

# APPENDICES

## Supplement to Report

### 2015 Profile of the OACAO's Member Centres and an Examination of Evaluation Capacity

**Report Prepared by: C.L. Sheppard, A.M. Myers, L. Dubé**  
School of Public Health & Health Systems, University of Waterloo

**Prepared for the Older Adult Centres' Association of Ontario**

With support from the Ontario's Ministry of Citizenship, Immigration and  
International Trade, Partnership Grant Program

**OACAO**

The Voice of Older Adult Centres  
La voix des centres pour aînés



**March 31, 2016**

## Table of Contents

<b>Appendix A: Sample Representativeness .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Appendix B: General Characteristics of Centres .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Appendix C: Funding and Participant Fees.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Appendix D: Programs, Services, and Facilities.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Appendix E: Issues Faced by Centres .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Appendix F: Use of OACAO Resources.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Appendix G: Methods of Soliciting Participant Feedback .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Appendix H: Planning &amp; Decision Making.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Appendix I: Evaluation Confidence, Concerns, and Beliefs .....</b>	<b>27</b>

## Appendix A: Sample Representativeness

Significance level for all comparisons are reported at the bottom of each table; significant relationships are bolded and shown with an asterisk.

*Table 1. Regional Comparisons of the MPS Respondents, Non-Respondents and Full OACAO Membership*

Region	Full Membership			Associate Members		
	2015 MPS Respondents (n=60)	OACAO Full Members <sup>1</sup> (n=116)	Invited Full Members (n=100)	2015 MPS Respondents (n=11)	OACAO Associate Members <sup>1</sup> (n=37)	Invited Associate Members (n=26)
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
EST	11 (18.3)	18 (15.5)	17 (17.0)	2 (18.2)	5 (13.5)	4 (15.4)
CEN	9 (15.0)	14 (12.1)	13 (13.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (2.7)	1 (3.8)
MTO	9 (15.0)	21 (18.1)	18 (18.0)	6 (54.5)	13 (35.1)	8 (30.8)
GH	10 (16.7)	24 (20.7)	17 (17.0)	1 (9.1)	8 (21.6)	4 (15.4)
GR	5 (8.3)	14 (12.1)	13 (13.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (5.4)	2 (7.7)
SW	9 (15.0)	13 (11.2)	11 (11.0)	1 (9.1)	2 (5.4)	2 (7.7)
NW	5 (8.3)	8 (6.9)	8 (8.0)	1 (9.1)	5 (13.5)	5 (19.2)
NC	2 (3.3)	4 (3.4)	3 (3.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (2.7)	0 (0.0)

<sup>1</sup> According to the OACAO's membership directory of as August 2015.

EST = Eastern; CEN = Central; MTO = Metro; GH = Golden Horseshoe; GR = Grand River; SW = South Western; NW = North Western; NC = North Centre.

*Table 2. Proportion of Municipal and Not-For-Profit Centres by Response Status*

	Respondents (n=67)		Non-Respondents (n=42)	
	n	%	n	%
<b>Not-For-Profit</b>	41	61.2	22	52.4
<b>Municipal</b>	26	38.8	20	47.6

Proportion of municipal versus not-for-profit centres did not differ between respondents and non-respondents ( $p > .3$ ).

*Table 3. Proportion of Elderly Person Centres by Response Status*

	Respondents (n=71)		Non-Respondents (n=45)	
	n	%	n	%
<b>Not an Elderly Person Centre</b>	17	23.9	10	22.2
<b>Elderly Person Centre</b>	54	76.1	35	77.8

Proportion of EPCs did not differ between respondents and non-respondents ( $p > .8$ ).

*Table 4. Average Size of Centres (Number of Members) by Response Status*

	<b>Respondents (n=58)</b>	<b>Non-Respondents (n=36)</b>
<b>Average</b>	909.43	1098.61
<b>Standard Deviation</b>	1186.31	1496.31
<b>Median</b>	560	613
<b>Range (min – max)</b>	60 - 7114	37 - 8000

Average number of members did not differ between respondents and non-respondents ( $p > .4$ ).

*Table 5. Proportion of Small, Medium and Large Centres by Response Status*

	<b>Respondents (n=58)</b>		<b>Non-Respondents (n=36)</b>	
	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Small (<math>\leq 300</math> members)</b>	19	32.8	11	30.6
<b>Medium (301 – 100 members)</b>	21	36.2	15	41.7
<b>Large (<math>&gt; 1000</math> members)</b>	18	31.0	10	27.8

Proportion of small, medium and large centres did not differ did not differ between respondents and non-respondents ( $p > .8$ ).

## Appendix B: General Characteristics of Centres

Significance level for all comparisons are reported at the bottom of each table; significant relationships are bolded and shown with an asterisk.

Table 1: Operational Characteristics of Municipal and Not-for-Profit Centres

		Mean	SD	Median	Range
<b>Age of Centre (years)</b>	<i>Municipal (n=25)</i>	20.1	10.3	27.5	4 - 48
	<i>Not-For-Profit (n=47)</i>	33.0	15.1	32.5	3 - 63
<b>Days Open Per Week</b>	<i>Municipal (n=25)</i>	5.8	0.9	6	5 - 7
	<i>Not-For-Profit (n=47)</i>	5.7	0.9	6	4 - 7
<b>Days Open Per Year</b>	<i>Municipal (n=25)</i>	288.7	48.7	300	176 - 365
	<i>Not-For-Profit (n=47)</i>	297.8	44.4	299.5	200 - 365
<b>Number of Full-Time Staff</b>	<i>Municipal (n=26)</i>	2.4	1.9	2	0 - 7
	<i>Not-For-Profit (n=45)</i>	3.1	4.3	2	0 - 27
<b>Number of Part-Time Staff</b>	<i>Municipal (n=27)</i>	3.2	3.2	2	0 - 10
	<i>Not-For-Profit (n=45)</i>	3.3	4.0	2	0 - 15
<b>Number of Paid Instructors</b>	<i>Municipal (n=26)</i>	13.1	9.8	10	0 - 40
	<i>Not-For-Profit (n=47)</i>	9.7	15.6	4	0 - 85
<b>Number of Volunteers</b>	<i>Municipal (n=23)</i>	124.0	80.1	114	30 - 325
	<i>Not-For-Profit (n=46)</i>	157.5	139.5	111.5	10 - 730
<b>Volunteer Hours</b>	<i>Municipal (n=22)</i>	12,679.1	9937.2	8976	1600 - 40,000
	<i>Not-For-Profit (n=48)</i>	13,991.5	17,798.2	6320	400 - 70,000
<b>Number of Members</b>	<i>Municipal (n=19)</i>	913.2	890.2	815	60 - 4000
	<i>Not-For-Profit (n=41)</i>	887.4	1271.2	550	142 - 7115

Municipal and NFP centres did not differ on age of centre ( $p > .2$ ), number of days open per week ( $p > .7$ ) or per year ( $p > .4$ ), the number of full-time staff ( $p > .4$ ), part-time staff ( $p > .8$ ) or paid instructors ( $p > .3$ ), the number of volunteers ( $p > .2$ ) or volunteer hours ( $p > .7$ ), or the average number of members ( $p > .2$ ).

