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Overview for today’s webinar

• Describe our methods and conceptual framework for the scales
• Review our validation studies of the paper version of the scales
• Review our efforts at training and implementation of paper version in 2 counties
• Describe our website https://olderadultnestegg.com and our statewide efforts to implement the scale
• Describe our bi-directional communication and addition of supplemental materials: Decision Tree, User Guides
• Discuss next steps
Key Question in Elder Justice
Integrity of Financial Judgment

Both under and over-protection of older adults can lead to damaging consequences.

- **Under protection** for older adults can lead to gross financial exploitation that can impact every aspect of the older adult’s life.

- **Over protection** can be equally as costly. Many older adults have very strong needs for autonomy and control. To unnecessarily limit autonomy can lead to increased health problems and shortened longevity.
Financial Exploitation: The Dark Side of Financial Capacity

Includes some interaction between the older adult victim and another “trusted” person.
Financial Exploitation: What Is It?

Six Domains*

**Theft & Scams**
Has anyone misused your ATM or credit card?

**Abuse of Trust**
Has someone convinced you to turn the title of your home over to them?

**Financial Entitlement**
Has anyone felt entitled to use your money for themselves?

**Coercion**
Did anyone put pressure on you to get a reverse mortgage?

**Signs of Possible Financial Exploitation**
Has anyone been frequently asking you for money?

**Money Management Difficulties**

*Conrad et al. (2010)*
Self report fraud 2008 and 2012:

5.0% (347 out of 6,920) to 6.1% (442 out of 7,252)

Examining new fraud cases between 2008-2012, n=4461
2013: The strongest finding was fraud prevalence in those with the highest depression and the lowest social-needs fulfillment (14%) compared to the prevalence among the rest of the sample (4.1%; $\chi^2 = 20.49; p < .001$).

2016: Fraud prevalence among those with clinically significant depression, and the lowest 10% in social-needs fulfillment (8.7%), was more than twice as high compared to the rest of the sample (4.1%; $\chi^2 = 7.85, p = .005$).
Using Person-centered Principles for Financial Decision-Making Capacity

- Mast (2011) Whole Person Dementia Assessment approach; integrates person-centered ideas with standardized assessment
- Context matters
- Voice of older adult is critical
- Real life decisions vs vignettes
What Does “Context Matters” Mean?

Financial Vulnerability
New National Data
Health and Retirement Study 2020 release

• Anxious about financial decisions, at least sometimes – 65%
• Wish had someone to talk with about finances, at least sometimes – 55%
• Worried that someone will take away one’s financial freedom, at least sometimes – 32%
• Confident making big financial decisions? Unsure/not confident – 26%
• Treated with less respect and courtesy during financial transactions, at least sometimes – 30%
• Talked into a decision to spend money that originally did not want to, at least sometimes – 22%
Ground Breaking Work of Appelbaum and Grisso 1988

- Originally for capacity for psychiatric treatment and guardianship, then health decisions
- Identified 4 aspects of decision-making
  - Communicating:
    1. Choice
    2. Understanding
    3. Appreciation
    4. Reasoning
Expert Panelists

- Using the Concept Mapping Model (Conrad et al., 2010) we then assembled two groups of experts.
- 6 were engaged in financial-capacity work across the nation
- 14 were local and worked directly and daily with older adults making sentinel financial decisions and transactions
- 4 phone conferences (2 per group)
How the scales were shaped by the panels

• Originally 28 open-ended stems were proposed as potential questions.

