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Age-Friendly Cities indicators: Outline

- What prompted this project?
- How did Banyule approach the project?
- What did we find?
- What does it mean?
Background 1: History

2007

• WHO published “Global Age-Friendly Cities: A guide”

2011

• WHO launched the global Network of Age-friendly cities

2012:

• World Health Organization (WHO) initiated a project to develop core indicators to measure the age-friendliness of cities

2013

• WHO Centre for Health developed conducted a consultation on developing age-friendly city Indicators in Quebec

2014

• Kobe Centre drafted core indicators
Background 2: The indicators project

2014

• Banyule applied for membership of the Global Network of Age-friendly cities
• Kobe Centre selected and funded 15 locations worldwide to pilot these indicators
• Banyule approached La Trobe University, and we submitted an application
• Banyule was selected as a pilot site
• We began to collect data

2015

• We finished the report
• The report was presented in Geneva
What are the core indicators (n = 14)

• Physical environment
  • Neighbourhood walkability
  • Accessibility of public spaces, buildings, and transport
  • Housing affordability
  • Safety

• Social environment
  • Positive social attitude towards older people
  • Engagement in volunteer activity and/or employment
  • Engagement in socio-cultural activity
  • Participation in local decision-making
  • Availability of information and services
  • Economic security

• Quality of life
Additional indicators

Non-core indicators

- Accessibility of priority vehicle parking
- Accessibility of housing
- Participation in leisure-time physical activity in a group
- Engagement in life-long learning
- Internet access

Equity indicators

- Disaggregation by groups
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Trial sites for the Indicators pilot

Banyule (Australia)
Bilbao (Spain)
Bowdoinham (USA)
Dijon (France)
Fishguard/Goodwick (UK)
Hong Kong (China)
La Plata (Argentina)
Nairobi (Kenya)
New Haven (USA)
Shanghai (China)
Tehran (Iran)
Tuymazy (Russia)
Udine (Italy)
Washington DC (USA)
### Project timeline: No room to move!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov 30 2014</td>
<td>WHO notified successful applicants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2014</td>
<td>Project group meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People allocated responsibility for collecting data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekly progress meetings at Banyule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2015</td>
<td>Information on each indictor collated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First workshop (Data focus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second workshop (Stakeholders’ experiences of collecting data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2015</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Feb. First draft report to WHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age-friendly City Champion training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World café workshop with residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Photographic project launched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2015</td>
<td>Incorporate feedback from WHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; draft to WHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final draft to WHO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data collection

- Allocated staff responsibilities
- Identified existing sources of data
- External agencies were contacted to source data that was not available by age or location
- Scheduled weekly progress meetings
- Each indicator, definition and data source was examined in detail and agreed on by the working group during a workshop.
Sources of data

• Banyule’s Household Survey (last completed in 2014)
• VicHealth’s Health Indicators Survey (2011)
• Victorian Population Health Survey (2008)
• Australian Census
• Administrative databases held by
  • Victoria Police
  • Victorian Department of Health (HACC, ACAP)
The indicators and how we approached them

The focus is people aged 60 and over

Most indicators have two definitions

- A formal statistic on ‘compliance’
- A perception

Operational definitions were used where data available did not accord exactly with WHO Indicators Guide definitions

- The case for all but two of the 28 indicator definitions
- Some operationalisations were not very apt
An example

Indicator 01: Neighbourhood walkability

1. Proportion of streets in the neighbourhood that have pedestrian paths which meet locally accepted standard
   - “Footpaths in excellent to reasonable condition and a least 1.2 m wide”
   - 98.7% of road reserve footpaths
   - 81.6% of open space paths

2. Proportion of older people who report that their neighbourhood is suitable for walking, including those who use wheelchairs and other mobility aids
   - 67.9%
Some results: Built environment accessibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator definition (new / revised)</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of new and existing public spaces and buildings that are fully accessible by wheelchair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of new and existing (Council-owned) public spaces and buildings that must be fully accessible by wheelchair</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of older people who report that public spaces and buildings in their community are accessible for all people, including those who have limitations in mobility, vision or hearing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of older people who live in a household where one or more persons use a mobility aid and have difficulty accessing public spaces and buildings.</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some results: Positive social attitude toward older people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator definition (new / revised)</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of reported cases of maltreatment of older persons (as a proportion of the total number of older people)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of reported crimes against older people aged 65 years and over (as a proportion of the total number of older people).</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of older people who report feeling respected and socially included in their community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of older people living in a household who agree that they feel part of the local community.</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Some results: Engagement in socio-cultural activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator definition (new / revised)</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of older adults among all reported visitors to local cultural facilities and events.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of older adults (aged 55 years and over) among all adults (aged 18 years and over) who reported participating in arts and related activities in the last 3 months.</td>
<td>30.3% (constructed from other stats)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of older people who report participating in socio-cultural activities at their own discretion at least once in the last week.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of people aged 55 years and over who participated in arts and related activities in the last 3 months.</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Equity indicators: Access to HACC and SEIFA
Most of the indicators were clearly relevant to local initiatives and priorities

- Neighbourhood walkability
  - Core business for local government
- Accessibility of public transport vehicles and Accessibility of public transport stops
  - Relates to the Council’s Integrated Transport Strategy
- Positive social attitude towards older people
- Engagement in volunteer activity
- Engagement in socio-cultural activity
- Participation in local decision-making
- Availability of information
- Availability of social and health services
  - Community aged care is core business for local government.
Some indicators were not relevant to local government

Housing affordability
Opportunity for employment
Economic security

Quality of life is a high-level indicator that is the responsibility of all three levels of government as well as a range of non-governmental organisations
Some indicators were not able to be determined

**Housing affordability**: Proportion of households who spend less than 30% of their equalised disposable income on housing

**Maltreatment**: Number of reported cases of maltreatment (elder abuse) is difficult to measure. Crime statistics are difficult to interpret and depend on the overall level of reported crime within a community.

