THE "VILLAGE" MODEL: CREATING CARING COMMUNITIES?

Annual Scientific Meeting
Gerontological Society of America
Washington, DC
November, 2014
Developmental Model of Healthy Aging

- **Continuity** [maintenance]
  - Minimal Age Barriers
- **Compensation** [support]
  - Accommodations/Supports
  - Basic Safety and Security
- **Challenge** [stimulation]
  - New Opportunities for Fulfillment
- **Control**
  - Efficacy Opportunities
  - Consumer-Directed Care
- **Connection**
  - Social Engagement Opportunities
  - Intergenerational and Age-Cohort Activities
- **Contribution**
  - Civic Engagement
  - Meaningful Family Roles
Conceptual Underpinnings

- Selective Optimization with Compensation (Baltes & Baltes)
- Proactivity Model of Successful Aging (Kahana & Kahana)
- Socioemotional Selectivity (Carstensen)
Characteristics of a “Village”

- Membership organization
- Self-governing
- Geographically-defined
- Provides or arranges services
- Social activities
- Goal = aging in place
Village program model

- **Social Activities**
- **Member Engagement**
- **Direct Services**
  - Provided by members, volunteers, or Village staff
  - Usually included as part of membership fee
- **Information and Coordination**
- **Referrals**
  - Preferred provider networks
  - Usually requires a payment to be made to an outside service provider
Member calls or emails Village office with request

Trained Village Staff or Office Volunteer Triage Request

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

Member contacted for feedback on quality of service
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Potential Impacts of Village Membership

**Village 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 engagement**
- 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**
Villages and Social Capital

- **Bonding capital**
  - Social activity
  - Social support

- **Bridging Capital**
  - Participation in meaningful roles

- **Linking capital**
  - Access to needed services
  - Reduced cost of services
UC Berkeley Villages Project
Project Components

- **Village organizational development**
  - Village characteristics and types
  - Factors associated with growth and sustainability
    - Cost-effectiveness
    - Challenges and best practices

- **Evaluation of Village program impacts**
  - Service use
  - Member satisfaction
  - Physical and social well-being
  - Ability to age in place
Village Studies

- 3 National Surveys of Villages
  - 2009 Survey funded by The SCAN Foundation
  - 2012 and 2013 funded by the Silberman Foundation
    (with Rutgers University and University of Maryland)

- Single Site Village Evaluation (2012-2013)
  - ElderHelp Concierge Club of San Diego
  - Funded by The SCAN Foundation

  - Includes 9 California Villages
  - Funded by the Archstone Foundation

  - Funded by the Retirement Research Foundation
California Village Study: Evaluation Design

- 9 Villages in California

- Organizational Development and Sustainability

- Member Outcomes
  - Retrospective member survey (N=282)
  - Pre-post test with members (N=133)

- Service Delivery (2 ½ years)

- Social Return on Investment Analysis
Characteristics of Participating Villages

- **Auspices**
  - Freestanding = 5 (of 9)
  - Agency-based = 4 (of 9)

- Members per village (mean) = 170
- Membership dues (mean) = $520/yr
- Discounted memberships (mean) = 9%
- Villages using time-banking = 2 (of 9)
- Paid staff (mean) = 2.18 FTE

- **Volunteering**
  - Volunteers per village (mean) = 74
  - Members per volunteer (mean) = 2.1
  - Members who volunteer (mean) = 40%
Member Characteristics

- **Member age (mean = 76)**
  - 24% under 70
  - 40% 70 - 79
  - 37% 80 and older

- **Other characteristics**
  - 75% female
  - 94% white, non-Hispanic
  - 97% speak English as first language
  - 76% college graduates
  - 6% high school education or lower
  - 45% married or partnered
Member Characteristics (cont’d)

- 23% of members are struggling financially (<EESI) (compared to 47% in CA)
- 15% are in fair or poor health
- 16% report an Activity of Daily Living impairment (bathing, dressing, getting around inside home)
- 43% report an IADL impairment (shopping, cooking, getting to places out of walking distance)
- 47% live alone
## Programs and Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 10 Internal Services</th>
<th>USED BY (% of all members)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Events/Classes</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information or Referrals</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Companionship</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Assistance</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Repair/Safety/Modification</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care Advocacy/Assistance</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Member Social Engagement

- Member roles:
  - Development of the Village
  - Governance
  - Service provision

- 49% of members volunteer for their Village
  - 29% assist other Village members
  - 17% serve on planning or governance boards
  - 9% do administrative work
  - 7% help with marketing or outreach
Evaluation Findings:
Social engagement (retrospective)

- 81% agree they know more people since joining the Village
- 63% talk to more people
- 62% feel more connected with other people
- 53% participate in activities and events more
- 40% leave their home more
- 39% say they are less lonely since joining the Village
Evaluation Findings:
Social engagement (longitudinal)

- Have someone to call if need help with routine activities (shopping, preparing meals, etc).
  - 73.3% agree or strongly agree at intake → 86.7% at follow up (p<.001)

No change or decline
- How often member leaves home
- How often member sees friends or neighbors
- How often member does volunteer work
- How often member attends meetings
# Social impact

(Linear regression on member chars and service use)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Social Impact (β) (n=282)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income (Above EESI)</td>
<td>-1.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives Alone</td>
<td>.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>-.486*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Activities</td>
<td>1.106***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>.640***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Companionship Svcs.</td>
<td>.693***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Svcs.</td>
<td>.435*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Svcs.</td>
<td>.279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001; model $R^2 = .389$
Evaluation Findings:
Impact on unmet needs (longitudinal)

Positive impacts

- Does your current residence need any modifications or changes to improve your ability to live there over the next 5 years?
  - 29% said yes at intake → only 17% said yes at follow up (p<.01)

- Housework
  - 31% reported needing additional help at intake → 20% at follow up (ns)

- Yard work
  - 39% reported needing additional help at intake → 27% at follow up (ns)

- Using the computer
  - 44% reported needing additional help at intake → 31% at follow up (ns)

No change

- Personal care - showering, bathing, dressing, transferring, taking medications (>95% no help needed)
- Meal preparation (>85% no help needed)
- Assistance getting around inside home (>95% no help needed)
Evaluation Results:
Aging in place (Longitudinal)

- **How confident are you that you can get the help you need to live in your own home as long as you would like?**
  - 38% were very confident at intake → 56% at follow-up (p<.001)

- **Are you considering moving to alternative housing?**
  - 29% said yes at intake → 14% at follow up (p<.001)
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