• Based on their extensive feedback, a broader set of questions (66 in total) was created for LFDRS, 10 items selected for the Lichtenberg Financial Decision Screening Scale (LFDSS)

• Later developed 34 item scale (Financial Vulnerability Assessment or FVA on our website)

• It was further agreed that a multiple-choice format would be used for questions
Conceptual Model for the Lichtenberg Financial Decision Rating Scale (LFDRS)

Contextual Factors
- Financial Situational Awareness
- Psychological Vulnerability
- Susceptibility

Intellectual Factors
- Express:
  - Choice
  - Rationale
  - Understanding
  - Appreciation

Consistency with Values

Integrity of Financial Decisional Ability

Institute of Gerontology
Formed 3 New Scales:

Lichtenberg Financial Decision Making Rating Scale (LFDRS)
Lichtenberg Financial Decision Screening Scale (LFDSS)
LFDRS-I Family/Friends Informant Scale

https://olderadultnestegg.com
FDT, FVA, FFI
### Items for Financial Awareness Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#2 How worried are you about having enough money to pay for things?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 Overall, how satisfied are you with your finances?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5 How satisfied are you with this money management arrangement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6 How confident are you in making big financial decisions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7b How often do you worry about financial decisions you’ve recently made?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13 How often do your expenses exceed your regular monthly income?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#15 Change in finances since you've gotten older in terms of seeking advice?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#20 How often do you wish that you had someone to talk to about finances?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#21 How often do you feel anxious about financial decisions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#24 How often do you feel downhearted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has memory loss interfered with your everyday financial activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a physician or other healthcare professional evaluated your memory?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#28 How often are you treated with less respect regarding finances?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#29 How fearful are you that someone will take away your financial freedom?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#30 How often do you feel relieved when talking about finances because you are lonely?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#52 Has a relationship with a family member/friend become strained due to finances as you have grown older?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#53 How often has a person talked you into a decision to spend money?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#55 Did anyone ever tell you that someone else you know wants to take your money?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#57 Have you had any conflicts with anyone about the way you spend money?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#60 Has anyone used or taken your money without your permission?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#61 How likely is it that anyone now wants to take or use your money without your permission?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of our Research on the LFDRS

- Community based samples with data collected by me and my research team
- Psychometric expertise and independent analyses by Dr. Jeanne Teresi and her colleagues
- Examined reliability (inter-rater, internal consistency)
- Examined whether conceptual model was empirically supported
- Examined validity—convergent, and whether the scale classified decisional deficits and financial exploitation at accurate levels
- Demonstrated intersection of cognitive decline, reduced decision making and financial exploitation
- Just finished collecting a new sample to cross validate findings and expand
A Person-Centered Approach to Financial Capacity Assessment: Preliminary Development of a New Rating Scale

PETER A. LICHTENBERG, PhD, ABPP, JONATHAN STOLTMAN, MA, and LISA J. FICKER, PhD
Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan, USA

MADELYN IRIS, PhD
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A Short Form of the Lichtenberg Financial Decision Rating Scale

Peter A. Lichtenberg, Evan Gross & Rebecca Campbell

Quantifying Risk of Financial Incapacity and Financial Exploitation in Community-dwelling Older Adults: Utility of a Scoring System for the Lichtenberg Financial Decision-making Rating Scale

Peter A. Lichtenberg, Evan Gross & Lisa J. Ficker

Financial decision-making abilities and financial exploitation in older African Americans: Preliminary validity evidence for the Lichtenberg Financial Decision Rating Scale (LFDRS)

Peter A. Lichtenberg PhD, ABPP, Lisa J. Ficker PhD & Annalise Rahman-Filiak MA

Financial Exploitation, Financial Capacity, and Alzheimer’s Disease

Peter A. Lichtenberg
Institute of Gerontology, Detroit, Michigan, and Wayne State University
Promoting Autonomy in Financial Decision Making in People with Cognitive Impairment

- 84-year-old man suffered injury and in rehab. He wants to change POA
- 82-year-old woman misdiagnosed with AD and wants to fight conservatorship
- 87-year-old man with MCI challenges conservatorship and guardianship application
- 90-year-old man with mild stage dementia. He makes a change to his will to benefit his only daughter
Lichtenberg Financial Decision Screening Scale (LFDSS): Aka—“Financial Decision Tracker”

