



VILLAGE RESEARCH UPDATE



OCTOBER 18, 2016

Andrew E. Scharlach, PhD Carrie L. Graham, PhD, MGS Roscoe Nicholson, MA







Acknowledgements

Center for the Advanced Study of Aging Services





THE RETIREMENT RESEARCH FOUNDATION

Overview: UC Berkeley Villages Research

Village organizational development

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

Impact of Village membership on seniors

- Service use
- Member satisfaction
- Physical and social well-being
- Ability to age in place

Prior Village Research

- National Survey of Villages and NORCs (2012-13)
 - 69 Villages
 - 62 NORC-SSPs
 - With Rutgers University, University of Maryland
 - Funded by the Silberman Foundation

California Village Evaluation

- Outcome evaluation
 - Surveys of current Village members (N=441)
 - Multi-year pre-post study of new Village members (N=229)
- Process evaluation
 - Village programs and services
 - Growth and sustainability
 - Challenges and best practices
- Funded by the Archstone Foundation (2011-2016)

Prior Village Research (cont'd)

National Village Data Archive Feasibility Study

- Test the feasibility of developing a national data archive of Village members
- 28 Villages completed 1,753 surveys with members
- Supported by the Retirement Research Foundation

Boost Your Brain & Memory Program Evaluation

- Implementation of brain fitness program in Villages
- Evaluation of feasibility and impact in 6 pilot sites
- In collaboration with the Mather LifeWays Institute on Aging

Current Village Research

2016 National Village Survey

- Organizational characteristics of Villages nationwide
- Factors associated with growth and sustainability
- Longitudinal comparison of Villages between 2012 and 2016
- Benefits and challenges of developing regional collaborations
- Factors associated with Village termination or transition
- In collaboration with Mather LifeWays Institute on Aging

Future Village Research

Village "Non-Participation" study

- Barriers to Village recruitment and retention
- Attitudes associated with failure to join a Village
- Factors associated with non-renewal
- UC Berkeley & Mather LifeWays collaboration

■ Non-Dues Villages

- Variations on the prototypic Village model
- Inclusiveness and diversity
- Resources and sustainability
- Conducted by Mather LifeWays Institute on Aging

Village Characteristics: 2012 vs. 2016

How have Villages changed since 2012?

Village Organizational Characteristics (2012 vs. 2016)

Since 2012, Villages are more likely to be:

- Members of VtV Network
- Freestanding
- Older

Less likely to be:

Rural

Slightly increased confidence in 10-year survival

Member Characteristics (2012 vs. 2016)

Slight increase since 2012 in:

- Average number of members
- % of members with discounted memberships
- Cost of household membership
- Cost of discounted membership
- Efforts to recruit underrepresented groups

No change in:

Member characteristics

Village Resources (2012 vs. 2016)

Since 2012, Villages are more likely to have:

- Endowment or reserve fund
- Support from government
- Business or foundation contributions
- Formal collaborations with other orgs.
- Outside assistance with administrative tasks (fundraising, grant writing, marketing, IT, clerical, staff training, volunteer management)

No change in:

- Budget size
- % of budget from membership dues
- Staffing

Services Offered Internally (2012 vs. 2016)

Since 2012, Villages are more likely to offer:

- Transportation
- Shopping
- Housekeeping/home repair
- Health promotion
- Local advocacy
- Discounted memberships, discounted services

Less likely to offer:

- 24/7 availability
- Care coordination
- Personal care
- Services for non-members
 Preliminary Findings from UC Berkeley Not for Public Dissemination

Snapshot of US Villages in 2015

Roscoe Nicholson, Mather LifeWays IOA

Andrew Scharlach, UC Berkeley

Carrie Graham, UC Berkeley

Characteristics of Villages in 2015

■ 115 Operational Villages Completed Surveys (75%)

- Median number of members: 115
- Geographic location
 - ■36% Urban
 - ■35% Suburban
 - 13% Rural
- ■85% Freestanding, 14% agency based

Year Began Offering Services

- ■10% launched prior to 2008 (over 9 years old)
- 44% between 2008 and 2011 (8-5 years old)
- ■21% between 2012 and 2013 (3-4 years old)
- ■26% between 2014 and 2015 (1-2 years old)

Services Offered by Village Staff & Volunteers

- Volunteer or staff services offered by >90% of Villages
 - Transportation
 - Companionship
 - Village-sponsored classes or educational events
 - Village-sponsored social events or outings
- Volunteer or staff services offered by >80% of Villages
 - Shopping
 - Providing information, advice or referrals to outside service providers
 - Technology assistance
 - Home repair or maintenance

Services Most Referred to Outside Providers

- Over 50% of Villages refer members to...
 - Home modifications or home safety assessment
 - Assistance with personal care
 - Assistance coordinating or managing health care or social services
- □ 30-50% of Villages refer members to...
 - Home repair or maintenance
 - Light housework
 - Health promotion programs
 - Gardening or yard care
 - Transportation
 - Technology assistance

2015 Village Staffing and Volunteers

Staffing

- ■80% of Villages had paid staff
- Average of 1.8 paid staff members
- Average paid FTE 1.2
- Ratio of 96 Village members to each paid staff person

Volunteers

- Average number of volunteers = 60
- Average ratio of members to volunteers = 1.9 to 1

2015 Village Governance

■ Village Boards

- Member make up 85% of Village boards on average
- Founding members make up 30% of the total board on average

