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Outline

• Recent changes in home-delivered meal (HDM) programs
• Designing a randomized control trial (RCT) of a HDM program
• Results from pilot RCT
• “Take Home” points
• Future directions
Background

• Much evidence suggests benefits of home-delivered meals

• Research needed
  – Quantify improvement in quality of life
  – Determine effectiveness of the daily “check in” and social contact

Motivation

• Funding cuts, increased costs, recession and sequestration
  – Increase in waiting lists
  – Switch in meal delivery modality

• Research needed
  – Identify who is affected by waiting lists
  – Identify if outcomes differ by type of meal delivery
Study Goals

- **Primary Goals**
  - Characterize seniors on waiting lists for HDM
  - Assess effectiveness of HDM for a variety of outcomes

- **Secondary Goals**
  - Practicality of conducting RCT with this population
  - Refine methods for larger scale evaluation

Design

- Three-arm parallel, fixed, single-blinded randomized controlled trial
- 8 sites
- 620 target participants
- 1:1:1 randomization
- Baseline survey (in person) and 15-week follow-up (via telephone)
Study Aims & Primary Outcomes

**Primary Outcomes**
- Evaluate the Effectiveness of HDMs
  - Improved Mental Health
  - Decreased Isolation
  - Improved Self-Reported Health
- Evaluate the Effectiveness of Meal Delivery Method
  - Decreased Isolation
  - Increased Feelings of Safety
  - Increased Ability to Remain in Home

**Secondary Outcomes**
- Evaluate the Effectiveness of HDMs
  - Reduced Healthcare Visits
  - Reduced Rates of Falls
- Evaluate the Effectiveness of Meal Delivery Method
  - Increased Client Satisfaction

Phase 1 – Identifying Participants and Conducting Initial Interview

- Programs compiled waiting lists
- Called to discuss study, scheduled in-person interviews
- Consented participants and completed in-person interviews (N=626)
- Participants randomly assigned to daily-delivered meals (n=214), frozen, once-weekly delivered meals (n=202), or to remain on the waiting list (n=210)
- Meal delivery began and continued 15 weeks
Phase 2 – Follow-Up Interview

Participants contacted to schedule follow-up interview

Conducted follow-up interview over telephone (n=459; 154 in control group, 174 in daily-delivery group, and 131 in frozen, once-weekly delivery group)

Data entered and sent to Meals on Wheels America

Phase 3 – Analysis

Data verified and cleaned by study personnel

Tested for balance between groups at baseline

Examined rates of attrition and loss to follow-up

Baseline and outcomes analyses
Polling Question #1

• What kinds of client health outcomes data does your state currently collect during the assessment or reassessment of clients? Select all that apply.

- Depression/Anxiety
- Social isolation/Loneliness
- Hospital utilization
- Fall risk
- Self-rated health

Results

• Baseline descriptive characteristics of sample
• Comparison to national population
• Interviewer observations
• Rates of attrition
• Outcome results
### Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma or GED</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College degree or higher</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insurance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medigap/Medicare Supplement</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Part D</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean = 76.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range=(60-102)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Help with Personal Care Needs

- **Do you sometimes need the help of another person with personal care needs?**
  - 58%

- **Do you have someone to help you over a long period of time with personal care activities?**
  - 63%
Social Support

“How often do you have contact with friends or family?”
- Daily or almost daily: 58%
- Once or twice a week: 24%
- Once or twice a month: 10%
- Less than once a month: 8%

“Is there a family member, friend, or neighbor that you feel you can call on for help if you need it?”
- Yes: 86%
- No: 13%

Nutrition Risk

Eats alone every meal: 47%
There are times when not enough money to buy the food needed: 45%
Lost or gained 10 pounds in the last 6 months without wanting to: 51%
Takes 3 or more prescribed or over-the-counter drugs each day: 88%
Comparing MTAM participants to the population of seniors nationally

- Nationally Representative Survey
  - 2011 National Health and Aging Trends Survey (NHATS)
    - Self-Rated Health
    - Anxiety & Depression
    - Fear of Falling
    - Difficulty Shopping and Cooking
    - Observations Inside and Outside the Home

- Analyses
  - Chi-square to test differences between groups

MTAM participants have worse self-rated health than seniors nationally

Q: “Would you say that in general your health is...”

Groups significantly different at the p<0.001 level

MTAM Seniors
Seniors Nationally

Excellent
Very good
Good
Fair
Poor

1%
11%
5%
22%
41%
29%
19%
7%
30%
**MTAM participants are more likely to screen positive for depression and anxiety than seniors nationally**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depression</th>
<th>MTAM Seniors</th>
<th>Seniors Nationally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Depression measured using PHQ-2 and Anxiety measured using the GAD-2; Groups significantly different at the $p<0.001$ level.

