

DRAFT 5/11/15

Title of Proposed Study:

“Commonalities and Differences in Local Government Approaches for Aging in Community”

Proposal Submitters: Isabelle Schoenfeld/Leslie Marks

Issue or Concern to be Addressed: There is much discussion about the WHO Age Friendly City’s approach; the Montgomery County Community for a Lifetime: Senior Agenda approach; N4A’s Livable Communities approach; the AARP Livability Index; and other approaches to aging in community. What is evident is that the general public and policymakers are often not clear about the commonalities and differences of these approaches in terms of how the local government and the private sector systematically develops and implements their activities/programs/policies to support senior residents of a community.

This study would explore a few approaches that are well regarded and identify their commonalities and differences and provide practical, realistic information that would help to understand what characteristics (including processes, policies, and organizational infrastructure) should be considered in the development and implementation of an aging in community approach.

Anticipated Outcome(s):

- Information about a few well-known, well-regarded approaches/models that have been developed and implemented in communities around the country to support their aging population.
- Information about the resources involved and the infrastructure or intra/inter-organizational coordination that should be considered to efficiently and effectively implement an approach in support of the senior residents of a community.
- Analysis of the commonalities and differences among the various approaches/models and identification of the key characteristics that are needed to support a community to be “age-friendly” or a “community for a lifetime.”
- Recommendations to be considered by Montgomery County decision-makers.

Description of Work:

- Three meetings of Subject Matter Experts – The two panel’s SMEs would answer pre-developed questions. The questions would relate to (1) the key characteristics of the approach (budget/resources and financial partners involved in development and in implementation; what data and measures are being used; what evaluation mechanisms are being applied (2) the organizational infrastructure for development and implementation (e.g., local government departments roles, non-profits roles, private sectors’ roles, and the senior residents of the communities roles) and, (3) best practices and lessons learned.
 - Meeting 1: Panel discussion of AARP’s Livability Index and n4a’s “Livable Communities for All Ages” with specific community examples.
 - Meeting 2: Panel discussion about WHO’s Age-Friendly Cities/Communities approach with specific local government examples and Montgomery County’s Community for a Lifetime (Senior Agenda/Senior Subcabinet) approach.
 - Meeting 3: Summarize the first two panel’s results, identify common threads, and develop recommendations.