

University of Massachusetts Boston ScholarWorks at UMass Boston

Gerontology Institute Publications

Gerontology Institute

2-1-2004

The Frank J. Manning Certificate in Gerontology Alumni Survey: 21 Years of Service to Elders

Nina M. Silverstein

University of Massachusetts Boston, nina.silverstein@umb.edu

Jenai Murtha

University of Massachusetts Boston

Donna Sullivan

University of Massachusetts Boston

May Jawad

University of Massachusetts Boston

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.umb.edu/gerontologyinstitute_pubs

 Part of the [Geriatrics Commons](#), [Health Services Research Commons](#), and the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Silverstein, Nina M.; Murtha, Jenai; Sullivan, Donna; and Jawad, May, "The Frank J. Manning Certificate in Gerontology Alumni Survey: 21 Years of Service to Elders" (2004). *Gerontology Institute Publications*. Paper 18.

http://scholarworks.umb.edu/gerontologyinstitute_pubs/18

This Research Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Gerontology Institute at ScholarWorks at UMass Boston. It has been accepted for inclusion in Gerontology Institute Publications by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at UMass Boston. For more information, please contact library.uasc@umb.edu.

**THE FRANK J. MANNING CERTIFICATE IN GERONTOLOGY
ALUMNI SURVEY**

21 YEARS OF SERVICE TO ELDERS



Nina M. Silverstein, Ph.D., Project Director
Jenai Murtha, MS, Teaching Assistant
Donna Sullivan, MS, Research Assistant
May Jawad, MS, Research Assistant

Gerontology Institute
and the
College of Public and Community Service
University of Massachusetts Boston
Boston, MA 02125-3393

February 2004

Website: www.geront.umb.edu

Fax: 617-287-7080

Email: gerontology@umb.edu

©Copyright, 2004, the Gerontology Institute, University of Massachusetts Boston. For more information on the Institute and its publications, or to order additional copies of this report, write to:

Publications, Gerontology Institute
University of Massachusetts Boston
100 Morrissey Boulevard
Boston, MA 02125-3393
Call (617) 287-7300; Fax (617) 287-7080
Email: gerontology@umb.edu

Cover photos of Francis X. Hurrie, Manning 2001, BA 2002; Ada Hayes, Manning 2001, BA 2002; Maryann Williamson, Manning 2003; and Judith Gorton, Manning 2002.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Faculty, staff, and students associated with the Frank J. Manning Certificate in Gerontology have long felt pride in the program that spans from a living laboratory of productive aging and lifelong learning to service to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and beyond. The time has come to quantify the outcomes that we have observed. We chose to use the model of action-research in the context of our applied research in aging class to have current students design and implement the research that would generate a response to the question, *Has the Manning Certificate succeeded in meeting its original objectives of training volunteers, advocates, and workers for the aging network of programs and services in Massachusetts?* We believe that readers of this report will agree that the Manning Certificate has indeed met its goals and more.

Many individuals contributed to the design and implementation of this research project. The Spring 2002 Elder-Action-Research project was directed by Nina M. Silverstein, Ph.D., with research and teaching assistance from doctoral candidates Jenai Murtha, MS; Donna Sullivan, MS; and May Jawad, MS.

An Advisory Board was recruited to assist with the formulation and review of the questionnaire as well as provide insight into the interpretation of preliminary findings. The following individuals from the College of Public and Community Service (CPCS) served on the Advisory Board: Suzanne Allmendinger, Director of Community Outreach; Sarah Bartlett, Administrative Dean; Marian Spencer, Gerontology Faculty member; Jeffrey Burr, Ph.D., Graduate Program Director, Gerontology; and Ellen Bruce, Associate Director, Gerontology Institute. Scott A. Bass, Dean of the Graduate School and Vice Provost for Research and Planning, University of Maryland, Baltimore County, and former Director of the Gerontology Institute, University of Massachusetts Boston, also served on the Board. In addition, advisory board members included: Elyse Jacobs and Pat Schell, former administrative staff members, Manning Gerontology program; and Patricia Gavin, Nancy Goldin, Kay Maguire, Marilouise M. MacDonald, and Renee Summers, alumnae, Manning Gerontology program.

Advisory Board member Jeffrey Burr was especially helpful in presenting theories of productive aging during a February 2002 lecture. Richard Rowland, a professor at Boston College School of Social Work and a former Secretary of the Massachusetts Executive Office of Elder Affairs who knew Frank Manning and was a faculty member when the program began, provided an historical perspective on the Manning Program to the class. In addition, a panel of advisory members and alumni Ruth Grillo, Shirley Jacobs, Ted and Francis Rubin, and Charlotte Yacker provided historical background and shared insights about the Manning Program with students during panel discussions. Milton and Arlene Wolk, Gerontology Program alumni and trainers at the Center for Survey Research, provided the class with helpful instruction on telephone interviewing techniques in March 2002. Carl Nash, a member of this class, and Renee Summers, a Manning alumna, analyzed some selected aspects of the qualitative data for this report.

Diane Pyle, former Manning Certificate Program Administrator, and Mary St. Jean, Gerontology Administrative Assistant, provided continued support throughout the project duration. Francis G. Caro, Ph.D., Director, Gerontology Institute reviewed, and Robert Geary, Gerontology Institute, edited, the final manuscript.

The following students of the Spring 2002 Action-Research class are acknowledged for their contributions to this study:

Virginia M. Ames	Suzanne Gnospelius	Maureen R. McGillicuddy
Betty Athanasoulas	Judith Anne Gorton	Marguerite L. McIntyre
Elizabeth Bayer	Marie C. Guzell	Carl R. Nash
Janet D. Benkert	Paula A. Hansen	Sr. Jeanne I. Perrault
Jean M. Benton	Holly K. Heggie	Leonard Renda
Flora Booth	Joanne Hennigan	Arvilla J. Sarazen
Jeanette M. Bradley	Marian Jones	Jacqueline A. Sasso
Cathy M. Callahan	Gerald J. Keane	Satu I. Schmidt
Phyllis M. Cassano	Joan E. Kelleher	Paul L. Taylor
Teresa V. Clark	Virginia M. Kelly	Jessica Tillman
David Coyle	Jane E. Linn	Susan Tylus
Mary J. Diggins	Donna J. Longo	Theresa Hagerty Walper
Jane Eastburn	John N. Macphee	Maryann Williamson
Margaret E. Frazier	Patricia M. Malone	Kathleen E. Wolf

Presentations based on selected findings from this study have been made at the following professional conferences and community gatherings:

Silverstein, N.M., & Murtha, J. (February 2004). Measuring the Impact of a Gerontology Certificate Program At 21: An Alumni Survey. Association of Gerontology in Higher Education Annual Meeting, (Richmond, VA).

Silverstein, N.M., Gnospelius, S., Butler, A., & Tylus, S. (June 2003). What Gerontology Alumni Do: 21 Years of Advocating, Volunteering, Employment, Education, & Caregiving. UMass Boston Gerontology Alumni Association Annual Spring Luncheon.

Butler, A., Longo, D., & Tylus, S. (May 2003). A Path Toward Enhancing the Aging Network: 21 Years of the Manning Certificate in Gerontology. Poster presentation at the Massachusetts Gerontology Association Annual Meeting (Waltham, MA.).

Silverstein, N.M., Murtha, J., Sullivan, D., Jawad, M. & Gnospelius, S. (March 2003). What Gerontology Certificate Alumni Do: 21 Years of Advocacy, Volunteering, Employment, Education, and Caregiving. Presentation at the 2003 NCOA-ASA Joint Conference, Chicago, IL.