**MTAM participants are more likely to have fallen and have the fear of falling limit activities than seniors nationally**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MTAM Seniors</th>
<th>Seniors Nationally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fallen</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worried about falling</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear limited activities</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q: “In the last month, have you fallen down?”
Q: “In the last month, did you worry about falling down?”
Q: “In the last month, did this worry ever limit your activities?”

Groups significantly different at the $p<0.001$ level.
MTAM participants are more likely to need help shopping for groceries and prepare food than seniors nationally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MTAM Seniors</th>
<th>Seniors Nationally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shop for groceries</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare or heat up food</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MTAM: Q: “Are there times when you are not physically able to shop for groceries?”
Q: “Are there times when you are not physically able to prepare or heat up your food?”
NHATS: Respondents who replied (a) they had assistance for health or functioning reasons or (b) they performed the activity themselves with difficulty were considered to have need for assistance.

Groups significantly different at the p<0.001 level.

MTAM participants have more exterior hazards than seniors nationally:

- Uneven Walking Surfaces: 15% MTAM, 10% Seniors Nationally
- Roof Problems: 5% MTAM, 11% Seniors Nationally
- Missing Bricks, Siding, or Other Outside Materials: 6% MTAM, 8% Seniors Nationally
- Crumbling Foundation or Open Holes: 6% MTAM, 7% Seniors Nationally
- Broken or Boarded Windows: 10% MTAM, 13% Seniors Nationally

Q: “Standing in front of the respondent's home/building, did it have…”

Groups significantly different at the p<0.001 level.
MTAM participants have more hazards inside the home than seniors nationally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazard</th>
<th>Seniors Nationally</th>
<th>MTAM Seniors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tripping Hazards</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooring in Need of Repair</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken Furniture or Lamps</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Pests</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peeling or Flaking Paint</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q: "Inside the respondent's home/apartment/unit, did you observe..."
Groups significantly different at the \( p<0.001 \) level

### Retention Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Initial Interviews</th>
<th>Follow-Up Interviews</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Frozen, Weekly</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Initial Interviews</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follow-Up Interviews</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 2</td>
<td>Initial Interviews</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follow-Up Interviews</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 3</td>
<td>Initial Interviews</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follow-Up Interviews</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 4</td>
<td>Initial Interviews</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follow-Up Interviews</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 5</td>
<td>Initial Interviews</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follow-Up Interviews</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 6</td>
<td>Initial Interviews</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follow-Up Interviews</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 7</td>
<td>Initial Interviews</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follow-Up Interviews</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 8</td>
<td>Initial Interviews</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follow-Up Interviews</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.753</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences between groups in response rate, by site, were tested with Chi-Square or Fisher’s Exact Test
Reasons for Attrition

- Moved/NH: 14%
- No Longer Wanted/Needed Meals: 26%
- Died: 19%
- Hospital: 14%
- Could Not Contact: 10%
- Other: 9%

No significant differences between groups in reason for attrition, by site

Outcomes Analyses

- Pre-post analyses
  - Examined differences in improvement
    - Mental Health
    - Self-Rated Health
    - Isolation
    - Loneliness
    - Ability to Remain in Home
- Follow-up survey analyses
  - Examined differences in incidence rate
    - Hospitalizations
    - Rates of Falls
  - Examined difference between meal delivery type
    - Feelings of Safety
    - Loneliness
    - Social Contact
    - Satisfaction
- Chi-square to test differences between groups
Groups receiving meals had higher rates of improvement in mental health (anxiety)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly, Frozen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Improve</td>
<td>n 131</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 93%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>n 10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measured using the GAD-2
No statistically significant difference between groups

Groups receiving daily-delivered meals had higher rates of improvement in self-rated health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly, Frozen</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Improve</td>
<td>n 117</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 77%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>n 35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 23%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No statistically significant difference between groups
Group receiving daily-delivered meals had greatest improvement in isolation

Q: “How often do you feel isolated from others? Never, Rarely, Sometimes, Often?”
No statistically significant difference between groups

Among those who live alone, meals have a larger effect on improvement in isolation

Q: “How often do you feel isolated from others? Never, Rarely, Sometimes, Often?”
These differences were statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 8.92, p=0.01$)
Group receiving daily-delivered meals had greatest improvements in loneliness

Loneliness measured using the UCLA 3-Item Loneliness Scale
No statistically significant difference between groups

Among those who live alone, meals have a larger effect on improvement in loneliness

Loneliness measured using the UCLA 3-Item Loneliness Scale
These differences were marginally statistically significant (p=0.09)
Group receiving daily-delivered meals had greatest improvement in worry about staying home

Q: "How often do you worry about being able to remain in your home? Never, Rarely, Sometimes, Often?"

