)	1.5% (14)	1.4% (10)	
Other/Mixed	3.3% (53)	3.1% (28)	3.5% (25)	
Male	23.5% (380)	22.5% (203)	24.9% (177)	1.28, p=.262
Education				
< High School	30.8% (497)	29.5% (266)	32.5% (231)	2.02, p=.364
High School or GED	31.4% (506)	31.5% (284)	31.2% (222)	
> High School	37.9% (611)	39.1% (353)	36.3% (258)	
Marital Status				
Now married	25.2% (407)	24.2% (219)	26.4% (188)	4.41, p=.621
Widowed	7.0% (113)	6.9% (62)	7.2% (51)	
Divorced	30.0% (484)	30.8% (278)	28.9% (206)	
Separated	12.2% (197)	12.9% (117)	11.2% (80)	
Never Married	25.6% (413)	25.1% (227)	26.1% (1186)	
Living Situation				
Own home	27.8% (450)	26.2% (237)	29.9% (213)	3.51, p=.477
Rent home	54.0% (873)	55.2% (499)	52.5% (374)	
Public Housing/Subsidized Housing	4.5% (72)	4.6% (42)	4.2% (30)	
Other/Missing	13.7% (221)	13.9% (126)	13.3% (95)	
Enrollment Diagnosis Group				
Mental/Physical Health	34.7% (561)	35.4% (32)	33.8% (241)	5.51, p=.480
Mental/Physical/Substance	9.8% (158)	9.0% (81)	10.8% (77)	
Other Behavioral/Physical	22.6% (366)	22.6% (204)	22.8% (162)	
Other Behavioral/Physical/ Substance	6.7% (109)	6.0% (54)	7.7% (55)	
Substance/Physical	15.2% (245)	15.3% (138)	15.0% (107)	
SMI	7.5% (122)	8.4% (76)	6.5% (46)	0.53, p=.466
SMI/Substance	3.4% (55)	3.4% (31)	3.4% (24)	
Mail (vs. In Person Recruitment)	57.6% (931)	58.4% (528)	56.6% (403)	
Healthcare worker	13.9% (224)	14.2% (128)	13.5% (96)	0.15, p=.696
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	T-test, p-value
Age, years	47.6 (8.9)	47.6 (8.9)	47.7 (8.3)	0.41, p=.682
Number of months in intervention	21.0 (3.8)	21.0 (3.8)	N/A	N/A
Time between baseline and January 2010, months	24.1 (3.9)	24.1 (3.8)	24.1 (3.9)	0.10, p=.918

Note: Participants did not vary significantly by study condition ($p < .05$) on any measured characteristic.

Outcome analysis (Table 2) showed that study condition was not associated with outpatient or inpatient/emergency service utilization or with likelihood of Medicaid eligibility due to disability, or with employment status in the long term follow-up period. However, compared to controls, intervention participants were more likely to use pharmacy services in the first year of follow-up (2010) (odds ratio = 1.34, $p = .010$) or at all over 5 years of follow-up (2010-2014) (odds ratio = 1.33, $p = .029$).

In subgroup outcome analyses (Table 3) of participants with serious mental illness diagnoses ($n = 177$), intervention participants were significantly more likely than controls to use pharmacy services at all over 5 years of follow-up (odds ratio = 2.81, $p = .007$) and more likely to be employed in longitudinal analysis (odds ratio = 4.91, $p = .037$).