Silverstein, N.M., & Sullivan, D. (December 2002). What Gerontology Alumni Do: 21 Years of Advocacy, Volunteering, Employment, Education, and Caregiving. Presentation for the "Alumni College Event" of the College of Public & Community Service, University of Massachusetts Boston.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The certificate program in Gerontology at the University of Massachusetts Boston was established in 1979 as part of an Administration on Aging (AoA) grant to develop and expand services to the elderly citizens of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. In 1984, a line item was added to the state budget by the legislature and governor establishing the Gerontology Institute at the University of Massachusetts Boston and ensuring the continuation of training, research, policy, and advocacy work on behalf of and with Massachusetts' elders (O'Brien, 1996). Upon Frank J. Manning's death in 1986, the program was renamed the Manning Certificate Program. Manning was a retired labor leader and an enthusiastic advocate of senior rights who was a charismatic and powerful leader of Massachusetts elders in the 1960s and 1970s. This report describes the measurable outcomes of that well-established program. Specifically, alumni representing classes since 1980 were surveyed to learn the extent of their involvement in employment, advocacy, and volunteer experiences in working with elders since completion of the Manning Certificate. In addition, some comparisons are made to an earlier study by Silverstein, Choi, and Bulot (2000) of older learners on the same campus who were not part of the Manning program.

In describing the Manning Certificate Program, Francis G. Caro, current Director of the Gerontology Institute, writes, "The certificate program seeks explicitly to strengthen the ability of graduates to make effective contributions in aging services and to serve as advocates for the elderly. Students learn about the needs of older people, service programs to address those needs, the role of the public sector in financing services for the elderly, and the manner in which publicly funded programs are shaped through the political process." (Caro, 1999, p.7). These goals do not set apart the Manning Certificate Program from similar programs at the more than 200 other colleges and universities that are members of the Association of Gerontology in Higher Education (AGHE); what is unique about the Boston program is that more than two-thirds of each class are students who are themselves "older people," ranging in age from 60s to mid-80s.

Forty-two Gerontology Certificate and undergraduate students in the Spring 2002 Elder-Action-Research class conducted telephone interviews with 77% (364) of the alumni. While most alumni were still residing in Massachusetts, 23 had moved on to 16 other states and one to another country. The majority resided in the South Shore (39%), followed by Metropolitan Boston (20%) and Metro West (19%).

The Sample

The average age of alumni at the time they were students was 62 years and ranged from 22 to 84 years. The current average age of the respondents was 71 years and ranged from 32 to 96 years. Most were female (83%) and white (88%). There was, however, a slight increase both in males and in persons of color between 1991-2001 compared to 1981-1990 (18% vs. 15% male; and 13% vs. 11% minority). Students entered the Manning Certificate Program from all educational backgrounds. Nearly as many students entered with graduate degrees (27%) as did those with a high school education or less (30%). Regardless of past educational experiences, many students had not entered a classroom for decades, 20 years on average.

Seventy percent of the respondents received a tuition and fee waiver¹ while enrolled in the program. Sixty percent received the waiver specifically designated for persons age 60+. Other fee waivers were for veteran or state employee status. Fifty-nine percent of the respondents indicated that receipt of the waiver was an incentive to their enrollment.

Over 90% of the respondents rated their educational experience at UMass Boston as either excellent (51%) or very good (42%). Ninety-four percent reported that the curriculum had met their needs.

Productive Aging

One definition of productive aging often cited is that proposed by Bass, Caro, and Chen (1993): “Productive aging is any activity by an older individual that produces goods or services, or develops the capacity to produce them, whether they are to be paid or not.” (p.6). The four areas where productive aging has been highly emphasized are in paid employment, volunteering, caregiving, and education or training for productive engagement. A *Productive Activities Index* was created, based on the definition provided by Bass, Caro, and Chen. The items included in the index were whether or not the respondent had done any of the following activities: currently working for pay, currently volunteering, providing childcare and providing eldercare. In addition, the following items were added encompassing an expanded definition of productive activity: accompanying others to the doctor, making appointments for others, driving others, handling finances for others, doing household chores for others, shopping for others, doing yard work for others, and preparing taxes for others.

Using that index, the alumni have been engaged in many productive activities both since the time they graduated from the Manning Program and in their current daily lives (some respondents may have been engaged in activities for a time since graduation but may no longer be involved in those activities). The mean number of productive activities reported *since* graduation is 4.12 while the mean number of *current* productive activities is 3.59 (of a potential total of 13 activities).

Of specific interest to this study was the extent of productive activity engaged in by the alumni that was related to the aging network. As speculated, the great majority of the alumni are currently active in contributing their knowledge and skills to the aging network in Massachusetts. Almost all—98%—report being involved in advocacy efforts; 88% are volunteering; and 71% report employment in aging services.

Employment

Forty-one percent of the respondents were employed since program completion. These alumni worked a median of 22 hours per week, ranging from a low of three hours to a high of 75 hours. Less than half (41%) of the alumni who reported that they were currently employed indicated that their employment was a continuation of prior work. Seventy-one percent of those who were working stated that their work related to aging issues. The major settings where

¹ The Administration of the University of Massachusetts Boston eliminated fee waivers for students age 60+, effective January 2004. At the time this report went to press, efforts to reverse that decision had not been successful.

respondents were working were elder service agencies (42%), social and mental health services (15%), and hospitals (6%).

Volunteering

Of the 77% who reported that they were currently volunteering, less than half (45%) indicated that their current volunteer activities were a continuation of previous volunteer work. The majority (87%) of those volunteering were in settings that related to aging issues, and 83% stated that the Manning Program prepared them for their volunteer positions. In addition, about two-thirds (63%) of the alumni were engaged in informal caregiving activities since completing the Manning Certificate.

Education

Almost two-thirds (63%) of the respondents continued with their education after completing their Manning Certificate. Twenty-eight percent spent a second year at UMass Boston and completed a two-semester advanced certificate in Gerontological Social Policy. A quarter of the respondents went on to complete their Bachelors degrees, and 5% later obtained graduate degrees. Moreover, almost half (45%) reported that they have given presentations on aging to community groups and organizations, and 40% have received awards or special recognition for their work on behalf of elders.

Connection to the University of Massachusetts Boston

In concluding the interview, alumni were asked: *Since graduating from the Gerontology Certificate program, have you encouraged others to enroll?* A majority— 89%— of respondents answered affirmatively with 33% aware that the individuals whom they had encouraged did enroll in the program. Over half (51%) joined the Alumni Association; 31% attended lectures on campus; 30% made monetary donations; 24% took courses; and 12% reported volunteering for the University.

The Meaning of the Manning

Almost all of the respondents took the opportunity to reflect on what the Manning Certificate has meant to their lives. Several themes emerged from their comments—the major themes being: life enrichment, the opportunity to continue with education, an increased awareness of elder issues and needs, building relationships to UMass Boston—with students and faculty, and an increased understanding of the aging process and service network.