Table 2. Proportional Size and Stand-Alone Status for Municipal and Not-for-Profit Centres

	Municipal		Not-For-Profit	
	n	%	n	%
<b>Small (1 – 300 members)</b>	6	31.6	15	36.6
<b>Medium (301-1000 members)</b>	6	31.6	14	34.1
<b>Large (1000+ members)</b>	7	36.8	12	29.3
<b>Stand-Alone</b>	9	33.3	20	42.6
<b>Not Stand-Alone</b>	18	66.7	27	57.4

Proportional size ( $p > .8$ ) and stand-alone status ( $p > .4$ ) did not differ between municipal and not-for-profit centres

Table 3. Operational Characteristics of Stand-Alone and Not Stand-Alone Centres

		Mean	SD	Median	Range
Age of Centre (years)*	Not Stand-Alone (n=47)	28.3	12.7	28.5	3 – 61
	Stand-Alone (n=30)	35.4	13.5	35	16 – 63
Days Open Per Week	Not Stand-Alone (n=47)	5.68	0.84	5	5 – 7
	Stand-Alone (n=30)	5.87	0.90	6	4 - 7
Days Open Per Year	Not Stand-Alone (n=46)	290.2	46.21	294	180 – 365
	Stand-Alone (n=30)	297.6	49.54	300	176 – 365
Number of Full-Time Staff	Not Stand-Alone (n=47)	2.35	2.44	1.5	0 – 12
	Stand-Alone (n=30)	3.77	4.96	3	0 – 27
Number of Part-Time Staff	Not Stand-Alone (n=47)	3.85	8.37	2	0 – 57
	Stand-Alone (n=30)	4.41	4.81	2	0 – 15
Number of Paid Instructors	Not Stand-Alone (n=47)	9.63	11.43	6.5	0 – 50
	Stand-Alone (n=30)	14.03	18.29	10	0 – 85
Number of Volunteers	Not Stand-Alone (n=47)	135.7	145.30	100	10 – 730
	Stand-Alone (n=30)	175.9	110.42	156	12 – 500
Volunteer Hours	Not Stand-Alone (n=47)	10,922.5	14,653.5	5540	400 – 70,000
	Stand-Alone (n=30)	16,740.8	15,050.2	16,000	1000 – 58,516
Number of Members*	Not Stand-Alone (n=47)	682.5	813.2	380	120 – 4800
	Stand-Alone (n=30)	1189.1	1458.1	909	60 – 7115

Stand-alone and not stand-alone centres did not differ in the number of days open per week ( $p > .3$ ) or per year ( $p > .5$ ), the number of full-time ( $p > .1$ ), part-time ( $p > .7$ ) staff or paid instructors ( $p > .1$ ), the number of volunteers ( $p > .2$ ) or volunteer hours ( $p > .1$ ). **Stand-alone centres were older ( $p = .033$ ) and tended to have more members ( $p = .080$ ).**

Table 4. Proportion of Small, Medium and Large Centres by Stand-Alone Status

	Not Stand-Alone (n=38)		Stand-Alone (n=26)	
	n	%	n	%
Small (1 – 300 members)	16	42.1	7	26.9
Medium (301-1000 members)	15	39.5	6	23.1
Large (1000+ members)*	7	18.4	13	50.0

**Stand-alone centres were more likely to have 1000+ members ( $p = .028$ ).**

Table 5. Operational Characteristics of Small, Medium, and Large Centres

		Mean	SD	Median	Range
<b>Age of Centre (years)</b>	<i>Small (n=23)</i>	27.3	12.3	27	4 – 50
	<i>Medium (n=20)</i>	29.9	13.1	29	3 – 61
	<i>Large (n=20)</i>	35.3	12.7	35	18 – 61
<b>Days Open Per Week*</b>	<i>Small (n=23)</i>	5.43	0.73	5	4 – 7
	<i>Medium (n=20)</i>	5.65	0.81	5	5 – 7
	<i>Large (n=20)</i>	6.14	0.93	6.5	5 – 7
<b>Days Open Per Year</b>	<i>Small (n=22)</i>	277.3	51.8	275	180 – 365
	<i>Medium (n=20)</i>	290.8	40.6	293	205 – 350
	<i>Large (n=20)</i>	303.0	49.9	306	176 – 364
<b>Number of Full-Time Staff*</b>	<i>Small (n=23)</i>	0.82	0.80	1	0 – 3
	<i>Medium (n=20)</i>	2.16	1.42	2	0 – 5
	<i>Large (n=20)</i>	5.65	5.49	3.5	2 – 27
<b>Number of Part-Time Staff*</b>	<i>Small (n=23)</i>	1.32	1.52	1	0 – 5
	<i>Medium (n=20)</i>	2.81	3.66	2	0 – 15
	<i>Large (n=20)</i>	5.85	4.79	4.5	0 – 15
<b>Number of Paid Instructors*</b>	<i>Small (n=23)</i>	4.22	4.28	3	0 – 15
	<i>Medium (n=20)</i>	9.85	12.44	7	0 – 47
	<i>Large (n=20)</i>	23.26	20.97	17	2 – 85
<b>Number of Volunteers*</b>	<i>Small (n=23)</i>	60	42.40	52	10 – 200
	<i>Medium (n=20)</i>	141.5	58.91	112	35 – 287
	<i>Large (n=20)</i>	258.7	159.85	184	100 – 730
<b>Volunteer Hours*</b>	<i>Small (n=23)</i>	4366.9	5222.7	2800	400 – 22,000
	<i>Medium (n=20)</i>	12,876.2	9027.6	10,243	800 – 28,500
	<i>Large (n=20)</i>	26,375.5	21,810.4	20,311.5	1802 – 70,000
<b>Number of Members*</b>	<i>Small (n=23)</i>	213.3	61.8	220	60 – 300
	<i>Medium (n=20)</i>	626.2	203.9	600	350 – 920
	<i>Large (n=20)</i>	1939.7	1566.7	1284	1003 – 7115

Size of centre was not associated with age of centre ( $p > .1$ ) or days open per year ( $p > .2$ ). **All other variables were significant (see section 3.3.1 in the report).**

## Appendix C: Funding and Participant Fees

The following tables show the breakdowns according to centre type, size and stand-alone status. Only variables where significant differences emerged between the groups are shown.

Table 1. Centre Funding Sources

		No		Yes	
		n	%	n	%
<b>Senior Community Grants</b>	<i>Small (n=23)</i>	16	69.6	7	30.4
	<i>Medium (n=21)</i>	17	81.0	4	19.0
	<i>Large (n=20)</i>	9	45.0	11	55.0
<b>EPC Special Grants</b>	<i>Small (n=23)</i>	11	47.8	12	52.2
	<i>Medium (n=21)</i>	3	14.3	18	85.7
	<i>Large (n=20)</i>	3	15.0	17	85.0
<b>New Horizons</b>	<i>NFP (n=47)</i>	24	51.1	23	48.9
	<i>Municipal (n=27)</i>	20	74.1	7	25.9
<b>Canada Summer Jobs</b>	<i>NFP (n=47)</i>	27	57.4	20	42.6
	<i>Municipal (n=27)</i>	25	92.6	2	7.4
	<i>Not Stand-Alone (n=49)</i>	40	81.6	9	18.4
	<i>Stand-Alone (n=30)</i>	17	56.7	13	43.3
	<i>Small (n=23)</i>	21	91.3	2	8.7
	<i>Medium (n=21)</i>	14	66.7	7	33.3
<b>In-Kind Donations</b>	<i>Large (n=20)</i>	10	50.0	10	50.0
	<i>Not Stand-Alone (n=49)</i>	30	61.2	19	38.8
	<i>Stand-Alone (n=30)</i>	12	40.0	18	60.0
<b>Sponsorship</b>	<i>Not Stand-Alone (n=49)</i>	35	71.4	12	40.0
	<i>Stand-Alone (n=30)</i>	14	28.6	18	60.0
	<i>Small (n=23)</i>	17	73.9	6	26.1
	<i>Medium (n=21)</i>	11	52.4	10	47.6
<b>Fundraising</b>	<i>Large (n=20)</i>	8	40.0	12	60.0
	<i>NFP (n=47)</i>	11	23.4	36	76.6
	<i>Municipal (n=27)</i>	13	48.1	14	51.9
	<i>Not Stand-Alone (n=49)</i>	21	42.9	28	57.1
	<i>Stand-Alone (n=30)</i>	5	16.7	25	83.3



Table 2. Fiscal Year

	Apr 1 – Mar 31		Jan 1 – Dec 31	
	n	%	n	%
Not-for-profit (n=47)	35	74.5	12	25.5
Municipal (n=26)	2	7.7	24	92.3
Stand-Alone (n=30)	13	43.3	17	56.7
Not Stand-Alone (n=48)	27	56.3	21	43.8
Small (n=23)	14	60.9	9	39.1
Medium (n=21)	11	52.4	10	47.6
Large (n=20)	9	45.0	11	55.0

Table 3. Annual Membership Fee Structure

	Fee is the Same		Fee Varies	
	n	%	n	%
Not-for-profit (n=44)	35	81.4	8	18.6
Municipal (n=23)	10	45.5	12	54.5
Small (n=20)	15	75.0	5	25.0
Medium (n=21)	18	85.7	3	14.3
Large (n=19)	10	52.6	9	47.4

## Appendix D: Programs, Services, and Facilities

The following tables show the breakdowns according to centre type, size and stand-alone status. Only variables where significant differences emerged between the groups are shown.