Foundational to the Rating Scale

---

**Financial Decision Tracker 10 Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLIENT</th>
<th>WORKSHOP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1. What financial obstacles are you facing or have faced?**
- [ ] Buying a car or home
- [ ] Paying bills or credit card debt
- [ ] Making purchases for health or medical care
- [ ] Making a large purchase for household or home

**2. How did you spend your last paycheck or other income?**
- [ ] Eating out at restaurants
- [ ] Shopping for clothes
- [ ] Buying a gift for someone else

**3. How will the decision impact you now and in the future?**
- [ ] Improve financial situation
- [ ] Rating impact
- [ ] Achieve financial goal
- [ ] Don’t know/unsure

**4. How much risk is there in your financial plan?**
- [ ] Low risk
- [ ] Medium risk
- [ ] High risk
- [ ] Don’t know/unsure

**5. What circumstances or situations motivated you to make the decision?**
- [ ] Family
- [ ] Friends
- [ ] Colleagues
- [ ] Don’t know/unsure

---

**Financial Decision Tracker**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Notes:**

- [ ] Reflections on decision-making process
- [ ] Strategies for financial planning

---

**Institute of Gerontology**

---
Aging and Informed Financial Decision Making: New Tools for the Professional Working With Older Adults

Evaluating an older client’s cognitive status regarding financial decision-making is like walking a tightrope, but a new tool is available to help professionals perform this delicate balancing act.

Peter A. Lichtenberg, PhD, ABPP, and Donna L. Pettee, CPA

Cross-validation of the screening scale in an adult protective services sample

Rebecca J. Campbell, Evan Gross & Peter A. Lichtenberg

Reliability and Validity of the Lichtenberg Financial Decision Screening Scale

Peter A. Lichtenberg, PhD, ABPP; Jeanne A. Teresi, EdD, PhD; Katja Ocepek-Welikson, MPH; Joseph P. Einicke, MS

Assessment of financial decision making: an informant scale

Rebecca C. Campbell, Peter A. Lichtenberg, Latoya N. Hall, Jeanne A. Teresi & Katja Ocepek-Welikson

Item response theory analysis of the Lichtenberg Financial Decision Screening Scale

Jeanne A. Teresi, Katja Ocepek-Welikson & Peter A. Lichtenberg
10 Questions from LFDSS

1. What is the financial decision you are making? **Choice**
2. Was this your idea or did someone suggest it or accompany you? **Autonomy**
3. What is the purpose of your decision? **Rationale**
4. What is the primary financial goal? **Understanding**
5. How will this decision impact you now and over time? **Understanding**
6. How much risk is involved? **Appreciation**
7. How may someone else be negatively affected? **Appreciation**
8. Who benefits most from this financial decision? **Understanding**
9. Does this decision change previous planned gifts or bequests to family, friends, or organizations? **Appreciation**
10. To what extent did you talk with anyone regarding this decision? **Autonomy**
APS Initial Partnership

2015-2017—validation of 10-item screening scale

• APS policy head Cynthia Farrell connects me to supervisors interested in piloting
• Scale is paper based and there is no scoring or feedback
• In-person training for APS staff who will use scales
• De-identified forms are scanned and sent back to me
• Supervisors gave feedback to improve form: clearer scoring and bullet point direction reminders.
## Table 1:
Demographic Percentages for Older Adults Screened at APS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic values</th>
<th>APS* cases (n = 29)</th>
<th>Professional** cases (n = 79)</th>
<th>Total sample (n = 108)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>financial exploitation vs. not</td>
<td>decision-making concerns vs. ok</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case substantiated</td>
<td>Case unsubstantiated</td>
<td>Decisional concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (mean/SD)</td>
<td>71.1 (10.3)</td>
<td>74.6 (14.8)</td>
<td>75.5 (10.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (mean/SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of education</td>
<td>12.4 (2.2)</td>
<td>12.8 (2.0)</td>
<td>14.2 (2.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APS* = Adult Protective Services; Professionals ** = Lawyers, financial planners, MD/medical professionals, law enforcement.