One respondent offered the following statement that reflects the feelings of many of the interviewed alumni: *Realizing that when one retires, it's not "all over." This has motivated me to contribute to others.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	vi
INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND	1
The Manning Certificate Program	2
Older Learners	4
Productive Aging	5
Study Objectives	6
METHODOLOGY	7
Sample and Response	8
Demographic Characteristics	8
RESULTS	10
Has the Student Profile Changed within the Past 21 Years?	10
Motivations for Enrollment	10
Obstacles Encountered on Campus	13
Computer Usage	14
Competency-Based Education	15
A Comment on Part of the Curriculum	15
ARE GRADUATES OF THE PROGRAM ENGAGED IN PRODUCTIVE ROLES WITHIN THE AGING SERVICES NETWORK?	16
Have Alumni Used Their Skills and Training in Advocating for Elders or in Caring for Family Members or Friends?	16
Impact on the Aging Services Network in Massachusetts	17
Advocacy	17
Employment	18
Volunteering	19
Caregiving	20
Productive Activities	21
Manning Alumni and Life-Long Learning	23
The Meaning of the Manning Program	23
Maintaining Contact with UMass Boston	25
CONCLUSIONS	26
REFERENCES	27
Appendix A: Original Objectives for the Gerontology Training Program	29
Appendix B: Geographic distribution of Manning Alumni (N=601)	30

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Geographic Distribution of the Alumni Respondents (N=364)	10
Table 2: Motivations for Attending the Program and Perceived Benefits Attained	12
Table 3: Obstacles Experienced on Campus.....	13
Table 4: Class Composition Preference by Age (N=330)	13
Table 5: Currently Employed by Age (N=364)	19
Table 6: Helping Others Informally (N=364).....	21
Table 7: Age by Number of Productive Activities Since Completion of the Manning Program (N=333)	22
Table 8: Age by Number of <i>Current</i> Productive Activities (N=333)	23
Table 9: Maintaining Contact with UMass Boston (N=364)	26

INTRODUCTION

The Certificate Program in Gerontology at the University of Massachusetts Boston, a large urban university, was established in 1979 as part of an Administration on Aging (AoA) grant to develop and expand services to the elderly citizens of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. In 1984, a line item was added to the state budget by the legislature and governor establishing the Gerontology Institute at the University of Massachusetts Boston and ensuring the continuation of training, research, and policy and advocacy work on behalf of and with Massachusetts' elders (O'Brien, 1996). Upon Frank J. Manning's death in 1986, the program was renamed the "Manning Certificate Program" in honor of Manning, a retired labor leader and an enthusiastic advocate of senior rights who was a charismatic and powerful leader of Massachusetts elders in the 1960s and 1970s. This report describes the measurable outcomes of that well-established program. Specifically, alumni representing classes since 1980 were surveyed to learn the extent of their involvement in employment, advocacy, and volunteer experiences in working with elders since completion of the Manning Certificate. Insights were also gained from other outcomes of their learning experiences in terms of their own aging and assistance with the aging of family members and friends. This study will help document the value of certificate-level training in Gerontology for its students and for the communities they serve.

BACKGROUND

In 1979, three campuses of the University of Massachusetts (Amherst, Boston, Worcester) and a consortium of 10 colleges in the Worcester, Massachusetts, area collaborated in a proposal to the Administration on Aging (AoA) for a grant to develop and expand services to

the elderly citizens of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The project, Preparation and Development for Careers in Gerontology, would “mobilize the resources of all the institutions involved to establish a comprehensive career training program for working with the elderly, consistent with the Massachusetts Department of Elder Affairs and AoA Priority Programs.” (Federal Application form 424, 8/13/79). This report examines outcomes of the Boston program exclusively.

The original objectives for the training program at the Boston campus are listed in Appendix A. Three of the objectives related specifically to the certificate program:

- Objective I: To establish a comprehensive career development and preparation program concentrating on policy formulation and implementation aspects of health, legal, employment, and social services as they relate to elderly.
- Objective II: To recruit and integrate urban, poor, and ethnic elderly as participants and resources in the program.
- Objective III: To expand the current College of Public and Community Service (CPCS) structure to build institutional acceptance and support for the program.

After reading this report, the reader will note that these objectives have been met.

The Manning Certificate Program

On the Boston campus, a particular emphasis was placed on the training of undergraduate students for careers in aging services, including training of the elderly themselves. Initially funded for three years as an experimental program that provided two semesters of gerontological training to students, the program on the Boston campus was deemed successful; so much so that it was continued after the experimental phase as a joint project of the College of Public and Community Service (CPCS) at the University of Massachusetts Boston and a senior advocacy

organization, Massachusetts Association of Older Americans (MAOA). In 1984, a line item was added to the state budget by the legislature and governor establishing the Gerontology Institute at the University of Massachusetts Boston and ensuring the continuation of the program's objectives. Further information on the establishment of the program and the development of the Gerontology Institute at the University of Massachusetts Boston is available at the web site, URL: http://www.geront.umb.edu/historical_review.htm.

In describing the Manning Certificate Program, Francis G. Caro, current Director of the Gerontology Institute writes, "The certificate program seeks explicitly to strengthen the ability of graduates to make effective contributions in aging services and to serve as advocates for the elderly. Students learn about the needs of older people, service programs to address those needs, the role of the public sector in financing services for the elderly, and the manner in which publicly funded programs are shaped through the political process." (Caro, 1999, p.7). These goals do not set the Manning Certificate Program apart from similar programs at the more than 200 other colleges and universities that are members of the Association of Gerontology in Higher Education (AGHE). What is unique about the Boston program is that more than two-thirds of each class is composed of students who are themselves "older people" who range in age from 60s to mid-80s.

There are special features in the design of the Manning Program that make it especially attractive to older learners: streamlined admissions procedure, tuition and fee waiver² for Massachusetts residents age 60+, small classes that meet as a cohort once per week, evaluation by competency rather than grade, supportive services provided in terms of writing and computer workshops; furthermore, certificate credit is transferable toward the undergraduate degree.

² The Administration of the University of Massachusetts Boston eliminated fee waivers for students age 60+, effective January 2004. At the time this report went to press, efforts to reverse that decision had not yet been successful.

Older Learners

The literature on older learners dates back over four decades (c.f. Havighurst, 1964). Much of the early literature reiterated the changing demographic trends with the projections of increases in the elderly population. Census reports highlighted the educational attainments of present and future elderly cohorts and their expected continued interests in educational pursuits. These facts, combined with the belief that many elders have discretionary income to dispose of, served as a magnet to attract the development and marketing of educational programs directed at the elderly (Moyer & Lago, 1987). A proliferation of reports during the period surrounding the development of the Manning Certificate Program reflects the pertinent issues of that time: higher education and the elderly (Covey, 1981; Graney & Hays, 1976; Peterson, 1981); needs and interests of older students (Cross, 1977; Kingston, 1982); and senior citizens' motivations for educational pursuits (Hiemstra, 1976; Perkins & Robertson-Tchabo, 1981; Romaniuk & Romaniuk, 1982).

Much discussion has highlighted the differences among older adults in relation to learning goals. O'Connor reviews the distinction between instrumental and expressive learning: "The former refers to learning directed toward some external objective, generally in the future (e.g., vocational education); the latter, expressive goals, refers to learning for its own sake, learning in which the experience of study provides its own gratification. These two goals are generally discussed as a dichotomy but they may also be conceived as representing a continuum. Students may have a combination of both instrumental and expressive goals; some may consider the two goals equally important while others are more or less influenced by one or the other dominant goal." (O'Connor, 1987, p.511). Noting expressive and instrumental goals are dually important to elders, it is increasingly evident that the heterogeneity of the older adult population

ensures the continuation of programs and services directed to either or both ends. The increase in Elderhostels (programs on 2,300+ campuses and institutions in the United States and abroad, Miller, 1997), Learning in Retirement programs (informal peer-led learning), and the phenomenal increase in older adults attending regular college classes (a dramatic 235% increase according to Ziernike, 1999)—not to mention the learning that takes place in public libraries, Councils on Aging and senior centers, hospitals and health clinics, community centers, and on-line and distance learning—provides evidence that learning is a lifelong pursuit for a vast number of individuals, that they seek learning opportunities in a variety of locations, and that they do so with diverse motives and goals.