Table 1. Programming Features

		No		Yes	
		n	%	n	%
<b>Offer Night Programs</b>	<i>NFP (n=47)</i>	18	38.3	29	61.7
	<i>Municipal (n=27)</i>	2	7.4	25	92.6
	<i>Small (n=23)</i>	13	56.5	10	43.5
	<i>Medium (n=21)</i>	4	19.0	17	81.0
	<i>Large (n=20)</i>	2	10.0	19	90.0
<b>Offer Weekend Programs</b>	<i>Not Stand-Alone (n=49)</i>	21	42.9	28	57.1
	<i>Stand-Alone (n= 30)</i>	7	23.3	23	76.7
	<i>Small (n=23)</i>	13	56.5	10	43.5
	<i>Medium (n=21)</i>	6	28.6	15	71.4
	<i>Large (n=20)</i>	5	25.0	15	75.0
<b>Offer Programs in Other Languages<sup>1</sup></b>	<i>NFP (n=47)</i>	34	72.3	13	27.7
	<i>Municipal (n=27)</i>	26	96.3	1	3.7

<sup>1</sup> Offer programs in languages other than English and French

Table 3. Programs and Activities Offered at Centres

		No		Yes	
		n	%	n	%
<b>Indoor Physical Activities</b>	<i>NFP (n=46)</i>	27	58.7	19	41.3
	<i>Municipal (n=27)</i>	9	33.3	18	66.7
	<i>Small (n=22)</i>	16	72.7	6	27.3
	<i>Medium (n=21)</i>	9	42.9	12	57.1
	<i>Large (n=20)</i>	6	30.0	14	70.0
<b>Outdoor Physical Activities</b>	<i>Small (n=23)</i>	14	60.9	9	39.1
	<i>Medium (n=21)</i>	9	42.9	12	57.1
	<i>Large (n=20)</i>	3	15.0	17	85.0
<b>Night Trips</b>	<i>Small (n=23)</i>	19	82.6	4	17.4
	<i>Medium (n=21)</i>	11	52.4	10	47.6
	<i>Large (n=20)</i>	11	55.0	9	45.0
<b>Intergenerational Programs</b>	<i>Small (n=23)</i>	17	73.9	6	26.1
	<i>Medium (n=21)</i>	8	38.1	13	61.9
	<i>Large (n=20)</i>	7	35.0	13	65.0

		No		Yes	
		n	%	n	%
<b>Ethno-cultural Programs</b>	<i>NFP (n=47)</i>	29	61.7	18	38.3
	<i>Municipal (n=27)</i>	24	88.9	3	11.1
	<i>Small (n=23)</i>	17	73.9	6	26.1
	<i>Medium (n=21)</i>	17	81.0	4	19.0
	<i>Large (n=20)</i>	8	40.0	12	60.0

Table 4. On-Site Services Provided by Centre

		No		Yes	
		n	%	n	%
<b>Foot care</b>	<i>Small (n=23)</i>	16	69.6	7	30.4
	<i>Medium (n=21)</i>	7	33.3	14	66.7
	<i>Large (n=20)</i>	3	15.0	17	85.0
<b>Hearing Clinic</b>	<i>Not Stand-Alone (n=49)</i>	34	69.4	15	30.6
	<i>Stand-Alone (n=30)</i>	15	50.0	15	50.0
	<i>Small (n=23)</i>	18	78.3	5	21.7
	<i>Medium (n=21)</i>	15	71.4	6	28.6
	<i>Large (n=20)</i>	6	30.0	14	70.0
<b>Blood Pressure Clinic</b>	<i>Small (n=23)</i>	18	78.3	5	21.7
	<i>Medium (n=21)</i>	12	57.1	9	42.9
	<i>Large (n=20)</i>	8	40.0	12	60.0
<b>Alternative Health Care</b>	<i>NFP (n=47)</i>	31	66.0	16	34.0
	<i>Municipal (n=27)</i>	24	88.9	3	11.1
<b>Falls Prevention</b>	<i>NFP (n=47)</i>	17	36.2	30	63.8
	<i>Municipal (n=27)</i>	21	77.8	6	22.2

Table 3. On-Site Support Services Provided by Centres

		No		Yes	
		n	%	n	%
<b>Friendly Visiting</b>	<i>NFP (n=47)</i>	33	70.2	14	29.8
	<i>Municipal (n=27)</i>	25	92.6	2	7.4
<b>Falls Prevention</b>	<i>NFP (n=47)</i>	31	66.0	16	11.4
	<i>Municipal (n=27)</i>	25	92.6	2	7.3
<b>Transportation</b>	<i>NFP (n=47)</i>	30	63.8	17	36.2
	<i>Municipal (n=27)</i>	24	88.9	3	11.1
	<i>Not Stand-Alone (n=48)</i>	40	83.3	8	16.7
	<i>Stand-Alone (n=30)</i>	17	56.7	13	43.3
	<i>Small (n=23)</i>	18	78.3	5	21.7
	<i>Medium (n=20)</i>	17	85.0	3	15.0
	<i>Large (n=20)</i>	9	45.0	11	55.0

## Appendix E: Issues Faced by Centres

The following tables show the breakdowns of the mean concern level for all issues faced by centres according to position, centre type, stand-alone status, and size. Significance level for all comparisons are reported at the bottom of each table; significant relationships are bolded and shown with an asterisk. For all tables, “Board/ED/Manager” signifies individuals who identified their position as board of directors, executive director or manager; “Mun” signifies municipal centres; “NFP” signifies not-for-profit centres; “Small” signifies centres with 1 – 300 members; “Med” signifies medium centres with 301 – 1000 members, and “Large” signifies centres with 1000+ members.

Table 1. Sustaining Core Funding

	Position		Stand-Alone*		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=51)	Program Coordinator (n=18)	Yes (n=30)	No (n=45)	Mun. (n=26)	NFP (n=44)	Small (n=22)	Med. (n=21)	Large (n=19)
Mean	3.10	2.67	3.13	2.93	2.65	3.23	3.05	2.81	3.21
SD	1.14	1.41	1.01	1.32	1.39	1.08	1.17	1.44	0.86

Mean concern did not differ by position ( $p > .1$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .4$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .5$ ). **Mean concern higher for NFP centres ( $p = .077$ ).**

Table 2. Obtaining Capital Improvement Funds

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=50)	Program Coordinator (n=13)	Yes (n=28)	No (n=40)	Mun. (n=26)	NFP (n=40)	Small (n=19)	Med. (n=18)	Large (n=20)
Mean	2.96	2.85	3.11	2.88	2.73	3.13	2.58	2.17	3.10
SD	1.16	1.35	1.20	1.16	1.25	1.14	1.35	0.79	1.21

Mean concern did not differ by position ( $p > .7$ ), type of centre ( $p > .1$ ). stand-alone status ( $p > .4$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .2$ ).

Table 3: Obtaining Core Funding.

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type*		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=51)	Program Coordinator (n=18)	Yes (n=28)	No (n=47)	Mun. (n=26)	NFP (n=44)	Small (n=22)	Med. (n=21)	Large (n=19)
Mean	3.00	2.61	3.07	2.87	2.42	3.34	3.14	2.71	3.05
SD	1.28	1.42	1.18	1.39	1.42	1.10	1.02	1.52	1.13

Mean concern did not differ by position ( $p > .2$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .5$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .5$ ). **Mean concern higher for NFP centres ( $p = .007$ ).**

Table 4. Securing Cash Donations

	Position		Stand-Alone*		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=50)	Program Coordinator (n=14)	Yes (n=27)	No (n=42)	Mun. (n=21)	NFP (n=44)	Small (n=19)	Med. (n=20)	Large (n=19)
Mean	2.74	3.00	3.15	2.57	2.57	2.95	2.68	3.00	2.68
SD	1.24	1.47	1.17	1.31	1.36	1.20	1.25	1.34	1.46

Mean concern did not differ by position ( $p > .5$ ), type of centre ( $p > .2$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .7$ ).  
**Mean concern higher for stand-alone centres ( $p = .067$ ).**

Table 5. Obtaining One-Time Funding

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type*		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=49)	Program Coordinator (n=16)	Yes (n=28)	No (n=43)	Mun. (n=21)	NFP (n=45)	Small (n=19)	Med. (n=20)	Large (n=19)
Mean	2.61	2.56	2.57	2.67	2.13	2.89	2.84	2.50	2.63
SD	1.30	1.55	1.40	1.30	1.62	1.19	1.26	1.40	1.30

