A cost-effectiveness analysis of a community-based health promotion intervention for adults with mobility impairments: Living Well With a Disability
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Abstract
This document reports on research conducted by the University of Montana and the University of Kansas for the Office of Disability and Health at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The research project, conducted between August 1, 1997 and July 31, 2001, was conducted in four separate but related studies. The research was conducted in eight States. We contracted with nine centers for independent living (CIL) to conduct 34 Living Well with a Disability health promotion workshops and to collect outcome measures. These programs included 246 individuals. In the first study, we evaluated the effectiveness and cost outcomes of the Living Well with a Disability health promotion program for adults with mobility impairments. The results of this study,
conducted over 18 months, indicated participants' activity limitation due to secondary conditions was substantially reduced. Responding to items from the BRFSS Quality of Life module, individuals reported gaining more than a full day without physical and mental symptoms following the program.
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