An earlier study by Silverstein, Choi, and Bulot (2001) of adult learners (aged 52-87) at the University of Massachusetts Boston provided evidence that a distinction exists between learners under 60 years of age and those aged 60 and over. The younger of these students were more likely to have instrumental motives (work-related, career advancement) and would likely be seeking full-time employment upon completion of their studies, while the older students were more likely to have expressive motives (joy of learning, becoming a more informed person) and were anticipating finding part-time employment and/or meaningful volunteer opportunities.

Productive Aging

The pursuit of education is an example of a productive activity in aging. One definition of productive aging often cited in gerontology and, indeed, nearly carved in stone at UMass Boston, is that proposed by Bass, Caro, and Chen (1993): “Productive aging is any activity by an older individual that produces goods or services, or develops the capacity to produce them, whether they are to be paid or not” (p.6). The four areas where productive aging has been highly emphasized are in paid employment, volunteering, caregiving, and education or training for

productive engagement. More recently, the definition has been revised in recognition of the myriad activities in which elders are engaged that often do not lend themselves to economic analysis. These productive activities include routine household chores, home repairs and maintenance, assisting other individuals within one's social network, and various sundry tasks and errands associated with the individual's self care (Bass & Caro, 2001).

One benefit of an educational opportunity for elders like the Manning Certificate Program is to enhance the individual's ability to cope with his or her own aging or to assist in the aging of friends and family members through activities that are more personal or social in nature. Educational benefits may indeed be revealed in economic and non-economic areas, depending on one's age and stage in the life course and contingent upon other forces and factors impacting an individual's life.

Study Objectives

The major objective of this study was to assess how well the Manning Program has done after its 21 years in existence: Did the program meet its initial goals? Would the initial objectives still be relevant for the 21st century? Have graduates of the program gone on to paid employment or volunteer positions? Are they engaged in activities within the aging network? Have graduates used the skills and training learned throughout their coursework in advocating for elders, or in caring for family members, friends, or themselves? Answers to these questions and others were sought through a telephone survey of the certificate alumni from the past 21 years.

METHODOLOGY

The overall question addressed in this report is:

- Has the Manning Certificate Program met its original objectives?

To answer that question, specific questions were addressed through the research:

- Has the student profile changed within the past 21 years?
- Are graduates of the program engaged in productive roles within the aging services network?
- Have alumni used their skills and training in advocating for elders or in caring for family members, friends, or for themselves?

An action-research model was used to conduct this project. This model brings the university faculty and students together with community leaders and agency representatives to address an issue of public concern (Bass & Silverstein, 1996; Silverstein, Moorhead, & Murtha, 2002). The partners for this project were the university stakeholders most closely associated with the Manning Program, namely the Gerontology Institute and the College of Public and Community Service.

In addition, an advisory board consisting of several additional stakeholders with vested interests in the Manning Program was assembled. Current and former faculty and administrators of the Manning Program, alumni representatives, and administrators from the Gerontology Institute and the College of Public and Community Service were recruited for the advisory board. The advisory board's purpose was to assist in deciding the domains to include in the survey instrument and later, to provide insight on the interpretation of research findings.

Forty-two gerontology certificate and undergraduate students enrolled in the Spring 2002 Elder-Action-Research class participated in the survey development, data collection, and data

processing. The data were collected through a telephone survey in the spring of 2002. The survey was 23 pages in length and included the following domains: current and past employment and volunteer positions; current and past advocacy activities; achievements in terms of presentations on aging, awards, and special recognitions; and socio-demographic variables. Structured, close-ended questions and opportunities for more qualitative open-ended responses were included in the survey.

Sample and Response

Almost 75% (601) of the alumni since the program's inception were presumed reachable at the time of the current survey in 2002. However, current phone numbers and addresses were not available for 22% (130) of the alumni. While most alumni were still residing in Massachusetts, 23 had moved on to 16 other states and one to another country (see Appendix B). It is not known whether those 130 individuals were now deceased, institutionalized, or had moved. Deleting those names from the master list, there was a possibility of completing interviews with 471 alumni. Ultimately, interviews were completed with 77% (364) of the available alumni. The interviews ranged in length from 10 to 71 minutes and averaged 37 minutes. As graduates of the program, the respondents were highly interested in participating in the study and were anxious to share their insights.

Demographic Characteristics

Selected demographic data were available for both respondents and non-respondents from program administrative data already collected during the time they were students. The average age of the alumni at the time they were students was 62 years and ranged from 22 to 84 years. The current average age of the respondents was 71 years and ranged from 32 to 96 years. Most were female (83%) and white (88%). There was, however, a slight increase both in males

and in persons of color between 1991-2001 compared to 1981-1990 (18% vs. 15% male; and 13% vs. 11% minority). Most respondents were married at the time they were students and at the time of the survey (52% vs. 48%). While the percent widowed increased slightly over time, the category of "never married" decreased during the same time period.

Students entered the Manning Certificate Program from all levels of higher education, with almost as many students entering with graduate degrees (over 27%) as entering as high school graduates or with less formal education (30%). Many of these students had not been in a formal classroom setting for several years—the median being 20 years.

Respondents considered themselves in relatively good health at the time of the survey, with 86% reporting "good," "very good," or "excellent" health, and 14% reporting "fair" or "poor" health. Almost all (89%) of the respondents reported that they currently drive.

The interviewed alumni represented each of the graduating classes from 1980-2001, with 7% from 1980-1985, 21% from 1986-1990, 34% from 1991-1996, and 38% from 1997-2001. Almost a third of the respondents (31%) recalled that they had heard of the program through *word of mouth*, 26% through the *Boston Globe*, 6% through the *Patriot Ledger*, and 5% mentioned seeing notices through their Councils on Aging. Other sources mentioned were other newspapers, radio, TV, church bulletins, and the Internet.

Seventy percent of the respondents had received tuition and fee waivers when they enrolled in the program. Sixty percent had received waivers specifically designated for persons age 60+. Other fee waivers were for veterans or state employees. Over half— 59%—of the respondents indicated that the waiver was an incentive to their enrollment.

The respondents currently resided throughout Massachusetts, with some residents currently living out-of-state. Most alumni respondents were from the South Shore (39%),

followed by Metropolitan Boston (20%) and Metro West (19%). Table 1 shows the geographic areas of the respondents.

Table 1: Geographic Distribution of the Alumni Respondents (N=364)

Location	Percent
Metropolitan Boston	20.1
Metro West	19.2
South Shore	39.0
North Shore	11.5
Central Massachusetts	0.8
Western Massachusetts	1.9
Cape and the Islands	2.2
Out-of-State	5.3

RESULTS

Has the Student Profile Changed within the Past 21 Years?

Looking at the two decades of 1981-1990 and 1991-2000, the program has seen a slight increase in the percentages of males (+3%) and minority students (+2%) in the later decade. An increase in age is also observed. Overall, the profile remains largely white (87%) and female (83%), with about half of the students between the ages of 60-69 years.

Motivations for Enrollment

Why did students enter the Manning Program and what benefits do they feel they attained? As noted in Table 2, alumni recalled several motivations for enrolling in the Manning Program, with the top motivations being: *becoming a more informed person, joy of learning, and personal growth and development*. The major benefits they reported attaining were: *becoming a more effective elder advocate, meeting new people, coping with loss, and enhancing caregiving skills*. What individuals attained differed somewhat from their original motivations to enroll.

Since a criterion for applying was that prospective students document their volunteer experience as well as their work history, students already entered with an impressive level of volunteer commitment and may not have added significantly to their effectiveness as a volunteer (68% noted *becoming an effective volunteer* as a motivation while only 21% reported that as a benefit attained). From the perspective of a programmatic goal of promoting elder advocacy, however, more respondents attained that benefit than originally reported it as a motivation to enroll (95% vs. 86%).