Mean concern did not differ by position ( $p > .9$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .7$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .7$ ).  
**Mean concern higher for NFP centres ( $p = .069$ ).**

Table 6. Securing In-Kind / Non-Cash Donations

	Position*		Stand-Alone		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=49)	Program Coordinator (n=14)	Yes (n=28)	No (n=41)	Mun. (n=22)	NFP (n=44)	Small (n=18)	Med. (n=21)	Large (n=19)
Mean	2.45	3.14	2.75	2.41	2.32	2.68	2.67	2.71	2.42
SD	1.23	1.17	1.32	1.18	1.13	1.25	1.24	1.23	1.43

Mean concern did not differ by type of centre ( $p > .2$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .2$ ), or size of centre ( $p > .7$ ).  
**Mean concern greater for program coordinators ( $p = .064$ ).**

Table 7. Space Within Centre for Programs

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=52)	Program Coordinator (n=18)	Yes (n=30)	No (n=46)	Mun. (n=25)	NFP (n=47)	Small (n=22)	Med. (n=21)	Large (n=20)
Mean	1.98	3.06	3.20	2.89	3.12	2.98	2.86	3.19	3.15
SD	1.21	1.51	1.16	1.32	1.24	1.24	1.21	1.47	0.99

Mean concern did not differ by position ( $p > .8$ ), type of centre ( $p > .6$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .2$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .6$ ).

Table 8. Maintenance or Repairs at Centre

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type*		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=49)	Program Coordinator (n=16)	Yes (n=27)	No (n=44)	Mun. (n=24)	NFP (n=44)	Small (n=20)	Med. (n=18)	Large (n=20)
Mean	2.65	2.31	2.56	2.64	2.04	2.91	2.55	2.78	2.85
SD	1.39	1.49	1.28	1.45	1.52	1.24	1.50	1.40	1.31

Mean concern did not differ by position ( $p > .4$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .8$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .7$ ). Mean concern level higher for NFP centres ( $p = .013$ ).

Table 9. Parking at/Near Centre

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=52)	Program Coordinator (n=17)	Yes (n=30)	No (n=45)	Mun. (n=25)	NFP (n=46)	Small (n=22)	Med. (n=21)	Large (n=20)
Mean	2.56	2.12	2.70	2.33	2.36	2.61	1.95	2.71	2.90
SD	1.50	1.69	1.37	1.62	1.50	1.55	1.59	1.74	1.33

Mean concern did not differ by position ( $p > .3$ ), type of centre ( $p > .5$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .2$ ), or size of centre ( $p > .1$ ).

Table 10. Upgrading Centre / Building in Which the Centre is Housed

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=50)	Program Coordinator (n=17)	Yes (n=29)	No (n=43)	Mun. (n=24)	NFP (n=44)	Small (n=22)	Med. (n=19)	Large (n=20)
Mean	2.32	1.94	2.28	2.28	2.00	2.36	1.86	2.74	2.60
SD	1.41	1.58	1.41	1.50	1.41	1.43	1.52	1.48	1.23

Mean concern did not differ by position ( $p > .3$ ), type of centre ( $p > .3$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .9$ ), or size of centre ( $p > .1$ ).

Table 11. Access to Public Transit

	Position*		Stand-Alone		Type		Size*		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=50)	Program Coordinator (n=15)	Yes (n=28)	No (n=42)	Mun. (n=23)	NFP (n=44)	Small (n=19)	Med. (n=19)	Large (n=20)
Mean	1.96	2.73	2.18	2.10	2.52	1.93	2.11	3.05	1.55
SD	1.48	1.58	1.59	1.46	1.38	1.55	1.49	1.31	1.43

Mean concern did not differ by type of centre ( $p > .1$ ) or stand-alone status ( $p > .8$ ). **Mean concern higher for program coordinators ( $p = .086$ ); medium centres more concerned than large centres ( $p = .004$ ).**

Table 12. Esthetic Appearance of the Centre

	Position		Stand-Alone*		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=51)	Program Coordinator (n=16)	Yes (n=29)	No (n=44)	Mun. (n=25)	NFP (n=44)	Small (n=22)	Med. (n=19)	Large (n=20)
Mean	1.98	1.94	2.45	1.75	1.96	2.07	1.91	2.58	2.15
SD	1.35	1.57	1.43	1.26	1.37	1.35	1.48	1.35	1.27

Mean concern did not differ by position ( $p > .9$ ), type of centre ( $p > .7$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .2$ ). **Mean concern level higher for stand-alone centres ( $p = .031$ ).**

Table 13. Space in the Centre for Holding Meetings

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=52)	Program Coordinator (n=17)	Yes (n=30)	No (n=44)	Mun. (n=25)	NFP (n=45)	Small (n=22)	Med. (n=20)	Large (n=20)
Mean	2.04	2.06	2.20	1.86	2.00	2.02	1.95	2.00	2.25
SD	1.36	1.52	1.38	1.37	1.32	1.44	1.33	1.52	1.21

Mean concern did not differ by position ( $p > .9$ ), type of centre ( $p > .9$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .3$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .7$ ).

Table 14. Covering Utility Costs

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type*		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=48)	Program Coordinator (n=13)	Yes (n=27)	No (n=39)	Mun. (n=23)	NFP (n=40)	Small (n=19)	Med. (n=18)	Large (n=19)
Mean	1.81	1.62	1.96	1.69	1.09	2.18	1.79	1.94	2.00
SD	1.44	1.76	1.51	1.44	1.16	1.48	1.55	1.63	1.49

Mean concern did not differ by position ( $p > .6$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .4$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .9$ ). **Mean concern level higher for NFP centre ( $p = .004$ ).**

Table 15. Accessibility of Centre

	Position*		Stand-Alone		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=49)	Program Coordinator (n=18)	Yes (n=29)	No (n=43)	Mun. (n=25)	NFP (n=43)	Small (n=20)	Med. (n=20)	Large (n=19)
Mean	1.45	2.28	1.97	1.51	1.64	1.67	1.75	1.95	1.58
SD	1.40	1.81	1.64	1.59	1.44	1.63	1.62	1.95	1.35

Mean concern did not differ by type of centre ( $p > .9$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .2$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .7$ ). **Mean concern level higher for program coordinators ( $p = .091$ ).**

Table 16. Finding Groups to Rent Space at the Centre When It's Not in Use

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=48)	Program Coordinator (n=11)	Yes (n=25)	No (n=40)	Mun. (n=22)	NFP (n=41)	Small (n=18)	Med. (n=18)	Large (n=18)
Mean	1.65	1.18	1.44	1.48	1.68	1.41	2.50	1.53	1.44
SD	1.51	1.40	1.33	1.57	1.43	1.50	1.54	1.65	1.38

Mean concern did not differ by position ( $p > .3$ ), type of centre ( $p > .4$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .9$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .9$ ).



Table 17. Attracting Program Volunteers

	Position		Stand-Alone*		Type		Size*		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=53)	Program Coordinator (n=18)	Yes (n=30)	No (n=46)	Mun. (n=26)	NFP (n=46)	Small (n=23)	Med. (n=20)	Large (n=20)
Mean	3.09	2.94	2.80	3.26	2.37	3.02	2.91	3.55	2.55
SD	1.10	1.31	1.16	1.06	0.96	1.15	1.08	0.76	1.36

Mean concern did not differ by position ( $p > .6$ ) or type of centre ( $p > .3$ ). **Mean concern level higher for stand-alone centers ( $p = .079$ ); medium centres were more concerned than large centres ( $p = .015$ ).**

Table 18. Getting People to Serve on Committees

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=53)	Program Coordinator (n=18)	Yes (n=30)	No (n=47)	Mun. (n=26)	NFP (n=46)	Small (n=23)	Med. (n=21)	Large (n=19)
Mean	2.91	2.83	3.00	2.89	3.08	2.89	2.70	3.38	2.68
SD	1.13	1.20	1.05	1.17	0.85	1.23	1.06	1.02	1.16

Mean concern did not differ by position ( $p > .8$ ), type of centre ( $p > .4$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .6$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .6$ ).