Table 2. Analysis of post-intervention outcomes among all DMIE participants

Outcome	Model Term ¹	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
		Outcome in 2010	Outcome Summary 2010-14	Outcome Longitudinally by Year 2010-14
		OR (95% CI), p-value	OR (95% CI), p-value	OR (95% CI), p-value
Outpatient Healthcare Services Use	Time (Year)	NA	NA	1.06 (0.96, 1.16), p=.304
	Study Condition	0.97 (0.63, 1.48), p=.883	1.01 (0.77, 1.34), p=.929	0.95 (0.45, 2.03), p=.206
	Study condition * Time	NA	NA	0.95 (0.83, 1.07), p=.292
Pharmaceutical healthcare services	Time (Year)	NA	NA	0.62 (0.57, 0.64), p<.001
	Study Condition	1.34 (1.0, 1.67), p=.010	1.33 (1.03, 1.71), p=.029	1.30 (0.90, 1.89), p=.056
	Study condition * Time	NA	NA	0.92 (0.88, 1.97), p=.132
Inpatient or emergency room services	Time (Year)	NA	NA	1.07 (0.68, 1.71), p=.005
	Study Condition	1.01 (0.49, 2.06), p=.988	0.88 (0.61, 1.27), p=.497	1.09 (0.39, 3.02), p=.387
	Study condition * Time	NA	NA	0.58 (0.26, 1.32), p=.547
Medicaid eligibility due to disability ²	Time (Year)	NA	NA	0.61 (0.57, 0.65), p<.001
	Study Condition	0.94 (0.70, 1.25), p=.660	0.94 (0.66, 1.31), p=.659	1.32 (0.79, 2.22), p=.359
	Study condition * Time	NA	NA	0.43 (0.02, 9.70), p=.938
Employment (any earned income) ²	Time (Year)	NA	NA	0.61 (0.57, 0.65), p=.001
	Study Condition	1.10 (0.88, 1.37), p=.414	1.18 (0.92, 1.50), p=.194	1.38 (0.75, 2.53), p=.300
	Study condition * Time	NA	NA	1.26 (0.68, 2.33), p=.723

Note: The first model is a multivariable logistic regression predicting the occurrence of the outcome in the first year of long term follow up (2010). The second is a multivariable logistic regression predicting the outcome during the period 2010-2014. The third is a multivariable random effects logistic regression model of the outcome by year, 2010-2014. N=1,616.

¹Models control for participant gender, race/ethnicity, education, marital status, occupation, age, recruitment location, and time since study enrollment.

²Models also control for use of outpatient, pharmacy and inpatient/emergency room services.

Table 3. Analysis of post-intervention outcomes among DMIE participants with diagnoses of serious mental illness (SMI)

Outcome	Model Term ¹	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
		Outcome in 2010	Outcome Summary 2010-14	Outcome Longitudinally by Year 2010-14
		OR (95% CI), p-value	OR (95% CI), p-value	OR (95% CI), p-value
Outpatient Healthcare Services Use	Time (Year)	NA	NA	1.16 (0.45, 3.00), p=.936
	Study Condition	1.63 (0.45, 5.93), p=.456	1.43 (0.61, 3.34), p=.411	1.19 (0.17, 8.26), p=.656
	Study condition * Time	NA	NA	2.49 (0.38, 16.50), p=.456
Pharmaceutical healthcare services	Time (Year)	NA	NA	1.85 (0.96, 3.55), p=.104
	Study Condition	1.69 (0.87, 3.27), p=.122	2.81 (1.32, 5.94), p=.007	3.67 (0.86, 15.64), p=.079
	Study condition * Time	NA	NA	3.76 (0.88, 16.19), p=.683
Inpatient or emergency room services	Time (Year)	NA	NA	0.35 (0.09, 1.34), p=.284
	Study Condition	5.29 (0.43, 65.43), p=.195	1.39 (0.50, 3.82), p=.528	2.15 (0.11, 42.08), p=.346
	Study condition * Time	NA	NA	1.38 (0.14, 13.28), p=.372
Medicaid eligibility due to disability ²	Time (Year)	NA	NA	0.01 (0.00, 0.08), p=.001
	Study Condition	1.00 (0.40, 2.49), p=.999	0.81 (0.24, 2.68), p=.725	2.09 (0.26, 16.61), p=.487
	Study condition * Time	NA	NA	1.69 (0.35, 8.19), p=.851
Employment (any earned income) ²	Time (Year)	NA	NA	0.69 (0.58, 0.81), p=.002
	Study Condition	1.41 (0.71, 2.79), p=.325	1.52 (0.69, 3.32), p=.300	4.91 (1.11, 21.86), p=.037
	Study condition * Time	NA	NA	4.04 (0.91, 17.91), p=.659

Note: The first model is a multivariable logistic regression predicting the occurrence of the outcome in the first year of long term follow up (2010). The second is a multivariable logistic regression predicting the outcome during the period 2010-2014. The third is a multivariable random effects logistic regression model of the outcome by year, 2010-2014. N=177.