The Silverstein, Choi, and Bulot (2000) data present an opportunity for comparison. Their sample was of older learners (age 50+) from the same campus, though not in the Gerontology program. Overall, the range of motivations matched the intended goals of the Manning Program and were more volunteer- and advocacy-oriented among the Manning sample than in the previous study of older learners, who were much less likely to have mentioned *becoming a more effective volunteer* as a motivation for enrollment in higher education. However, the Silverstein, Choi, and Bulot (2000) sample³ was more likely to have reported an expressive reason such as *interest in a particular subject* as a strong motivation for enrollment than did the Manning alumni. Thus, the older learners attracted to the Manning Program were noticeably different in their motivations when compared to other older learners on campus.

Over 90% of the respondents rated their educational experience at UMass Boston as either excellent (51%) or very good (42%). Ninety-four percent reported that the curriculum had met their needs.

³ The older learners in the Silverstein, Choi, and Bulot 2000 sample ranged in age from 52-87 and were not in the Gerontology certificate program.

Table 2: Motivations for Attending the Program and Perceived Benefits Attained

Motivations for Enrollment	Motivations noted by Manning Program (2002) (N=364)	Motivations noted in Silverstein, Choi & Bulot (2000) (N=504)	Benefits attained by Manning Program (2002) (N=364)
Coping with loss	NA	NA	90.4
Becoming a more informed person	95.3	73.0	73.4
Joy of learning	95.1	73.6	NA
Personal growth and development	92.3	NA	85.7
Keeping your mind active	89.3	64.9	64.8
Becoming a more effective elder advocate	86.3	NA	95.1
Meeting new people	80.8	30.5	90.4
Seeking new directions in life	74.7	47.5	NA
Becoming more effective as a volunteer	68.1	16.6	20.6
Enhancing caregiving skills	64.0	NA	88.5
Gaining self-confidence	63.5	73.0	68.1
Improving self-image	56.9	NA	68.4
Interest in a particular subject or course matter	48.9	73.9	NA
Keeping from being bored	48.9	24.5	NA
Something you have always wanted to do	45.1	57.8	NA
Advancing career	38.7	45.1	32.1

Note: NA indicates that the item was not asked.

As previously stated, the Manning Program was specifically designed with additional supports for older learners. In fact, almost a quarter, 23%, of the respondents stated that they had *needed help beyond the classroom*. Almost all of the students, 93%, who had indicated that they had needed help beyond the classroom also reported that they received the help that they needed.

Seventeen percent had noted that there were times while they were students that they had felt *discouraged*. Sixty-nine percent of those students acknowledged that the situation that had discouraged them had been resolved.

Obstacles Encountered on Campus

We then asked about obstacles they may have experienced on campus. Fifteen percent of the respondents noted that they had a disability while attending UMass Boston. Over half, 58%, of those students thought that the university had accommodated their needs.

Table 3: Obstacles Experienced on Campus

	Manning Sample (2002) (N=364)	Silverstein, Bulot, & Choi (2000) (N=504)
Difficulty finding parking	27.5	NA
Difficulty understanding course material	20.3	NA
Difficulty navigating around campus	18.4	67.7
Difficulty hearing other classmates	12.6	38.4
Difficulty hearing professors	8.2	27.4
Difficulty contacting faculty or staff	3.6	33.2

Note: A three-point scale was used in the Silverstein, Choi, and Bulot (2000) study for these items: *never*, *occasionally*, and *often*. The included percentages reflect a summation of the *occasionally* and *often* responses.

Some people prefer to learn with classmates of their own ages, while others prefer learning with students of all ages. Since the Manning Program has intentionally recruited older students age 60+ and combined them with traditionally-aged undergraduates in their 20s and working adults in their 30s and 40s, we were interested in their thoughts about class composition. Almost two-thirds, 65%, stated that they preferred to be in a classroom with students of all ages; 12% stated a preference to be in a classroom with their peers; while the remaining respondents did not have a preference with regard to the class composition. Table 4 illustrates how those preferences broke down by age. Though not a statistically significant difference, students age 65

years and older were likely to state that they preferred *all ages* in a classroom followed by having *no age preference* for class composition while the group of students less than age 65 years who also stated that they preferred *all ages*, were equally divided between preferring *peers close to their own ages* or having *no age preference*.

Table 4: Class Composition Preference by Age (N=330)

Class composition	55-64 years	65-74 years	75+ years	Total
Peers close to own age	17.1 (7)	41.5 (17)	41.5 (17)	100% (41)
All ages	11.7 (25)	42.5 (91)	45.8 (98)	100% (214)
No age preference	10.7 (8)	44.0 (33)	45.3 (34)	100% (75)
Total	12.1 (40)	42.7 (141)	45.2 (149)	100% (330)

The Manning Program utilizes a dedicated classroom, thus, unlike the students in the Silverstein, Choi, and Bulot (2000) study who needed to navigate through many classrooms and buildings on campus, the Gerontology students needed only to find one area. In addition, until November 2003, the Manning Program had a full-time professional staff person who served as the program administrator.⁴ This administrator was available to provide specialized advising to students and serve as a liaison to faculty. Thus, Manning students had little difficulty contacting faculty or staff.

Computer Usage

All students currently in the Manning Program are required to use computers. We asked the alumni about their computer usage. Seventy percent of the alumni surveyed reported that they use a personal computer. Thirty-eight percent use the computer *at least once per day*. Fifty-eight percent use the Internet; 56% use e-mail. Almost half (49%) said that they have taken

⁴ This professional full-time staff position was lost as a result of campus-wide budget cuts decided upon by the University administration in August 2003.

computer classes. Eighteen percent credited the Manning experience as being instrumental in developing their computer skills.

Competency-Based Education

The Manning Program is based on demonstrating competencies rather than receiving letter grades. The alumni were asked if this program characteristic was helpful to them in alleviating stress and anxiety. Over three-fourths of the respondents (78%) indicated *yes*. At the time of the survey, an internship was not a required part of the undergraduate program in Gerontology. Because the Manning Certificate is fully integrated into undergraduate education and satisfies several of the competencies of the undergraduate major in Gerontology, we used this opportunity to assess interest in the offering of an internship. We defined the internship as *working in an aging-related position within an institution or community-based agency approximately 10 hours per week per 14-week semester*. Forty-two percent of the alumni said that they would have been *very interested* in an internship experience; 27% said that they would have been *somewhat interested*; and 31% would not have been interested. Since the time of the survey an internship has become a required part of the undergraduate curriculum. Students have the option of demonstrating one of two intervention competencies: *Intervention with Elders: Community-Based* or *Intervention with Elders: Institution-Based*.

A Comment on Part of the Curriculum

One of the requirements of the Manning Program includes visiting with a frail elder. This requirement helps students to demonstrate the *Working with Elders* competency addressed within the *Concepts of Aging* class curriculum. Almost all of the respondents, 93%, recalled their experiences in visiting with a frail elder. Over half, 53%, continued to visit with the frail elder

after completing the Manning Program. Fifteen percent reported that they were still visiting the individual elders while most noted that the elders were now deceased.

ARE GRADUATES OF THE PROGRAM ENGAGED IN PRODUCTIVE ROLES WITHIN THE AGING SERVICES NETWORK?

Have Alumni Used Their Skills and Training in Advocating for Elders or in Caring for Family Members or Friends?