**Income**: The proportion of older people living in a household with a disposable income below the poverty threshold is difficult to determine

- Census data rely on self-report and are notoriously unreliable.
- Age Pension depends on whether single/couple, whether a rental supplement is provided, whether other sources of income are available
Some indicators are problematic for other reasons

**Employment:** The proportion of older people who are currently unemployed

- Fails to take into account the large number of people aged 60 and over who are retired.

Proportion of **visitors to socio-cultural events** are older people

- Not appropriate because visitors are not asked for their age.

Proportion of people aged 60 and over who **voted** in the most recent local election:

- Voting is compulsory for people aged 70 and younger
Some indicators proved too challenging to address in the short time available

Proportion of older people in local volunteer registries

Proportion of older people who report having opportunities for paid employment

Proportion of older people who report having personal care or assistance needs met in their home setting through the use of formal services

  - Data available by age group at national and state levels only
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Innovative feature: World Café Workshop

25 older residents participated in workshop

Purpose
- Verify the WHO indicator definitions
- Do the results reflect residents’ experience?
- Should this indicator definition be a Banyule indicator?
What happened at the World Café workshop?

- Twenty-five residents from the Banyule Age-friendly City Advisory Committee and Champion Program participated in this
- Two-hour workshop
- Residents had been provided with the summary of indicators and data prior to the workshop
- The indicators had been grouped into four themes
- Residents moved between tables three times during the workshop to allow them to contribute to each of the four themes.

1. What do you think about the results from your experience in Banyule? (Do the numbers fit with your experience?)
2. How important is this indicator for making the community age-friendly? (Rank: 1 = Not important to 5 = Very important).
## World café - Engagement & participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement in volunteer activity</th>
<th>Proportion of older people (aged 60+ years) who reported undertaking voluntary work through an organisation or group in the last 12 months</th>
<th>17.9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engagement in socio-cultural activity</td>
<td>Proportion of older adults (aged 55+ years) among all adults (aged 18+ years) that reported participating in arts and related activities in the last 3 months</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proportion of people (aged 55+ years) who participated in arts and related activities in the last 3 months</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in local decision making</td>
<td>Proportion of eligible voters (aged 70+ years) who voted in the most recent local Government election</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proportion of adult population (aged 18+ years) who are members of a decision-making board or committee</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in leisure-time physical activity in a group</td>
<td>Proportion of older people (aged 60+ years) who are members of leisure centres owned by Banyule Council</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proportion of older people (aged 60+ years) that report participating in sports clubs</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some World Café results: 1

Walkability

- Agreed that neighbourhood walkability is important and relevant
- WHO definition does not recognise many issues that impact on walkability (e.g., vegetation)
  - Fallen leaves become slip and trip hazards
  - Hilliness impacts of ability to walk to shops and transport

Accessibility of public spaces and buildings

- Adapted indicator used in the project did not cover enough building types
- Important to gather data on in the future
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Some World Café results: 2

Accessibility of public transport and stops

- Extremely important as an indicator
  - Issues were around ticketing system, timetabling, feeling vulnerable, and lack of information
  - Distance to public transport stop not satisfactory: 55% of houses within 500 m of a public transport station

Positive social attitude

- Number of reported crimes against older people seemed too low
  - Perception of safety might be a better question
  - Proportion of older people who felt part of the community seemed low (66%) and was a concern
Some World Café results: 3

Engagement in local decision-making

• Very important

• Surprised by the high number of voters aged 70 and over (48%), but disappointed that some people chose not to vote

Availability of social and health services

• Were not sure about the accuracy of this indicator (20% receive HACC; 2% receive home care packages; 3% receive assessments)

• Quality is more important than quantity of service (trust issues)
Meeting in Geneva, 2015: Delegates
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Piloting the Age-friendly City Indicator Guide

Banyule, Victoria, Australia
Successes and challenges of Banyule’s project

Successes

Collaboration
Not having to conduct a new survey
Knowledge of existing datasets
Skilled data analyst
World Café workshop initiative

Challenges

Adhering to WHO definitions
Cost of accessing some crime and housing affordability statistics
Some statistics not available by age groups
Meeting in Geneva, 2015: Key messages from the meeting

- Importance of champions
  - For both project and more generally
- Importance of ownership and partnerships
  - Other agencies
  - Older people
- Maintaining rigour in the measures
- Standardisation vs. adaptability
- Equity (identifying inequity)
- Sustainability of initiatives
Impacts and learnings for Banyule

The project provided

• Validity and status to the aged care team’s work
• A solid background for taking new ideas to leaders of the community
• Opportunity for resources to be directed to age-friendliness
• Baseline data for measuring change
• Relationship with La Trobe University

The indicators

By themselves, many have little meaning, i.e. without

• Comparison with other groups / general population / other municipalities
• Change / progress over time

Mismatch between quantitative data and perceptions

• Useful to supplement statistics with qualitative data

Images: Wikimedia Commons
Next steps

The Council intends to continue collecting data on indicators of age-friendliness and for a wider range of indicators than they do currently.

The Guide offers a useful framework and rationale for including new or changed indicators in the Council’s regular Household Survey.

Different groups of people are envisaged to be involved in data collection in different ways.
Thank you

Contact: y.wells@latrobe.edu.au