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Mission:

- Improving services for the elderly through research, collaboration and education

Examples of aging-in-place projects:

- California Villages Project
- ElderHelp Concierge Club
- Motion Picture and TV Fund Aging Initiative
- Contra Costa for Every Generation
- Creating Aging-Friendly Communities
- Strategic Plan for an Aging California
What Do Aging Boomers Want?

- Remain in their own homes or neighborhoods
- See friends, social networks
- Get to shopping, health care
- Be safe
- Be healthy
- Be involved in the community

Maturing of America Survey, Part 2.
(National Association of Area Agencies on Aging)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aging in Place</th>
<th>Aging in Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Underlying motivation:</strong></td>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals:</strong></td>
<td>Avoid institutionalization</td>
<td>Foster interdependence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibility:</strong></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Communal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>View of Aging:</strong></td>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service delivery:</strong></td>
<td>Unidirectional</td>
<td>Reciprocal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elder Role:</strong></td>
<td>Care recipient</td>
<td>Participant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Based on work by Janice Blanchard, Janet Stambolian and William Thomas, MD)
Aging in Community – Logic Model

- Facilitate Service Access
- Build Community
- Promote Elder Empowerment

- Individual Capacity
  - Physical and psychosocial wellbeing

- Community Capacity
  - Social Capital
  - Improved service delivery system

Aging in Community
The “Village” Concept
Senior Membership Associations

Beacon Hill Village
Boston, MA
“Village” Model

- “Villages are self-governing, grassroots, community-based organizations, developed with the sole purpose of enabling people to remain in their own homes and communities as they age.”

[from Village-to-Village Network website]
How A Village Works

Member calls or emails Village office with request

Trained Village Staff or Office Volunteer Triage Request

Member contacted for feedback on quality of service

Core or concierge service met with a volunteer

Concierge service met with a vendor at a discounted rate

Member signed up for event or ongoing service/support

Professional Village staff help navigate challenge

Some Examples
- Home Health
- Lawn/garden
- Electrician
- Plumber
- Painting
Villages in the US – Current and Future
UC Berkeley Villages Project

- Evaluation of individual Villages
  - Service use
  - Member satisfaction
  - Member outcomes
  - Cost-effectiveness

- National surveys of Village organizations
  - Factors associated with sustainability and effectiveness

- Longitudinal studies of Village members
  - Impact of Village programs
Village Impact Pathways

Social Engagement
- Social Activities
- Educational Activities
- Transportation

Assistance and Support
- Companionship
- Housekeeping
- Home maintenance
- Safety modification

Wellness/Advocacy
- Care coordination/advocacy
- Care management
- Medical transport

Civic Engagement
- Volunteering
- Participating in governance

Social support
- Increased social connections
- Increased participation
- Civic engagement
- Reduced isolation

Access to services
- Awareness of services
- Use of services
- Getting the care you need when you need it

Health/Well-being
- Quality of life
- Well being
- Health

Self efficacy
- Confidence with self care
- Confidence with home care
- Confidence aging in place

Aging in Community
2012 National Village Survey*

- Data from 69 of 80 operational Villages (RR=87%)
- Average organizational age = 3.1 years
- 77.5% freestanding
- 31% urban, 31% suburban, 17% rural, 21% mixed

* A collaboration of researchers from Rutgers University, University of California-Berkeley, University of Michigan, and University of Maryland, with support from the Silberman Foundation
Village membership

- Median = 96 members (range 13-550)

- Individual membership cost
  - Average= $428.51/yr (range $25 - $948)

- Household membership cost
  - Average= $572.93/yr (range $50 - $1,285)
## Village members vs. US population 65+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Village Members</th>
<th>US population 65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>69% Female</td>
<td>59% Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31% Male</td>
<td>41% Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Living Arrangements</strong></td>
<td>51% Alone</td>
<td>31% Alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49% With others</td>
<td>69% With others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race &amp; Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td>94% White</td>
<td>83% White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2% African American</td>
<td>8% African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2% Hispanic</td>
<td>6% Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1% Asian/Pacific</td>
<td>3% Asian/Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Status</strong></td>
<td>12% “Impoverished”</td>
<td>16% &lt; SPM*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12% “Insecure”</td>
<td>33% 100%-199% SPM*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* SPM = Supplemental Poverty Measure
(U.S. Census Bureau, 2011; Short, 2011)
Funding

- **Total Yearly Budget**
  - Median yearly budget = $82,643
  - Minimum = $1,000  Max = $674,000
  - Average of $1036.23 per member

- **Funding Sources**
  - 50% membership dues/fees
  - 24% donations
  - 12% foundation or corporate grants
  - 12% non-profit organization contributions
  - 2% government grants
## Services used most often

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Provided by member volunteers</th>
<th>Provided by Village staff</th>
<th>Referred to outside providers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation/Socializing</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Companionship</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery Shopping</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reassurance calls</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare advocacy</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Member to Member engagement

- 41% talk to other Village members at least weekly
- 21% see other Village members at least weekly
  - 49% at least monthly
- 44% of members provide volunteer services
  - 29% assist other Village members
  - 17% serve on planning or governance boards
  - 9% do administrative work
  - 7% help with marketing or outreach
# Health and Social Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health &amp; Well-Being</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better Quality of life</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happier</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthier</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Functioning</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Know more people</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk to more people</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel more connected</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate more</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave home more</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less lonely</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Access</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More able to get help</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know more about services</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use services more</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More able to get medical care</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age in Place</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More able to stay in home</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking care of home easier</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking care of self easier</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Impacts

- 38% of Villages work on making their community more aging-friendly
  - 22% are engaged in political advocacy
  - 10% work on improvements in the built environment
  - 6% sponsor public educational events
Villages – Promoting Aging-in-Place

- Improving Service Access
  - Meeting needs
  - Improving ability to access needed services
  - Reducing cost of services

- Building Community
  - Social engagement
  - Social support

- Promoting Elder Empowerment
  - Participation in meaningful roles
Housing-Integrated Program Models

- Motion Picture Television Fund
- Eskaton
- Navigage
Motion Picture & Television Fund

Residential Care
Independent Living
Assisted Living
Memory Care
Skilled Nursing Care

Community Programs
Health Centers
Geriatric Assessment
Case Management
Home Modifications
Community Councils
Eskaton

- Residential Care
  - Continuing Care Community (CCRC)
  - Memory Care, Pre-memory Care

- Community-Based Programs
  - Eskaton Village: “Live Well at Home”
  - Home Care and Adult Day care
  - Transportation Service

- “Smart Home” Design
Navigage

- CCRC
  - Marguerite Gardens

- Virtual community (“SherpaLife”)
  - Concierge
  - Activities
  - Products
  - Life planning
The best way to predict the future is to invent it.

Peter Drucker
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