The great majority of the alumni are currently active in contributing their knowledge and skills to the aging network of programs and services in Massachusetts. Almost all, 98%, reported being involved in advocacy efforts; 88% are volunteering; and 71% report employment in aging services. By comparison, the alumni were asked if they were engaged in these activities prior to entering the Manning Program; that is, are the observed outcomes a measure of change or are they reflective of what activities people were already doing? Given that the application process favored individuals who had already demonstrated commitment to elders through advocacy, volunteering, or work, it was expected that significant change may not be apparent. In fact, in terms of advocacy, 60% reported that they had been advocates in the past, while 67% reported advocacy activities since program completion; 45% reported employment prior to the program and 41% reported employment since graduation. A decrease in the percentage of those employed was not surprising in that many of the earlier cohorts of students were newly retired. Thus, the greatest change was observed in relationship to volunteering, with 65% reporting volunteer activities prior to the Manning Program and 88% reporting that they volunteered since completing the Manning.

Impact on the Aging Services Network in Massachusetts

Advocacy

As noted previously, almost all (98%) of the respondents were engaged in advocacy activities. Examples of advocacy activities were reported on multiple levels. Over half reported being involved in advocacy issues on an individual basis (58%) or at the local community level (55%). Forty-three percent of those involved with advocacy efforts reported advocacy activities at the state level and 20% at the federal level. Over half (54%) noted that their advocacy activities were a continuation of efforts on behalf of issues they had been involved with prior to entering the Manning Program, with 39% indicating that the issues were different. Almost all—92%—noted that their advocacy efforts had "something to do with aging issues or the aging network."

The respondents were able to elaborate on the types of advocacy activities in which they were engaged. Specifically, Manning alumni were engaged in advocacy efforts related to direct care (about 31%), health issues (about 14%), general legislative advocacy issues (about 13%), and housing (about 8%). Direct care included such issues as meals and nutrition, transportation, personal needs, grandparenting, and home repairs. Examples of legislative advocacy included working on specific state bills impacting elders, sending out "legislative alerts" to elders and organizations and agencies in the aging network, and a series of budget, taxes, and zoning concerns. Health issues included disability, blindness, and deafness, Medicare and Medicaid, drug and alcohol abuse, mental health, the cost of prescription drugs, dental care, and quality of care issues. Housing issues noted were affordability, accessibility, and elder homelessness. Other issues included consumer fraud, income security for women, age discrimination in employment, and aging veterans' issues.

The respondents also provided the specific types of organizations that provided settings for their advocacy. Those settings included: AARP, Operation ABLE (*Ability Based on Long Experience*, an older worker program available through AARP), Alzheimer's Association, American Cancer Society, Catholic Charities, Cerebral Palsy, Councils on Aging/Senior Centers, Habitat for Humanity, League of Women Voters, Massachusetts Association of Older Americans, Massachusetts Executive Office of Elder Affairs, Mass Senior Action, Neighborhood Network, non-profit boards and chairmanships, Ombudsmen (available through the Massachusetts Executive Office of Elder Affairs), Parkinson's Association, SHINE (*Serving the Health Information Needs of Elders*, a health insurance information program available through the Massachusetts Executive Office of Elder Affairs), schools and colleges, Silver Hair Legislature, South Shore Elder Services, VA hospital, VA Old Soldiers Home, West Suburban Elder Services (now called Springwell), University of Massachusetts Boston Gerontology Institute, Vision association, White House Conference on Aging (delegate).

Employment

Forty-five percent of the alumni reported that that were employed prior to enrollment in the Manning Program. As previously noted, the average age of the respondents when they enrolled in the Manning Program was 62 years and ranged from 22 to 84 years. Many looked to the Manning Program as a bridge from working to volunteering in retirement. In fact, 21% were working full-time and 24% were employed part-time prior to their enrollment. Forty-one percent were employed since program completion. These alumni worked a median of 22 hours per week, ranging from a low of three hours to a high of 75 hours. Less than half (41%) of the alumni who reported that they were currently employed indicated that their employment was a continuation of prior work. Seventy-one percent of those who were working stated that their work related to

aging issues. The major settings where respondents were working were elder service agencies (42%), social and mental health services (15%), and hospitals (6%). Others mentioned religious and civic organizations and schools. Seventy-two percent indicated that the Manning Certificate prepared them for their current work. Table 5 illustrates that, of those who were employed at the time of the interview, 30% were age 59 years or less; 27% were ages 60-69; and 43% were age 70 or older.

Table 5: Currently Employed by Age (N=364)

Currently employed	<59 years	60-69 years	70+ years	Total
NO	4.2 (9)	20.6 (44)	75.2 (161)	100% (214)
YES	30.0 (45)	27.3 (41)	42.7 (64)	100% (150)

Volunteering

A criterion for entering the Manning Program was that individuals demonstrate a commitment to their communities; thus, it is not surprising that 66% of the alumni had volunteered prior to entering the program. Of the 77% who reported that they were currently volunteering, less than half (45%) indicated that their current volunteer activities were a continuation of previous volunteer work. The majority of those who volunteered (87%) noted that the volunteer placements were related to aging issues, and 83% stated that the Manning Program prepared them for their volunteer positions. Sixty-one of the alumni were volunteering at Councils on Aging/Senior Centers. Thirty-five volunteered at their church or synagogue. Twenty-eight mentioned their area agency on aging. Twelve were Ombudsmen. Others listed volunteer placements such as hospitals, schools, battered women shelters, adult day health centers, hospice, elder housing, visiting nurse associations, museums, libraries, food pantries,

nursing homes, Boys & Girls Clubs, and organizations like the Red Cross, American Cancer Society, Catholic Charities, and civic organizations.

Caregiving

People are involved in many activities that they may not think of as volunteer service. For the purposes of quantifying some of those activities, we asked the alumni about their activities associated with caregiving. About two-thirds (63%) of the alumni were engaged in caregiving activities since completing the Manning Certificate. Table 6 illustrates that 62% provided elder care at some time since they completed the program (with 34% currently providing elder care); 55% reported having provided child care (with 37% currently providing child care); and 34% reported having provided respite care (14% currently doing so). In addition, the alumni demonstrated a high level of current involvement in providing informal help to others in traditional areas such as providing companionship to homebound elders (40%), nursing home residents (38%), and hospital patients (22%), but also in more instrumental areas such as driving others where they needed to go (49%), accompanying others to medical appointments (38%), and arranging appointments or making phone calls for others (44%).

The types of activities included in Table 6 also reflect substantive areas of the Manning Program and undergraduate gerontology curriculum, specifically the competencies: *Health and Physical Aspects of Aging*, *Concepts of Aging*, *Social and Demographic Implications of Aging*, *Working with Elders*, and *Intervention with Elders*. Their studies include exploring issues of caregiving, aging-in-place, long-term care, community-based services. A recent phenomenon, *grandparents who are raising their grandchildren*, also referred to in a broader sense as *kinship care*, provides an example of greater insight into interpreting the percentage of elders listed in

Table 6 as *providing child care*; one can no longer assume that intermittent as opposed to custodial care is reflected in that response.