These differences were statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 9.46, p=0.009$)

Among those who live alone, meals have a larger effect on improvement in worry about staying home

Q: "How often do you worry about being able to remain in your home? Never, Rarely, Sometimes, Often?"

These differences were statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 9.04, p=0.01$)
Groups receiving meals had lower rates of hospitalizations

- Hospitalized during study period
  - 14% of individuals who received meals
  - 20% of individuals in the control group
  - Marginally significant difference ($\chi^2=2.99$, $p=0.08$)

Groups receiving meals had lower incidence of falls among population of fallers

- Among participants who had fallen in the past month at baseline (n=116)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly, Frozen</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fallen</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Fall</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These differences were statistically significant ($\chi^2=9.718$, $p<.01$)
Group receiving daily-delivered meals reports Meals on Wheels helps them feel safer

• “Does having home-delivered meals help you to feel safe in your home?”
  – 70% of individuals receiving frozen, weekly-delivered meals
  – 80% of individuals receiving traditional, daily delivered meals
  – Significant difference ($\chi^2 = 4.11, p=0.04$)

Reasons given for feeling safer differed between the groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Frozen, Once Weekly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meal</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of Kitchen</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay Home</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q: “In what ways does it make you feel safe?”
These differences were statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 11.07, p=0.03$)
Group receiving daily-delivered meals reports Meals on Wheels helps them feel less lonely and have more contact

Q: “Do services received from the home-delivered meals program help you feel less lonely?”
χ² = 4.61, p<0.05

Q: “If you did not receive home-delivered meals, would you say “I would have little daily contact with people?””
χ²=5.21, p<0.05

Both Groups Satisfied with Program

- 99% of participants in both groups would recommend program to others
- Reasons for recommendation vary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Frozen, Once Weekly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meal</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q: “Why would you recommend this program to others?”
These differences were statistically significant (χ²= 11.9, p=0.003)
Conclusions

- Seniors on Meals on Wheels waiting lists need a variety of supports

- Need additional help beyond meals
  - Important to assess these needs
  - Referral to other services
  - Opportunities for collaboration

Conclusions

- Those receiving home-delivered meals had greater improvements in:
  - Anxiety
  - Self-rated health
  - Isolation
  - Loneliness

- And had reduced rates of:
  - Hospitalizations
  - Falls
Conclusions

• Between baseline and follow-up, respondents receiving daily-delivered meals were more likely to exhibit:
  – Improvement in mental health (i.e., anxiety)
  – Improvement in self-rated health
  – Reductions in the rate of falls
  – Improvement in feelings of isolation
  – Decreases in worry about being able to remain in home

Conclusions

• Those receiving daily-delivered meals reported greater benefits from their home-delivered meal experience compared to the group receiving frozen meals
  – More likely to attribute their meals to making them feel safer
  – More likely to note that their meals resulted in more social contact
  – More likely to report decreased loneliness
Limitations

- Sample size (power)
- Rate of attrition
- Once-weekly delivery in this study by Meals on Wheels programs were not comparable to the competitor model that drop-ships frozen meals
- Findings are based on self-report

Take Home Points

- Results suggest Meals on Wheels program provides “More Than a Meal”:
  - Home-delivered meals improve the well-being of older adults
  - The benefits of the contact afforded by daily-delivered meals exceed those of once-weekly delivered, frozen meals
- Seniors who live alone are more likely to experience improvements in health and well-being than those who live with others
- Seniors on waiting lists for home-delivered meals are at higher risk than the population of older adults living in the community:
  - They have varied health and social service needs
  - They also have more functional impairment, social isolation and poor dietary intake
Research Study Next Steps

• Examine healthcare utilization and outcomes using Medicare Claims

• Conduct larger scale Pragmatic Randomized Controlled Trial

Polling Question #2

• From the initial survey findings of those individuals requesting meals, what are possible actions you would consider? Select all that apply.

- Advocate for more funding
- Refer wait-listed clients to other services
- Add client health outcome questions to your survey tools
- Rethink meal delivery services are prioritized
Questions?

Thank you!

kali_thomas@brown.edu
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