Table 19. Attracting / Paying Quality Instructors

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=48)	Program Coordinator (n=17)	Yes (n=28)	No (n=42)	Mun. (n=24)	NFP (n=43)	Small (n=19)	Med. (n=19)	Large (n=20)
Mean	2.98	2.76	3.04	2.86	2.96	2.98	3.16	3.00	2.55
SD	1.14	1.35	0.96	1.28	1.08	1.14	1.26	1.16	1.15

Mean concern did not differ by position ( $p > .5$ ), type of centre ( $p > .9$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .5$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .2$ ).

Table 20. Ability to Expand Offerings or Offer New Programs and Services

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=53)	Program Coordinator (n=18)	Yes (n=30)	No (n=47)	Mun. (n=25)	NFP (n=47)	Small (n=22)	Med. (n=21)	Large (n=20)
Mean	2.98	2.67	3.03	2.81	2.00	2.85	3.09	3.14	2.55
SD	1.08	1.41	1.13	1.28	1.08	1.27	1.02	1.28	1.19

Mean concern did not differ by position ( $p > .3$ ), type of centre ( $p > .6$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .4$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .2$ ).

Table 21. Ability (Time and Expertise) to Conduct Marketing

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=53)	Program Coordinator (n=18)	Yes (n=30)	No (n=47)	Mun. (n=22)	NFP (n=41)	Small (n=23)	Med. (n=21)	Large (n=20)
Mean	2.85	2.78	3.13	2.66	2.96	2.85	2.74	3.29	2.45
SD	1.26	1.26	1.01	1.40	1.14	1.32	1.60	1.15	1.10

Mean concern did not differ by position ( $p > .8$ ), type of centre ( $p > .7$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .1$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .1$ ).

Table 22. Ability (Time and Expertise) to Prepare Grant Applications

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=52)	Program Coordinator (n=17)	Yes (n=29)	No (n=46)	Mun. (n=23)	NFP (n=46)	Small (n=22)	Med. (n=21)	Large (n=20)
Mean	2.87	2.53	3.07	2.65	2.92	2.77	2.64	2.95	2.55
SD	1.34	1.70	1.25	1.54	1.38	1.49	1.71	1.56	1.28

Mean concern did not differ by position ( $p > .4$ ), type of centre ( $p > .6$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .2$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .6$ ).

Table 23. Level of Staffing

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=53)	Program Coordinator (n=16)	Yes (n=28)	No (n=46)	Mun. (n=25)	NFP (n=44)	Small (n=20)	Med. (n=20)	Large (n=20)
Mean	2.87	2.50	2.64	2.87	2.52	2.95	3.05	2.95	2.60
SD	1.24	1.46	1.34	1.29	1.19	1.36	1.19	1.50	1.10

Mean concern did not differ by position ( $p > .3$ ), type of centre ( $p > .1$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .4$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .5$ ).

Table 24. Ability (Time and Expertise) to Report to Funding Agencies

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=50)	Program Coordinator (n=17)	Yes (n=29)	No (n=44)	Mun. (n=25)	NFP (n=47)	Small (n=21)	Med. (n=21)	Large (n=20)
Mean	2.58	2.47	2.86	2.43	2.48	2.67	2.62	2.76	2.10
SD	1.42	1.66	1.43	1.50	1.47	1.49	1.77	1.51	1.33

Mean concern did not differ by position ( $p > .7$ ), type of centre ( $p > .6$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .2$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .3$ ).

Table 25. Securing Partners to Jointly Offer Programs/Services

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type		Size*		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=53)	Program Coordinator (n=18)	Yes (n=29)	No (n=46)	Mun. (n=24)	NFP (n=47)	Small (n=22)	Med. (n=20)	Large (n=20)
Mean	2.25	2.61	2.34	2.30	2.20	2.38	2.59	2.55	1.75
SD	1.25	1.42	1.17	1.40	1.35	1.28	1.30	1.28	1.37

Mean concern did not differ by position ( $p > .3$ ), type of centre ( $p > .5$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .8$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .07$ ).

Table 26. IT Support for Data Management / Analysis

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=52)	Program Coordinator (n=18)	Yes (n=28)	No (n=45)	Mun. (n=26)	NFP (n=43)	Small (n=21)	Med. (n=20)	Large (n=20)
Mean	2.42	2.06	2.29	2.31	2.12	1.40	2.29	2.55	1.95
SD	1.38	1.59	1.38	1.46	1.42	1.42	1.52	1.36	1.36

Mean concern did not differ by position ( $p > .3$ ), type of centre ( $p > .4$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .9$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .4$ ).

Table 27. Ability to Purchase Supplies

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=52)	Program Coordinator (n=18)	Yes (n=30)	No (n=46)	Mun. (n=25)	NFP (n=46)	Small (n=21)	Med. (n=21)	Large (n=20)
Mean	2.23	2.11	2.20	2.17	1.96	2.35	2.24	2.24	2.10
SD	1.34	1.45	1.16	1.51	1.37	1.39	1.38	1.58	1.21

Mean concern did not differ by position ( $p > .7$ ), type of centre ( $p > .2$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .9$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .9$ ).

Table 28. IT Support for Websites / Listservs

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=50)	Program Coordinator (n=16)	Yes (n=25)	No (n=42)	Mun. (n=26)	NFP (n=42)	Small (n=19)	Med. (n=20)	Large (n=28)
Mean	2.22	2.13	2.14	2.19	1.81	2.33	2.37	2.45	1.63
SD	1.46	1.54	1.41	1.49	1.42	1.44	1.53	1.47	1.26

Mean concern did not differ by position ( $p > .8$ ), type of centre ( $p > .1$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .8$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .1$ ).

Table 29. Attracting Younger Participants (i.e., Baby Boomers)

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=53)	Program Coordinator (n=18)	Yes (n=30)	No (n=47)	Mun. (n=26)	NFP (n=46)	Small (n=22)	Med. (n=21)	Large (n=20)
Mean	3.04	2.83	3.27	2.87	3.27	2.98	2.95	3.14	2.80
SD	1.14	1.30	1.11	1.15	0.92	1.20	1.17	0.91	1.36

Mean concern did not differ by position ( $p > .5$ ), type of centre ( $p > .2$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .1$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .6$ ).

Table 30. Keeping Participant Fees Affordable

	Position		Stand-Alone*		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=51)	Program Coordinator (n=17)	Yes (n=30)	No (n=44)	Mun. (n=24)	NFP (n=45)	Small (n=21)	Med. (n=21)	Large (n=20)
Mean	2.94	2.94	3.33	2.68	3.17	2.98	2.86	3.14	2.70
SD	1.22	1.14	0.96	1.27	0.87	1.20	1.06	1.15	1.30

Mean concern did not differ by position ( $p = 1.0$ ), type of centre ( $p > .4$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .4$ ). **Mean concern higher for stand-alone centres ( $p = .020$ ).**

Table 31. Attracting new participants

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=53)	Program Coordinator (n=18)	Yes (n=30)	No (n=48)	Mun. (n=26)	NFP (n=47)	Small (n=23)	Med. (n=21)	Large (n=20)
Mean	2.81	2.67	3.03	2.69	3.08	2.77	2.87	2.90	2.50
SD	1.29	1.28	1.19	1.27	0.94	1.29	1.18	1.18	1.47

Mean concern did not differ by position ( $p > .6$ ), type of centre ( $p > .2$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .2$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .5$ ).

Table 32. Increasing Level of Participation / Attendance

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=54)	Program Coordinator (n=18)	Yes (n=30)	No (n=48)	Mun. (n=26)	NFP (n=47)	Small (n=23)	Med. (n=21)	Large (n=20)
Mean	2.80	2.56	2.97	2.67	2.92	2.81	2.78	3.10	2.40
SD	1.02	1.15	1.13	1.19	1.02	1.15	1.24	0.89	1.35

Mean concern did not differ by position ( $p > .4$ ), type of centre ( $p > .6$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .2$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .1$ ).

## Appendix F: Use of OACAO Resources

The following tables show the breakdowns according to centre type, size and stand-alone status. Only variables where significant differences emerged between the groups are shown.