Table 6: Helping Others Informally (N=364)

Activity	Since Manning Completion	Currently Providing
Visiting homebound elders	79% (286)	40% (146)
Visiting hospital patients	77% (281)	22% (80)
Visiting nursing home residents	76% (277)	38% (139)
Accompanying others to medical appointments	74% (268)	38% (137)
Driving others	73% (265)	49% (178)
Arranging appointments/ making phone calls for others	70% (254)	44% (159)
Providing elder care	62% (226)	34% (124)
Providing child care	55% (199)	37% (135)
Providing respite care for caregivers	34% (125)	14% (51)

Productive Activities

A *Productive Activities Index* was created based, in part, on the definition provided by Bass, Caro, and Chen (1993) stated earlier in this report. We expanded on their definition to include activities directed toward the benefit of others and even further explored when self-care might be considered productive behavior. The productive aging questionnaire items that formed the index were whether or not the respondent had reported a "yes" response to having performed any of the following activities: currently working for pay, currently volunteering, providing childcare, providing eldercare, providing respite care (providing a break for the caregiver), accompanying others to the doctor, making appointments for others, driving others, handling finances for others, doing household chores for others, shopping for others, doing yard work for others, and preparing taxes for others. These categories were not weighted. That is, *working for*

pay was counted equally to volunteering. In addition, the categories may not have been *mutually exclusive*. Thus, categories like *child care* and *elder care* may represent specific types of *respite care*. Further, caution should be exercised in interpreting the scoring in *The Productive Activities Index*. The index was utilized to determine the levels of productive activity alumni were engaged in both *since* they graduated the Manning Program (Table 7) and *currently* (Table 8).

Table 7: Age by Number of Productive Activities Since Completion of the Manning Program (N=333)

Productive Activities	55-64 years	65-74 years	75+ years	Total
None	0.0 (0)	30.0 (3)	70.0 (7)	100% (10)
1 to 3 activities	4.7 (5)	41.1 (44)	54.2 (58)	100% (107)
4 to 6 activities	14.9 (28)	42.0 (79)	43.1 (81)	100% (188)
7 or more activities	28.6 (8)	53.6 (15)	17.9 (5)	100% (28)
Total	12.3 (41)	42.3 (141)	45.4 (151)	100% (333)

As both Tables 7 and 8 illustrate, alumni have been engaged in many productive activities both since the time they graduated from the Manning Program and in their current daily lives. Since graduating from the Manning, only 10 respondents reported that they had not been involved in any of the productive activities included in the index. The mean number of productive activities reported *since* graduation was 4.12, while the mean number *currently* was 3.59. The maximum number of activities reported by any one individual *currently* was 12 separate activities. Table 8 shows the respondents current age and the number of productive activities in which they were currently engaged in at the time of the survey.

Table 8: Age by Number of *Current* Productive Activities (N=333)

Productive Activities	55-64 years	65-74 years	75+ years	Total
None	2.4 (1)	17.1 (7)	80.5 (33)	100% (41)
1 to 3 activities	6.7 (10)	45.6 (68)	47.7 (71)	100% (149)
4 to 6 activities	14.1 (13)	47.8 (44)	38.0 (35)	100% (92)
7 or more activities	33.3 (17)	43.1 (22)	23.5 (12)	100% (51)
Total	12.3 (41)	42.3 (141)	45.4 (151)	100% (333)

Manning Alumni and Life-Long Learning

Almost two-thirds (63%) of the respondents continued on with their education after completing the Manning Certificate Program. Twenty-eight percent spent a second year at UMass Boston and completed a two-semester Advanced Certificate in Gerontological Social Policy. A quarter of the respondents went on to complete their Bachelors degrees and 5% later obtained graduate degrees. In addition, 7% joined the Learning in Retirement program at UMass Boston. Almost half (45%) reported that they have given presentations on aging to community groups and organizations. And 40% have received awards or special recognition for their work on behalf of elders.

The Meaning of the Manning Program

The interview ended with the following open-ended question: *In a few words, what has the Manning program meant to your life?* Almost all of the respondents (88%) offered their reflections on the program. Carl Nash, Manning '02, completed data analysis for this question. Characteristically of a Manning graduate, Mr. Nash volunteered his time during the summer following the completion of his certificate. The responses clustered around the following themes: Life enrichment, opportunity to continue with education, increased awareness of elder issues and

needs, building relationships to UMass Boston--its students and faculty, increased understanding of the aging process, and aided in caregiving and in providing services to elders.

1. Life enrichment

Realizing that when you retire, it's not all over has helped me in contributing to others.

I have the strength to go ahead with life.

Made life much more than it was before.

2. Opportunity to continue with education

Felt encouraged to go on with my education.

It totally changed my career direction...opened up a whole new world of academia and gave me a whole new outlook.

It opened new doors to a different field of interest--mission to help others.

3. Increased awareness of elder issues & needs

Totally enriching...I feel confident speaking on elder issues...Proud I took the program. I have confidence now that I did not have before.

It gave me a larger insight into the demographics of the older population, its problems, and a greater understanding of how government elder programs are affected. I have never had any previous experience in social programs.

4. Building relationships to UMass Boston--its students and faculty

I think I gained a great deal from the faculty and other students. I do continue to meet with classmates.

(Note: 62% of the respondents indicated that they had maintained friendships with classmates.)

5. Increased understanding of the aging process

6. Aided in caregiving and in providing services to elders

Gave me the background to become an ombudsman for the elderly.

Maintaining Contact with UMass Boston

Many alumni identify closely with the university they attended. In concluding the interview, the alumni were asked: *Since graduating from the Manning Certificate Program, have you encouraged others to enroll?* A majority of the respondents (89%) said yes, with 33% aware that the individuals whom they had encouraged did enroll in the program.

In addition, the respondents were asked to comment on the extent to which they have maintained contact with UMass Boston. Table 9 illustrates that over half (51%) joined the Alumni Association, almost a third (31%) reported having attended lectures on campus, 30% made monetary donations, 24% still took courses, and 12% reported volunteering for the University. Aside from a similar level of monetary donations, the Manning alumni differed from the general sample of older learners surveyed by Silverstein, Choi, and Bulot (2000). Their 2000 study of older learners on the UMass Boston campus revealed students who were more likely to report that as alumni, they would continue to take classes or to attend lectures at a much higher rate than the Manning alumni. The Manning alumni, however, were more likely to join the alumni association.

Table 9: Maintaining Contact with UMass Boston (N=364)

	Manning Sample (N=364)	Silverstein, Choi, & Bulot (2000) (N=504)
Joining the Alumni Association	51.1	45.9
Attending lectures	31.3	62.5
Monetary donations	30.2	30.8
Taking courses	24.5	67.9
Attending University functions	20.6	NA
Using the library	15.4	NA
Bringing friends to visit UMass Boston	13.2	34.4
Volunteering for UMass Boston	11.8	30.4
Using the health and fitness facilities	3.0	NA

CONCLUSIONS

It is clear that the Manning Program alumni are a special group of individuals. They have a shared sense of commitment to elders and demonstrate that commitment formally, through their employment, volunteer activities, or advocacy settings and informally, through their relationships with family members and friends. The program has exceeded its original goals by not only enhancing the knowledge base of those who volunteer and work within the aging network, but it has also served to enhance the skills of informal caregivers by increasing their gerontological knowledge base so that when challenges of aging are presented, they know where to turn for support and what steps to take toward resolution. In addition, the Manning alumni, by their own example, are leading highly productive lives and continue to make valuable contributions to their communities.