¹Models control for participant gender, race/ethnicity, education, marital status, occupation, age, recruitment location, and time since study enrollment.

²Models also control for use of outpatient, pharmacy and inpatient/emergency room services.

Longitudinal use of pharmacy services and employment outcomes by study condition and SMI diagnosis are shown in Figures 1 and 2. In Figure 1, pharmacy services decline over time for all groups. The lowest utilizing group is the serious mental illness comparison group, followed by the serious mental illness intervention group. In Figure 2, employment in each year declines for all groups, with the serious mental illness control group having the lowest proportion of any earned income, followed by the serious mental illness intervention group.

Figure 1. Relationship of study condition, SMI and pharmacy services use over time





Figure 2. Relationship of study condition, SMI and earned income over time



Discussion/Policy Implications

Taken together, the results of our analysis offer minimal support for the long-term effectiveness of early intervention services to reduce dependence on federal disability benefits. Compared to controls, intervention participants were no more likely to be employed, they were equally likely to be eligible for Medicaid due to disability, and they showed similar patterns of medical service utilization, differing only in pharmacy service utilization which was lower for the control than experimental group.

In the subgroup analysis of DMIE participants with serious mental illness, the positive effect of the intervention on prescription drug use persisted. In addition, there was a significant association of study condition with a greater likelihood of employment in this population. Observed outcomes by study condition and serious mental illness group suggests that although intervention participants with serious mental illness had lower levels of employment over time than non-serious mental illness participants in either study condition, they still were considerably more often employed than control participants with serious mental illness who did not receive the early intervention services. This raises the intriguing possibility that early intervention services may be especially valuable for people with this notoriously persistent disability.

There are several study limitations. First is the unknown status of participants over the study period in terms of loss to follow-up. While this is a weakness, there is no compelling reason to expect that loss to follow-up was associated with original DMIE study condition given that administrative data were used. Second is the small number of participants in the serious mental illness subgroup. Because of this, analyses of outcomes with a low prevalence may have been

affected by under-powered statistical models. Third is the fact that Texas' DMIE study population was uniquely selected to meet defined eligibility criteria and did not represent the larger employed adult population with potentially disabling conditions. Thus, study results may not be generalizable to other working-age populations of adults in the state.

While our results offer minimal support for the long-term effectiveness of early intervention models to reduce dependence on disability benefits, it is also true that there have been changes in federal policies regarding both health care coverage and employment services that could alter the context in which these models operate. Given initial positive results of DMIE, along with some evidence for the long-term positive effects on labor force participation for the vulnerable group with serious mental illness, it may be premature to abandon these efforts. Hopefully, future studies can assess more clearly defined models based on recently validated evidence-based practices and bolstered by established fidelity, so that the full potential of early intervention can be more completely understood.

References

- Bohman, T. M., Wallisch, L., Stoner, D., & Pittman, A. (2008). Health Care Support Workers at Risk: Texas Working Well Highlights. Austin, TX: Texas Department of State Health Services.
- Bohman, T. M., Wallisch, L., Christensen, K., Stoner, D., Pittman, A., Reed, B. & Ostermeyer, B. (2011). Working Well - The Texas Demonstration to Maintain Independence and Employment: 18-month outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation* 34(2): 97-106.

www.mathematica-mpr.com

Improving public well-being by conducting high quality,
objective research and surveys

PRINCETON, NJ ■ ANN ARBOR, MI ■ CAMBRIDGE, MA ■ CHICAGO, IL ■ OAKLAND, CA ■ WASHINGTON, DC

MATHEMATICA
— CENTER FOR —
STUDYING DISABILITY POLICY

Mathematica® is a registered trademark of
Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.