Table 1. Breakdown of OACAO Resources Used by Centres

		No		Yes	
		n	%	n	%
<b>OACAO</b>	<i>Not Stand-Alone (n=49)</i>	22	44.9	27	55.1
<b>Listserv</b>	<i>Stand-Alone (n=30)</i>	7	23.3	23	76.7
<b>OASSIS</b>	<i>Not-for-profit (n=46)</i>	32	69.6	14	30.4
<b>Benefits</b>	<i>Municipal (n=27)</i>	27	100.0	0	0.0
<b>OACAO</b>	<i>Not Stand-Alone (n=49)</i>	23	46.9	26	53.1
<b>Reports</b>	<i>Stand-Alone (n=30)</i>	4	13.3	26	86.7
	<i>Not-for-profit (n=47)</i>	11	23.4	36	76.6
<b>Seniors</b>	<i>Municipal (n=27)</i>	13	48.1	14	51.9
<b>Active</b>	<i>Small (n=23)</i>	14	60.9	9	39.1
<b>Living Fairs</b>	<i>Medium (n=21)</i>	2	9.5	19	90.5
	<i>Large (n=20)</i>	6	25.0	15	75.0
<b>Advice</b>	<i>Small (n=23)</i>	15	65.2	8	34.8
<b>from ED /</b>	<i>Medium (n=21)</i>	6	28.6	15	71.4
<b>Board</b>	<i>Large (n=20)</i>	8	40.0	12	60.0

Table 2. Breakdown of Factors Encouraging Participation in OACAO Regional Meetings

		No		Yes	
		n	%	n	%
	<i>Small (n=23)</i>	5	21.7	18	78.3
<b>Location</b>	<i>Medium (n=21)</i>	7	33.3	14	66.7
	<i>Large (n=20)</i>	11	55.0	9	45.0
	<i>Small (n=23)</i>	7	30.4	16	69.6
<b>Webinar /</b>	<i>Medium (n=21)</i>	13	61.9	8	38.1
<b>Teleconf.</b>	<i>Large (n=20)</i>	6	30.0	14	70.0
	<i>Not-for-profit (n=47)</i>	24	51.1	23	48.9
<b>Money</b>	<i>Municipal (n=27)</i>	24	88.9	3	11.1

Table 3. Breakdown of Factors Encouraging Participation in the OACAO Annual Conference

		No		Yes	
		n	%	n	%
<b>Location</b>	<i>Not-for-profit (n=47)</i>	18	38.3	29	61.7
	<i>Municipal (n=27)</i>	19	70.4	8	29.6
<b>Money</b>	<i>Not-for-profit (n=47)</i>	22	46.8	25	53.2
	<i>Municipal (n=27)</i>	19	70.4	8	29.6

Table 4. Level of Interest in Topics and Preferred Mode of Delivery (Full Sample; n=79)

	<b>Interest Level</b>	<b>Delivery Method</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Attracting Males</b>	Mean: 2.76	None specified	19	24.1
	SD: 1.29	Annual Conference	8	10.1
	Min: 0	Regional Workshops	23	29.1
	Max: 4	Webinars	23	29.1
	N 79	Manuals	6	7.6
<b>Attracting Younger Seniors</b>	Mean: 3.25	None specified	20	25.3
	SD: 1.07	Annual Conference	10	12.7
	Min: 0	Regional Workshops	22	27.8
	Max: 4	Webinars	22	27.8
	N 79	Manuals	5	6.3
<b>Attracting Ethno-Cultural Seniors</b>	Mean: 2.10	None specified	29	36.7
	SD: 1.48	Annual Conference	7	8.9
	Min: 0	Regional Workshops	17	21.5
	Max: 4	Webinars	20	25.3
	N 79	Manuals	6	7.6
<b>Integrating Younger and Older Participants</b>	Mean: 2.30	None specified	29	36.7
	SD: 1.50	Annual Conference	10	12.7
	Min: 0	Regional Workshops	15	19.0
	Max: 4	Webinars	21	26.6
	N 79	Manuals	4	5.1
<b>Collaborating With Universities</b>	Mean: 1.72	None specified	31	39.2
	SD: 1.39	Annual Conference	7	8.9
	Min: 0	Regional Workshops	15	19.0
	Max: 4	Webinars	19	24.1
	N 79	Manuals	7	8.9
<b>Establishing Community Partners</b>	Mean: 2.24	None specified	25	31.6
	SD: 1.41	Annual Conference	4	5.1
	Min: 0	Regional Workshops	23	29.1
	Max: 4	Webinars	22	27.8
	N 79	Manuals	5	6.3

	<b>Interest Level</b>	<b>Delivery Method</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Effective Boards / Committees</b>	Mean: 2.33	None specified	24	30.4
	SD: 1.41	Annual Conference	8	10.1
	Min: 0	Regional Workshops	17	21.5
	Max: 4	Webinars	21	26.6
	N 79	Manuals	9	11.4
<b>Event Planning</b>	Mean: 1.92	None specified	21	39.2
	SD: 1.29	Annual Conference	6	7.6
	Min: 0	Regional Workshops	13	16.5
	Max: 4	Webinars	21	26.6
	N 79	Manuals	8	10.1
<b>Fundraising</b>	Mean: 2.51	None specified	27	34.2
	SD: 1.50	Annual Conference	7	8.9
	Min: 0	Regional Workshops	14	17.7
	Max: 4	Webinars	21	26.6
	N 79	Manuals	10	12.7
<b>Innovative Programming</b>	Mean: 3.00	None specified	25	31.6
	SD: 1.228	Annual Conference	10	12.7
	Min: 0	Regional Workshops	19	24.1
	Max: 4	Webinars	19	24.1
	N 79	Manuals	6	7.6
<b>Program Evaluation</b>	Mean: 2.43	None specified	29	36.7
	SD: 1.40	Annual Conference	4	5.1
	Min: 0	Regional Workshops	17	21.5
	Max: 4	Webinars	17	21.5
	N 79	Manuals	12	25.2
<b>Social Media</b>	Mean: 2.20	None specified	31	39.2
	SD: 1.42	Annual Conference	8	10.1
	Min: 0	Regional Workshops	12	15.2
	Max: 4	Webinars	25	31.6
	N 79	Manuals	3	3.8
<b>Strategic Planning</b>	Mean: 2.22	None specified	29	36.7
	SD: 1.36	Annual Conference	9	11.4
	Min: 0	Regional Workshops	17	21.5
	Max: 4	Webinars	20	25.3
	N 79	Manuals	4	5.1
<b>Volunteer Positions</b>	Mean: 2.11	None specified	29	36.7
	SD: 1.42	Annual Conference	6	7.6
	Min: 0	Regional Workshops	17	21.5
	Max: 4	Webinars	19	24.1
	N 79	Manuals	8	10.1



	<b>Interest Level</b>	<b>Delivery Method</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Volunteer Appreciation</b>	Mean: 2.30	None specified	29	36.7
	SD: 1.47	Annual Conference	6	7.6
	Min: 0	Regional Workshops	11	13.9
	Max: 4	Webinars	19	24.1
	N 79	Manuals	14	17.7
<b>General Aging Topics</b>	Mean: 2.51	None specified	24	30.4
	SD: 1.31	Annual Conference	9	11.4
	Min: 0	Regional Workshops	16	20.3
	Max: 4	Webinars	21	26.6
	N 79	Manuals	9	11.4
<b>Other OACs</b>	Mean: 2.48	None specified	24	30.4
	SD: 1.31	Annual Conference	20	25.3
	Min: 0	Regional Workshops	15	19.0
	Max: 4	Webinars	16	20.3
	N 79	Manuals	4	5.1

## Appendix G: Methods of Soliciting Participant Feedback

The following tables show the breakdowns according to centre type, size and stand-alone status. Only variables where significant differences emerged between the groups are shown.

Table 1. Breakdown of Feedback Methods by Centre Type

		Not-for-profit (n=47)		Municipal (n=27)	
		n	%	n	%
<b>Discussion Groups</b>	No	19	40.4%	25	92.6%
	Yes	28	59.6%	2	7.4%
<b>In Person Interviews</b>	No	30	63.8%	25	92.6%
	Yes	17	36.2%	2	7.4%

Table 2. Breakdown of Feedback Methods by Stand-Alone Status

		Not Stand-Alone (n=49)		Stand-Alone (n=30)	
		n	%	n	%
<b>Suggestion Boxes</b>	No	21	42.9%	3	10.0%
	Yes	28	57.1%	27	90.0%

Table 3. Breakdown of Feedback Methods by Centre Size

		Small (n=23)		Medium (n=21)		Large (n=20)	
		n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>Suggestion Boxes</b>	No	10	43.5%	6	28.6%	2	10.0%
	Yes	13	56.5%	16	71.4%	18	90.0%
<b>In-Person Surveys</b>	No	9	39.1%	10	47.6%	2	10.0%
	Yes	14	60.9%	11	52.4%	18	90.0%

## Appendix H: Planning & Decision Making

The following tables show the breakdowns according to centre type, size and stand-alone status. Only variables where significant differences emerged between the groups are shown.