Committees

Average number of committees = 4.5

2015 Membership Types

- Average Annual Membership Cost
 - ■Individual: \$410
 - ■Household: \$601
- 47% offer "tiered" memberships
 - Social or "no dues memberships the most common
- □72% offer discounted memberships
 - 62% use standardized criteria
 - ■38% judge case-by-case

2015 Village Finances

- Average annual expenditure: \$103,861
 - Range: \$0-716,000
- 42% have endowments or reserve funds

Sources of Revenue	
Membership dues	44%
Individual donations	22%
Grants from private foundations	12%
Fundraising events	9%
Business or corporate donations	6%
Government grants or contracts	5%

2015 Village Diversity

Low Income Members

61% of Villages reported less than 10% of members as economically vulnerable

■ Minority Members

83% of Villages reported that less than 10% of members were non-white

□ Functional Status

- 77% of Villages reported less than 10% of members required regular assistance with personal care
- 82% of Villages have policies about needs inappropriate for Village membership

2015 Village Inclusivity Efforts

Group Targeted	<u>%</u>
Lower income members	49%
Younger members	30%
Racial or ethnic minorities	25%
Sexual minorities (LGBTQ)	13%
Men	10%

Village Cooperative Efforts



- 96% of Villages were part of VtV
- 46% of Village were part of a regional coalition of Villages
 - Stay tuned!

2015 Survey of Village Members

Carrie Graham & Andrew Scharlach

UC Berkeley

Center for the Advanced Study of Aging Services

Project funded by: The Retirement Research Foundation and The Archstone Foundation

The Impact of Villages on Members

- UC Berkeley worked with 28 Villages across the US to administer surveys to all active members
- Surveys conducted between Feb and Dec 2015
- □ Final sample size after data cleaning was 1,753
- □ Average response rate across all Villages was 65%

We asked Village members...

- Demographics
- Health and functional status
- □ Village involvement & service use
- Perceived impacts in the areas of
 - Health and health care access
 - Well-being
 - Social Engagement
 - Civic engagement
 - Confidence aging in place
- Logistic Regression to identify predictors of perceived impacts

Characteristics of Village Members (N=1,753)

- □ Age
 - 42% 74 and younger
 - 37% 75-84 years
 - 22% 85 or older
- Race (96% White)
- □ **Gender** (72% Female)
- Education
 - 18% no college degree
 - 25% college degree
 - 58% graduate degree
- Household composition (45% live alone)
- \square **Income** (74% \$50,000 or higher per year)
- Self-rated health status
 - Very good or excellent 58%
 - Good 28%
 - Poor or fair 14%

Member Involvement in Village

Years since joined Village

- Less than 1 year 6%
- 1-2 years 49%
- □ 3-4 years 26%
- 5 or more years 19%

46% Volunteered for Village in past year

Services used in the past year

- 67% Village-sponsored social or educational events
- □ 35% Called the Village for information, referral or advice
- 27% Transportation services
- 22% Technology assistance services

Village Impact on Social and Civic Engagement

- Because of your membership in the Village, would you say...
 - 56% increased sense of connection to other people
 - 55% increased ability to count on other people
 - 30% get together more often with friends and neighbors
 - 29% attend meetings of organized groups more often
 - 27% do volunteer work more often

Predictors of Improved Social and Civic Engagement

- Who is more likely to report increases in social/civic engagement?
 - Younger members (under 75)
 - Report improved sense of connection
 - Increased frequency of social gatherings and volunteer work
 - New members (>1 years)
 - Increased frequency of attending meetings
 - Men
 - Improved sense of connection and frequency of attending meetings
 - Lower education (less than college)
 - Improved ability to count on other people
 - Member volunteers
 - Improved sense of connection, ability to count on other people
 - Increased frenquency of social gatherings, volunteer work and attending meetings
 - Members who used Village services (transporation, technology assitance, Village-sponsored events, and info & referral)
 - Improved sense of connection and ability to count on other people
 - Increased frenquency of social gatherings and attending meetings

Predictors of Improved Health and Health Care Access

- Because of your membership in the Village, would you say...
 - 8% physical health is better
 - Women
 - Those with lower education (less then college)
 - Living alone
 - Used Village transportation
 - Called village information and referral (preferred provider) in the last year
 - lacktriangle lacktriangl
 - Those in fair or poor health
 - Living alone
 - Those who used Village transportation
 - Those who used Village technology assistance

Village Impact on Quality of Life

- 47% say their quality of life is better because of the Village
 - Younger members (under 75)
 - Lower education (less then college)
 - Longer Village membership (5 or more years)
 - Member volunteers
 - Those who used services (transportation, technology assistance,
 Village-sponsored events and referral)

Confidence and Ability to Age in Place

- Because of your membership in the Village, would you say...
 - 50% improved ability to get the help you need to live in your current residence
 - Used transportation services
 - Used Information and referral services
 - 29% improved ability to take care of your home
 - Used Information and Referral
 - 20% easier getting to places you need or want to go
 - Those with lower education (less than college degree)
 - Used transportation and technology services

Who perceives the most benefit from Village membership?

- Using Village services impacts members in all ways, health, well being, and social connections, and increased confidence/ability to age in place.
- Some evidence that those who are the most vulnerable (women, living alone, lower education, in poor health) are perceiving positive health impacts.
- Younger members, men and newer members seeing more impacts in social and civic engagement.

For further information, contact:

Andrew Scharlach, PhD scharlach@berkeley.edu

Carrie Graham, PhD clgraham@berkeley.edu

Roscoe Nicholson, MA rnicholson@matherlifeways.com