

Seniors Working Group Survey

LIONSVIEW SENIORS' PLANNING SOCIETY

Thanks goes to the West Vancouver
Foundation for funding the Seniors Working
Group



**WEST VANCOUVER
FOUNDATION**

Summary

Format

- ❖ Lionsview Seniors Planning Society put out a survey for the Seniors Working Group, to reflect on the past year and a half.
- ❖ 8 respondents
- ❖ 13 questions

Question 1

“How Long Have you been a member of the SWG?”

Question Style: Short Answer

Number of Respondents: 8

Responses:

- ❖ Membership spanned consistently from the beginning of the group to joining 4 months prior to the survey.

Question 2

“How strongly do you feel that the participants in the Working Group represented the diversity of organizations on the North Shore.”

Question Style: Scale 1 to 10.

Number of Respondents: 8

Responses:

- ❖ 1 (12.5%) respondent selected “10”.
- ❖ 5 (62.5%) people chose “9”.
- ❖ 2 (25%) people selected “8”.
- ❖ The average response was 8.875, and the median response 9.

Question 3

“What have you found most useful about the Working Group?”

Question Style: Multiple Selection, with a comment section.

Number of Respondents: 8

Responses:

- ❖ 7 (87.5%) of people selected “Collaborating with other organizations”.
- ❖ 7 (87.5%) selected “Information sharing”.
- ❖ 7 (87.5%) also selected “Sharing of ideas and resources.”
- ❖ 6 (75%) selected “Problem-solving issues and concerns”.
- ❖ 5 (62.5%) people choose “Networking”.
- ❖ 3 (37.5%) indicated “Presentations.”
- ❖ Respondents appreciated staying informed, having the knowledge to refer clients, sharing information to create protocols and getting information on in-person programming.

Question 4

“Rate the overall effectiveness of the Working Group.”

Question Style: Scale 1 to 10.

Number of Respondents: 7

Responses:

- ❖ 5 (71.4%) respondents selected “9”
- ❖ 2 (28.6%) choose “8”.
- ❖ The average response was 8.71, and the median response was 9.

Question 5

“How effective did you find the Working Group in supporting organizations adapt programs and services to Covid-19?”

Question Style: Scale 1 to 10.

Number of Respondents: 8

Responses:

- ❖ 1 (12.5%) respondent selected “10”.
- ❖ 3 (37.5%) people chose “9”.
- ❖ 3 (37.5%) selected “8”.
- ❖ 1 (12.5%) respondent selected “7”.
- ❖ The mean (average) and the median were both 8.5

Question 6

“Rate the quality of the guest presentations.”

Question Style: Scale 1 to 10.

Number of Respondents: 8

Responses:

- ❖ 4 (50%) respondents selected “9”.
- ❖ 3 (37.5%) people chose “8”.
- ❖ 1 (12.5%) person selected “5”.
- ❖ The mean (average) response was 8.125, and the median was 8.5.

Question 7

“Please comment on any presentation topics you would like to see moving forward.”

Question Style: Long Answer.

Number of Respondents: 1

Responses:

- ❖ Suggestions included, supporting seniors during extreme heat, and having emergency preparedness updates.

Question 8

“Would you be interested in continuing the Working Group moving forward?”

Question Style: “Yes, No, Maybe”

Number of Respondents: 8

Responses:

- ❖ 5 (62.5%) people selected “yes”.
- ❖ 3 (37.5%) respondents indicated “maybe”.
- ❖ No respondents indicated “no”, suggesting a is support to continue the SWG in the future.

Question 9

“Moving forward, would you prefer the Working Group focus on a different topic collectively (ex. multiculturalism) or take a broader approach? ”

Question Style: Sliding scale between Focused Approach (1) and Broad Approach (10)

Number of Respondents: 8

Responses:

- ❖ 1 (12.5%) respondent selected “10”.
- ❖ 2 (25%) people choose “8”, “7” and “6” respectively.
- ❖ 1 (12.5%) person chose “4”.
- ❖ The median response was “7”, indicating that there is a fairly strong preference towards a broad approach.

Question 10

“If the Seniors Working Group chose to focus on a new topic, what topics do you think should be considered. Please list below.”

Question Style: Long Answer

Number of Respondents: 5

Responses:

- ❖ General feedback, included staying broad, but taking on specific topics as needed.
- ❖ Supporting multicultural seniors
- ❖ Supporting transitions for those who have declined cognitively/physically during the pandemic.
- ❖ LGTBQ+ seniors needs, how to effectively track statistics and perform impact measurement.
- ❖ Reaching isolated seniors

Question 11

“Moving forward if the Working Group continues, what type of meeting style would you prefer?”

Question Style: Multiple choice,
“Zoom, in-person, hybrid,
alternating with other option”

Number of Respondents: 8

Responses:

- ❖ 5 (62.5%) respondents indicated they would prefer “Zoom,”.
- ❖ 2 (25%) indicated they would like “hybrid.”
- ❖ Other feedback included having quarterly in-person meetings that would focus on networking, in addition to the regular Zoom meetings.

Question 12

“Moving forward, how frequently would you prefer the Working Group meet?”

Question Style: Multiple Choice, “Bi-weekly, monthly, quarterly, with other option”

Number of Respondents: 8

Responses:

- ❖ 5 (62.5%) respondents indicated they would prefer meeting monthly.
- ❖ 2 (25%) responded they preferred quarterly.
- ❖ 1(12.5%) person wrote they preferred meeting every second month.

Question 13

“Please use the space for any final comments, including feedback on improving the Working Group”

Question Style: Long Answer

Number of Respondents: 4

Responses:

- ❖ Several people commented they appreciated the information dissemination and problem-solving.
- ❖ Respondents also commented there should be more differentiating the Seniors Coalition and SWG
- ❖ One respondent indicated that the Seniors Coalition and SWG could be combined.

Conclusion

- ❖ Feedback was positive overall
- ❖ Questions asking people to rate an aspect of the SWG from 1 to 10, had a mean (average) over "8".
- ❖ Respondents indicated an interest in continuing the SWG in the future and having a broad approach.
- ❖ The average response suggested that meetings should occur monthly and be held over Zoom.