Table 1. Breakdown of Centre Personnel Involved in Planning and Decision Making

		No		Yes	
		n	%	n	%
<b>Board of Directors</b>	<i>Small (n=23)</i>	11	47.8	12	52.2
	<i>Medium (n=21)</i>	1	4.8	20	95.2
	<i>Large (n=20)</i>	8	40.0	12	60.0
<b>Executive Director</b>	<i>Not-for-profit (n=47)</i>	20	42.6	27	57.4
	<i>Municipal (n=27)</i>	24	88.9	3	11.1
<b>Manager / Supervisor</b>	<i>Not-for-profit (n=47)</i>	25	51.1	23	48.9
	<i>Municipal (n=27)</i>	6	22.2	21	77.8
	<i>Small (n=23)</i>	10	43.5	13	56.5
	<i>Medium (n=21)</i>	13	61.9	8	38.1
<b>Finance</b>	<i>Large (n=20)</i>	3	15.0	17	85.0
	<i>Not-for-profit (n=47)</i>	33	70.2	14	29.8
	<i>Municipal (n=27)</i>	25	92.6	2	7.4
<b>Program Coordinator</b>	<i>Small (n=23)</i>	9	39.1	14	60.9
	<i>Medium (n=21)</i>	9	42.9	12	57.1
	<i>Large (n=20)</i>	1	5.0	19	95.0

Table 2. Breakdown of standing committees established at centre

		No		Yes	
		n	%	n	%
<b>Finance Committee</b>	<i>Not Stand-Alone (n=49)</i>	40	81.6	9	18.4
	<i>Stand-Alone (n=30)</i>	19	63.3	11	36.7
<b>Programming</b>	<i>Not-for-Profit (n=47)</i>	30	63.8	17	36.2
	<i>Municipal (n=27)</i>	24	88.9	3	11.1
<b>Human Resources</b>	<i>Not-for-Profit (n=47)</i>	33	70.2	14	29.8
	<i>Municipal (n=27)</i>	26	96.3	1	3.7
	<i>Not Stand-Alone (n=49)</i>	43	87.8	6	12.2
	<i>Stand-Alone (n=30)</i>	21	70.0	9	30.0

Table 3. Breakdown of Centre Personnel Involved in the Preparation of Funding Submissions

		No		Yes	
		n	%	n	%
<b>Executive Director</b>	<i>Not-for-Profit (n=47)</i>	21	44.7	26	55.3
	<i>Municipal (n=27)</i>	26	96.3	1	3.7
	<i>Small (n=23)</i>	15	65.2	8	34.8
	<i>Medium (n=21)</i>	16	76.2	5	23.9
	<i>Large (n=20)</i>	8	40.0	12	60.0
<b>Manager / Supervisor</b>	<i>Not-for-Profit (n=47)</i>	27	57.4	20	42.6
	<i>Municipal (n=27)</i>	7	25.9	20	74.1
	<i>Small (n=23)</i>	10	43.5	13	56.5
	<i>Medium (n=21)</i>	14	66.7	7	33.3
	<i>Large (n=20)</i>	5	25.0	15	75.0

Table 4. Breakdown of Centre Personnel Involved in the Preparation of Funding Reports

		No		Yes	
		n	%	n	%
<b>Executive Director</b>	<i>Not-for-Profit (n=47)</i>	19	40.4	28	59.6
	<i>Municipal (n=27)</i>	26	96.3	1	3.7
	<i>Small (n=23)</i>	13	56.5	10	43.5
	<i>Medium (n=21)</i>	16	76.2	5	23.8
	<i>Large (n=20)</i>	8	40.0	12	60.0

## Appendix I: Evaluation Confidence, Concerns, and Beliefs

The following tables show the breakdowns of the mean rating for all evaluation confidence, concerns and belief statements by position, centre type, stand-alone status, and size. Significance level for all comparisons are reported at the bottom of each table; significant relationships are bolded and shown with an asterisk. For all tables, “Board/ED/Manager” signifies individuals who identified their position as board of directors, executive director or manager; “Mun” signifies municipal centres; “NFP” signifies not-for-profit centres; “Small” signifies centres with 1 – 300 members; “Med” signifies medium centres with 301 – 1000 members, and “Large” signifies centres with more than 1000 members.

*Table 1. Evaluation is Integral to Our Planning and Decision Making Processes*

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=55)	Program Coordinator (n=18)	Yes (n=30)	No (n=49)	Mun. (n=27)	NFP (n=47)	Small (n=23)	Med. (n=21)	Large (n=20)
Mean	3.16	3.11	3.13	3.12	3.04	3.21	3.04	3.10	3.40
SD	0.98	0.83	.82	1.03	0.85	1.02	0.98	0.83	0.99

Mean rating did not differ by position ( $p > .8$ ), type of centre ( $p > .4$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .9$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .4$ ).

*Table 2. Evaluation is Part of Our Routine Management Practices*

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=55)	Program Coordinator (n=18)	Yes (n=30)	No (n=49)	Mun. (n=27)	NFP (n=47)	Small (n=23)	Med. (n=21)	Large (n=20)
Mean	3.05	2.83	2.97	2.98	2.85	3.09	2.91	3.14	3.15
SD	1.04	0.92	1.00	1.09	0.91	1.14	1.04	0.85	1.14

Mean rating did not differ by position ( $p > .4$ ), type of centre ( $p > .3$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .9$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .6$ ).

*Table 3. Everyone in Our Centre Believes that Program Evaluation Is Essential*

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=55)	Program Coordinator (n=18)	Yes (n=30)	No (n=49)	Mun. (n=27)	NFP (n=47)	Small (n=23)	Med. (n=21)	Large (n=20)
Mean	2.82	2.39	2.70	2.69	2.41	2.87	2.57	2.81	2.80
SD	1.00	1.09	0.84	1.12	0.84	1.08	1.20	0.75	1.06

Mean rating did not differ by position ( $p > .1$ ), type of centre ( $p > .4$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .9$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .6$ ).

Table 4. We Include Plans for Evaluation, Performance Indicators, and a Budget for Collecting this Data in All Funding Proposals

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type*		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=54)	Program Coordinator (n=18)	Yes (n=30)	No (n=48)	Mun. (n=27)	NFP (n=46)	Small (n=22)	Med. (n=21)	Large (n=20)
Mean	2.44	2.06	2.43	2.29	1.96	2.57	2.18	2.29	2.70
SD	1.30	1.43	1.25	1.37	1.22	1.33	1.68	1.15	1.23

Mean rating did not differ by position ( $p > .2$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .3$ ), or size of centre ( $p > .4$ ). **Mean rating higher for NFP centres ( $p = .058$ ), and was positively correlated with total number of staff ( $r = .238, p = .037$ ).**

Table 5. We Have (a) Designated Person(a) Tasked with Overseeing Evaluation

	Position		Stand-Alone*		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=53)	Program Coordinator (n=18)	Yes (n=30)	No (n=47)	Mun. (n=26)	NFP (n=46)	Small (n=22)	Med. (n=21)	Large (n=20)
Mean	1.79	1.67	2.13	1.53	1.58	1.83	1.86	1.90	1.90
SD	1.45	1.57	1.23	1.57	1.42	1.51	1.75	1.30	1.33

Mean rating did not differ by position ( $p > .7$ ), type of centre ( $p > .4$ ), size of centre ( $p > .9$ ). **Mean rating higher for stand-alone centres ( $p = .067$ ).**

Table 6. We Would Like to do More Evaluation but are Unsure How to Start

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=52)	Program Coordinator (n=18)	Yes (n=29)	No (n=47)	Mun. (n=25)	NFP (n=46)	Small (n=22)	Med. (n=21)	Large (n=20)
Mean	1.56	1.44	1.83	1.36	1.76	1.46	1.73	1.45	1.50
SD	1.41	1.62	1.49	1.39	1.45	1.46	1.49	1.50	1.50

Mean rating did not differ by position ( $p > .7$ ), type of centre ( $p > .4$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .1$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .8$ ).