Note: No significant differences in age, gender, or education within the APS cases (substantiated vs. not) or professional cases (decision-making concerns vs. OK).
Participants seen by law and finance Professionals were older and more educated than the group seen by APS workers

Sample size overall = 108
Table 3: Independent Samples t-Tests for the LFDSS Total Risk Score for Current Financial Decision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LFDSS total risk score</th>
<th>APS case substantiated</th>
<th>APS case not substantiated</th>
<th>Professional case: Decisional concerns</th>
<th>Professional case: No decisional concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>14.50 (6.3)</td>
<td>8.20 (2.0)</td>
<td>17.42 (6.8)</td>
<td>8.63 (2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>-4.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 Highlights

• Risk scores were higher for:
  • APS cases of exploitation AND
  • For law and finance cases of decisional capacity
Michigan APS Step #2

• Worked directly with APS Deputy Director Terry Beurer and his leadership team
• One sector supervisor, Doug Williams, agrees to work with me to implement scales with his team
• Publish with larger sample size for validation and cross validation studies
• Supervisor’s positive appraisal leads to support for a one-year implementation project on our training and scales
# 2017 Study: *Innovation in Aging*

Demographics and Characteristics Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referral Source</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Protective Services</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
<td>76.93</td>
<td>(10.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Categories (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 65</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74 yrs</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 - 84 yrs</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+ years</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Grade of Education (years)</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.66</td>
<td>(2.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than High School</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college +</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Education</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lichtenberg Financial Decision Screening Scale (<em>dichotomous variables</em>)</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>(1.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lichtenberg Financial Decision Screening Scale (<em>ordinal variables</em>)</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>(3.91)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Points

• Large sample size of 213
• Good distribution of age and education
• Able to be used by professionals of all backgrounds (APS, financial, legal)
Table 2: Internal Consistency Estimates for the 7-Item Lichtenberg Financial Decision Screening Scale Using Different Coding Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dichotomous Variables&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Ordinal Variables&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>0.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>0.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College and above</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and below</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 75 years old</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 years old or greater</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>0.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Protective Services</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.942</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Professionals    | 133 | 0.947 | 0.956                  | 58.786                           | 0.846 | 0.855                  | 62.620                           

<sup>a</sup>Alpha, McDonald’s Omega Total and Explained Common Variance all calculated using tetrachoric correlations. Explained Common Variance obtained from a bi-factor model.

<sup>b</sup>Alpha, McDonald’s Omega Total and Explained Common Variance all calculated using polychoric correlations. Explained Common Variance obtained from a bi-factor model.
Key Points

• Excellent internal consistency of items

• One factor structure and holds across ages, education, gender
Cross-validation of the screening scale in an adult protective services sample

Rebecca J. Campbell, Evan Gross & Peter A. Lichtenberg
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total sample (n = 105)</th>
<th>Case substantiated (n = 64)</th>
<th>Case unsubstantiated (n = 39)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (mean/SD)</td>
<td>77.58 (10.8)</td>
<td>77.24 (11.67)</td>
<td>77.2 (7.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (Mean/SD)</td>
<td>12.79 (2.23)</td>
<td>12.93 (2.39)</td>
<td>12.35 (1.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Female)</td>
<td>57.1% (n = 60)</td>
<td>60.9% (n = 39)</td>
<td>51.3% (n = 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.9% (n = 45)</td>
<td>39.1% (n = 25)</td>
<td>48.7% (n = 19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$t(100) = -0.42, p = .67$
$t(58) = 0.94, p = .35$
$\chi^2(1) = 0.923, p = .34$
Figure 1. Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curve for the LFDSS score predicting exploitation.

Diagonal segments are produced by ties.
1. To your knowledge, what type of financial decision or transaction did your relative or friend recently make or is thinking of making?

