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Mission:

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

Examples of projects:

- California Villages Project
- Aging-in-Place Models
- Creating Aging-Friendly Communities
- Strategic Plan for an Aging California
- Consortium for Social Work Training in Aging
The “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]
Services Villages Provide

- **Core Services**
  - Transportation, shopping, meal preparation, companionship, etc.

- **Concierge Services**
  - Information, referral, service coordination

- **Community Building**
  - Social activities, classes, volunteering, governance

- **Health and Wellness**
  - Health promotion, medical accompaniment
Potential Impacts of the Village Model

- **Individual Capacity-Building**
  - Physical and psychosocial functioning
  - Coping strategies/skills

- **Community-Building**
  - Social engagement
  - Social support

- **P-E Stability**
  - Social inclusion
  - Aging-in-place

- **Service Delivery System**
  - Availability, accessibility, affordability, appropriateness
  - Social and economic policies, local planning, etc.

- **Macro Context**
  - Social and economic policies, local planning, etc.

Preliminary Findings from UC Berkeley - Not for Public Dissemination
UC Berkeley Villages Project

- Statewide and National Evaluations of Villages
  - Service use
  - Member satisfaction
  - Member outcomes
  - Cost-effectiveness

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

- Longitudinal studies of Village members
  - Impact of Village programs (12-months, 24-months)
Village Characteristics
Village Membership

- Median = 96 members (range 13-550)

- Individual membership cost
  - Average= $428/yr (range $25 - $948)

- Household membership cost
  - Average= $573/yr (range $50 - $1,285)

(from 2012 National Village Survey)
**Funding**

- **Total Yearly Budget**
  - Median yearly budget = $82,643
  - Minimum = $1,000  Max = $674,000

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

Preliminary Findings from UC Berkeley - Not for Public Dissemination
# 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)
## 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>
Impact of Village Membership
# Health and Social Impacts

## Health and Well-Being

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Variable</th>
<th>Intake</th>
<th>12-month Follow-Up</th>
<th>24-month Follow-Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-rated health (exc/vg)</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADLs (any)</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>37.9%+</td>
<td>41.4%+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Social Functioning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Variable</th>
<th>Intake</th>
<th>12-month Follow-Up</th>
<th>24-month Follow-Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social contact (daily)</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>45.5%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend meetings (weekly)</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone you can count on?</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>93.2%***</td>
<td>91.5%***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of community (agree strongly)</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Service Access and Aging in Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Variable</th>
<th>Intake</th>
<th>12-month Follow-Up</th>
<th>24-month Follow-Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Services Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitalizations</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing home stay</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aging in Place</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to age in place (very confident)</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>51.6%*</td>
<td>57.8%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considering relocating</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home modifications needed</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>17.5%+</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perceived Benefits of Village Membership

1. Peace of mind
2. Being part of a community (social interaction)
3. Social activities
4. Services (esp. transportation)
5. Staff and volunteers
6. Being part of a social movement
7. Classes and lectures
8. Volunteering for other members/giving back
9. Access to services through preferred providers

Preliminary Findings from UC Berkeley - Not for Public Dissemination
Villages – Promoting Healthy Aging

- 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

Preliminary Findings from UC Berkeley - Not for Public Dissemination
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