Table 7. Practice: We collect information but are not sure what to do with the data we collect

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=54)	Program Coordinator (n=17)	Yes (n=29)	No (n=48)	Mun. (n=26)	NFP (n=46)	Small (n=22)	Med. (n=21)	Large (n=20)
Mean	1.24	1.29	1.48	1.13	1.31	1.24	1.18	1.57	1.10
SD	1.13	1.49	1.15	1.21	1.23	1.20	1.30	1.43	0.97

Mean rating did not differ by position ( $p > .8$ ), type of centre ( $p > .8$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .2$ ), or size of centre ( $p > .4$ ).

Table 8. We Find Requests for Evaluation Data from Funders to be Confusing

	Position		Stand-Alone*		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=53)	Program Coordinator (n=18)	Yes (n=30)	No (n=47)	Mun. (n=25)	NFP (n=47)	Small (n=23)	Med. (n=21)	Large (n=20)
Mean	1.60	1.33	2.00	1.36	1.28	1.71	1.48	1.76	1.60
SD	1.17	1.33	1.20	1.19	1.10	1.30	1.24	1.38	1.00

Mean rating did not differ by position ( $p > .4$ ), type of centre ( $p > .1$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .7$ ).

**Mean rating higher for stand-alone centres ( $p = .025$ ).**

Table 9. We Are Hesitant to Ask our Participants to Provide Information for Evaluation

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=54)	Program Coordinator (n=17)	Yes (n=30)	No (n=47)	Mun. (n=26)	NFP (n=47)	Small (n=22)	Med. (n=21)	Large (n=20)
Mean	1.22	1.12	1.27	1.17	1.15	1.11	0.86	1.43	1.10
SD	1.25	1.27	1.39	1.22	1.12	1.32	1.32	1.36	1.21

Mean rating did not differ by position ( $p > .7$ ), type of centre ( $p > .8$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .7$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .3$ ).

Table 10. We are Hesitant to Ask Staff/Volunteers to Collect Evaluation Data as they are Already Busy and this Would Take Time Away from Service Delivery

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=54)	Program Coordinator (n=17)	Yes (n=30)	No (n=47)	Mun. (n=26)	NFP (n=47)	Small (n=22)	Med. (n=21)	Large (n=20)
Mean	1.20	1.65	1.40	1.28	1.54	1.09	1.00	1.67	1.15
SD	1.23	1.17	1.35	1.25	1.17	1.28	1.27	1.35	1.23

Mean rating did not differ by position ( $p > .1$ ), type of centre ( $p > .1$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .6$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .2$ ).

Table 11. We are Hesitant to Collect Outcome Data as it may Show Our Programs are not “Successful” or Making a Difference

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=54)	Program Coordinator (n=16)	Yes (n=30)	No (n=46)	Mun. (n=25)	NFP (n=47)	Small (n=22)	Med. (n=20)	Large (n=20)
Mean	0.52	0.63	0.73	0.46	0.48	0.55	0.59	0.40	0.60
SD	0.91	1.03	0.91	0.94	0.71	0.93	1.14	0.68	0.75

Mean rating did not differ by position ( $p > .6$ ), type of centre ( $p > .7$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .2$ ), or size of centre ( $p > .7$ ). **Mean rating was positively correlated with total number of staff ( $r = .266, p = .021$ ).**

Table 12. We do not Have the Time to do Program Evaluation

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=54)	Program Coordinator (n=17)	Yes (n=30)	No (n=47)	Mun. (n=26)	NFP (n=47)	Small (n=22)	Med. (n=21)	Large (n=20)
Mean	1.30	1.65	1.67	1.32	1.42	1.45	1.50	1.57	1.30
SD	1.22	1.27	1.24	1.34	1.27	1.35	1.54	1.17	1.22

Mean rating did not differ by position ( $p > .3$ ), type of centre ( $p > .9$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .2$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .7$ ).



Table 13. We do not Have the Expertise and Experience In-House to do Evaluation

	Position		Stand-Alone*		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=54)	Program Coordinator (n=17)	Yes (n=30)	No (n=47)	Mun. (n=26)	NFP (n=47)	Small (n=22)	Med. (n=21)	Large (n=20)
Mean	1.19	1.59	1.73	1.11	1.31	1.47	1.45	1.33	1.20
SD	1.28	1.66	1.34	1.37	1.29	1.46	1.63	1.53	1.11

Mean rating did not differ by position ( $p > .2$ ), type of centre ( $p > .6$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .8$ ).

\*Mean rating higher for stand-alone centres ( $p = .052$ ).

Table 14. We do not Have the Money to Pay for Data Collection, Entry, Analysis

	Position		Stand-Alone*		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=54)	Program Coordinator (n=17)	Yes (n=29)	No (n=48)	Mun. (n=26)	NFP (n=46)	Small (n=22)	Med. (n=21)	Large (n=20)
Mean	1.93	2.12	2.55	1.73	1.85	2.13	2.14	2.33	1.95
SD	1.61	1.54	1.50	1.58	1.49	1.67	1.49	1.71	1.64

Mean rating did not differ by position ( $p > .6$ ), type of centre ( $p > .4$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .7$ ).

Mean rating higher for stand-alone centres ( $p = .027$ ).

Table 15. We do not Believe That Evaluation is Worth the Time, Effort or Money Required

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=52)	Program Coordinator (n=18)	Yes (n=29)	No (n=48)	Mun. (n=26)	NFP (n=46)	Small (n=22)	Med. (n=21)	Large (n=19)
Mean	0.63	0.67	0.71	0.63	0.62	0.70	0.82	0.48	0.68
SD	1.12	0.84	0.94	1.08	0.98	1.07	1.18	0.75	1.16

Mean rating did not differ by position ( $p > .9$ ), type of centre ( $p > .4$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .7$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .5$ ).

Table 16. Our Centre Runs Effectively and Efficiently Without Evaluation

	Position*		Stand-Alone		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=52)	Program Coordinator (n=18)	Yes (n=28)	No (n=48)	Mun. (n=26)	NFP (n=46)	Small (n=23)	Med. (n=20)	Large (n=19)
Mean	0.77	0.98	0.96	1.06	1.08	0.96	1.09	1.00	0.89
SD	1.67	1.37	1.11	1.16	1.13	1.10	1.23	1.17	1.10

Mean rating did not differ by type of centre ( $p > .6$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .7$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .8$ ). Mean rating higher for program coordinator staff ( $p = .017$ ).

Table 17. Mean Confidence in Ability to Conduct Evaluation and Present Credible Results

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=54)	Program Coordinator (n=17)	Yes (n=28)	No (n=48)	Mun. (n=26)	NFP (n=45)	Small (n=22)	Med. (n=19)	Large (n=20)
Mean	2.67	2.71	2.75	2.56	2.42	2.76	2.68	2.53	2.90
SD	0.91	1.2	0.89	1.01	0.90	1.01	1.04	1.21	0.79

Mean confidence level did not differ by position ( $p > .8$ ), type of centre ( $p > .1$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .4$ ), or size of centre ( $p > .5$ ).

Table 18. Mean Concern About Centre's Ability to Conduct Routine Evaluation Activities

	Position		Stand-Alone		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=53)	Program Coordinator (n=18)	Yes (n=30)	No (n=47)	Mun. (n=25)	NFP (n=47)	Small (n=23)	Med. (n=21)	Large (n=20)
Mean	2.53	2.39	2.80	2.34	2.52	2.55	2.22	2.81	2.25
SD	1.23	1.50	1.10	1.42	1.26	1.32	1.60	1.33	1.12

Mean concern level did not differ by position ( $p > .6$ ), type of centre ( $p > .9$ ), stand-alone status ( $p > .1$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .2$ ).

Table 19. Mean concern about centre's ability to conduct in-depth evaluation studies

	Position		Stand-Alone*		Type		Size		
	Board/ED /Manager (n=53)	Program Coordinator (n=18)	Yes (n=30)	No (n=47)	Mun. (n=25)	NFP (n=47)	Small (n=23)	Med. (n=21)	Large (n=20)
Mean	2.92	2.56	3.20	2.60	2.96	2.82	2.61	2.90	2.70
SD	1.19	1.42	0.93	1.41	1.27	1.22	1.53	1.45	0.98

Mean concern level did not differ by position ( $p > .2$ ), type of centre ( $p > .6$ ) or size of centre ( $p > .7$ ). **Mean concern level higher for stand-alone centres ( $p = .026$ ).**