REFERENCES

- Bass, S. A., Caro, F. G., & Chen, Y-P. (1993). Introduction. In Bass, S. A., Caro, F. G., and Chen, Y-P. (Eds.), *Achieving a Productive Aging Society*. CT: Auburn House, p. 6.
- Bass, S. A., & Caro, F. G. (2001). Productive aging: A conceptual framework. In N. Morrow-Howell, J. Hinterlong, & M. Sherraden (Eds.), *Productive aging: Concepts and challenges* (pp. 37-78). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Bass, S. A., & Silverstein, N. M. (1996). Action-Research: A practical model to link teaching, research, and community service. *Metropolitan Universities*, 7(3): 85-94.
- Caro, F. G. (1999). *Training for Older People in Applied Social Research Methods*, Boston, MA: Gerontology Institute, University of Massachusetts Boston.
- Clubok, M.(2001). A Survey of Undergraduate Gerontology Certificate Students. *Gerontology & Geriatrics Education*, Vol. 21 (4)13-23.
- Covey, H. C. (1981). American higher education and older people. *Educational Gerontology*, v6 (373-381).
- Cross, K. P. (1977). *A Critical Review of State and National Studies on the Needs and Interests of Adult learners*. Paper presented at the National Institute of Education's Invitation Conference, Washington, DC, September 26-28, 1977.
- Graney, M. J. & Hays, W. C. (1976). Senior students: Higher education after age 62. *Educational Gerontology*, v1 (343-359).
- Havighurst, R. J. (1964). Changing status and roles during the adult life cycle: Significance for adult education. In H. Burnes (Ed.), *Sociological backgrounds for adult education*. Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults.
- Hiemstra, R. (1976). Older Adult learning: Instrumental and expressive categories. *Educational Gerontology*, v1(227-236).
- Kingston, A. J. (1982). The senior citizen as college student. *Educational Gerontology*, v8 (43-52).
- Manning Certificate Program (2002). Gerontology Institute, University of Massachusetts Boston web site, http://www.geront.umb.edu/historical_review.htm.
- Miller, B. (1997). The Quest for lifelong learning. *American Demographics*, v19, n3, p20(2).
- Moyer, I. & Lago, D. (1987). Institutional barriers to older learners in higher education. *Educational Gerontology*, v13 (157-169).

- O'Brien, J. (1996). "A new part of my life..." *Contributions of the Manning gerontology students*. Boston, MA: Gerontology Institute, University of Massachusetts Boston.
- O'Brien, J. & Norton, J. (1998). *The Gerontology Institute, University of Massachusetts Boston, 1994-1998*. Boston, MA: Gerontology Institute, University of Massachusetts Boston.
- O'Connor, D. M. (1987). Elders and higher education: Instrumental or expressive goals? *Educational Gerontology*, v12 (511-519).
- Perkins, H. V. & Robertson-Tchabo, E. A. (1981). Retiree return to college: An evaluative study at one university campus. *Educational Gerontology*, v6 (273-287).
- Peterson, D. A. (1981). Participation in education by older people. *Educational Gerontology*, v7 (245-256).
- Romaniuk, J. & Romaniuk, M. (1982). Participation motives and experiences of older adults in an undergraduate classroom: The Elderhostel experience. *Gerontologist*, 22 (362-368).
- Seftel, J. (1994). "OLD WARRIOR - Frank Manning and the Senior Power Movement," 28 min. video, Arlington, MA: Seftel Productions, http://www.seftel.com/films_old.html.
- Silverstein, N. M., Choi, L. H. & Bulot, J. (2001). Older Learners on Campus. *Gerontology & Geriatrics Education*, Vol. 22 (1).
- Silverstein, N. M., Choi, L. H., & Bulot, J. (2000). *Older Learners in Higher Education: Their Motivations, Barriers, and Expectations*. Boston, MA: Gerontology Institute, University of Massachusetts Boston.
- Silverstein, N. M., Moorhead, J., & Murtha, J. (2002). Action-research in Gerontology: Faculty, student, and community partner perspectives. *Gerontology & Geriatrics Education*, Vol. 22(3) 11-32.
- Ziernike, K. (1999). U. S. colleges putting on an older face, with help from Net. *Boston Globe*, August 31, 1999, p. A1.

Appendix A: Original Objectives for the Gerontology Training Program

Objective I: To establish a comprehensive career development and preparation program concentrating on policy formulation and implementation aspects of health, legal, employment, and social services as they relate to elderly.

Sub-Objectives:

- Development of a modular learning structure for beginning students
- Development of a modular learning structure for advanced students

Objective II: To recruit and integrate urban, poor, and ethnic elderly as participants and resources in the program.

Sub-Objectives:

- Identification of populations and establishment of recruitment systems
- Integration of elderly as participants and resources

Objective III: To expand the current CPCS structure to build institutional acceptance and support for the program.

Sub-Objectives:

- Establishment of in-service training for faculty and support staff
- Reorganization of existing courses
- Creation of new courses and curricular materials

Objective IV: To identify information on existing and emerging career opportunities in both the public and private sectors that are appropriate to the field of aging.

Sub-Objectives:

- Development and update of current career opportunities
- Identification of potential career opportunities
- Establishment of Information Network and publication through DES

Objective V: To examine the inter-related roles of training institutions, service providers, and service recipients in determining social policy and its impact on the quality of life for urban, poor, and minority elders.

Sub-objectives:

- Identification of one or more impact sites and indicators for use by practitioners and faculty
- Application of indicator and assessment of data over time.

Appendix B: Geographic distribution of Manning Alumni (N=601)

Abington	1	Holbrook	1
Acton	1	Holliston	2
Arlington	6	Hull	7
Athol	2	Humarock	1
Ayer	1	Hyde Park	8
Bedford	2	Ipswich	2
Belmont	4	Jamaica Plain	6
Beverly	1	Kingston	1
Boston	26	Lenox	1
Braintree	12	Lexington	8
Brant Rock	1	Lincoln	1
Brewster	1	Lowell	2
Bridgewater	2	Lynn	5
Brighton	3	Malden	3
Brockton	3	Marblehead	4
Brookline	9	Marlboro	1
Burlington	1	Marshfield	11
Cambridge	17	Mashpee	2
Canton	6	Mattapan	5
Centerville	1	Maynard	1
Charlestown	2	Medford	7
Chelmsford	3	Melrose	1
Chelsea	1	Methuen	1
Cohasset	4	Middleboro	1
Concord	6	Milford	1
Cotuit	1	Milton	23
Dedham	7	Montague	1
Dennisport	1	N. Reading	1
Dorchester	14	N. Scituate	1
Dover	1	N. Weymouth	1
Duxbury	4	N. Andover	1
E. Weymouth	1	N. Attleboro	2
East Walpole	1	N. Chelmsford	1
Eastham	1	N. Eastham	1
Easton	3	N. Marshfield	1
Everett	2	N. Weymouth	1
Framingham	4	Natick	4
Green Harbor	1	Needham	8
Hanover	5	New Bedford	1
Hingham	14	Newton	18
North Dennis	1	Winchester	1
Norfolk	2	Winthrop	6

Norton	1	Woburn	5
Norwell	2	Wollaston	4
Norwood	9	Worcester	1
Onset	1	Wrentham	3
Osterville	1		
Peabody	6	Out-of-state	
Pembroke	2	Arizona	1
Plymouth	3	California	1
Quincy	30	Colorado	1
Randolph	12	Connecticut	1
Reading	1	Florida	2
Revere	5	Georgia	1
Rockland	3	Nevada	1
Roslindale	3	Illinois	1
Roxbury	6	JAPAN	1
Rutland	1	Maine	3
S. Weymouth	5	New Hampshire	1
Salem	2	North Carolina	3
Sandwich	1	New York	1
Scituate	7	Tennessee	1
Sharon	2	Vermont	2
Somerville	9	Virginia	1
South Yarmouth	1	Washington State	2
Springfield	4		
Stoneham	1		
Stoughton	2		
Sudbury	1		
Swampscott	4		
Taunton	1		
Upton	1		
Walpole	1		
Waltham	10		
Wareham	1		
Watertown	7		
Wellesley	3		
West Roxbury	8		
Westford	1		
Westminister	1		
Weston	1		
Westwood	2		
Weymouth	9		
Whitman	2		
Wilmington	1		