2. Was this decision their idea or did someone else suggest it?

3. Now and over time, how do you think this decision or transaction will impact your relative or friend financially?

4. How much risk is there that this decision could result in a negative impact, such as loss of funds?

5. Overall, how satisfied is your relative or friend with finances?

6. Who manages your relative’s or friend’s money day to day?

7. Is your relative or friend helping anyone financially on a regular basis?

8. How often does your relative or friend seem anxious or distressed about financial decisions?

9A. Is your relative’s or friend’s memory, thinking skills, or ability to reason with regard to finances worse than a year ago?

9B. Has this interfered with their everyday financial activities?

10. Does your relative or friend regret or worry about a financial decision or transaction they made or intend to make?

11. Would others, who know your relative or friend well, say the current major financial decision is unusual for them?

12. To your knowledge, how much has your relative or friend come to rely on just one person for all financial decisions?

13. Has anyone used or taken your relative’s or friend’s money without their permission?

14. How likely is it that anyone now wants to take or use your relative’s or friend’s money without their permission?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. FF sample demographics.</th>
<th>No Concerns about FE (n = 118)</th>
<th>Concerns about FE (n = 32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informant Age (Mean/SD)</td>
<td>63.4 (12.1)</td>
<td>59.7 (9.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Age (Mean/SD)</td>
<td>72.4 (9.3)</td>
<td>73.6 (9.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informant Education (Mean/SD)</td>
<td>15.1 (2.5)</td>
<td>15.4 (1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Education (Mean/SD)</td>
<td>13.3 (2.5)</td>
<td>13.3 (1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informant Gender (%/n)</td>
<td>81.4% (n = 96)</td>
<td>90.6% (n = 29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18.6% (n = 22)</td>
<td>9.4% (n = 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Gender (%/n)</td>
<td>70.3% (n = 83)</td>
<td>81.3% (n = 26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29.7% (n = 35)</td>
<td>18.8% (n = 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Race (%/n)</td>
<td>48.3% (n = 57)</td>
<td>78.1% (n = 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American/Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>11.9% (n = 14)</td>
<td>6.3% (n = 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Informant/Senior Relationship</td>
<td>42.5 (19.3)</td>
<td>43.3 (21.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years the Informant Has Known the Senior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$t(148) = 1.61, p = .11$

$t(147) = -.64, p = .53$

$t(148) = -.71, p = .48$

$t(91) = .09, p = .93$

$\chi^2(1) = 1.55, p = .21$

$\chi^2(1) = 1.51, p = .22$

$\chi^2(1) = 2.17, p = .14$

$t(146) = -.20, p = 84$
– a ROC curve analysis was conducted using the full-scale risk score. As shown in Figure 1, the ROC curve found good sensitivity and specificity of the FFI score to detect an informant’s current concerns regarding financial exploitation (AUC = .806).
Goal: use our online training and scoring system to have all Michigan APS workers trained and certified and using the scale

Strategy: provide in-person or webinar training to all center supervisors to train and certify them first; then give similar training to field staff and have them trained and certified.

Improvements to the system post-training allowed me to review each scale that was administered. Sent inquiries to staff and supervisor for cases that had questions.
Create a single user account or organizational account

Then select your profession from drop down
Get Certified

Select “For Professionals” at top menu

Select Pro Certification

To get online certification in all 3 scales it will take a total of approximately 1-1 1/2 hours.

Go at your own pace. You do not Need to get certified in all 3 at once.
Training

Overview
The Lichtenberg trio of assessment tools is designed to complement and enhance each other. Training is streamlined and straightforward. Regardless of your expertise, we have an assessment and training to help you and your client.

Start Training

Financial Decision Tracker (LFDSS)
This brief 10-question assessment is the basis to determine how and why the older adult has made a specific financial decision. Easy to administer regardless of professional background.
Complete the Overview training to begin training on the Financial Decision Tracker.

Family & Friends Interview
Family & Friends adds information from a trusted third-party to help determine the quality of a client’s financial decision making. Easy to administer regardless of professional background. Training to conduct the Financial Decision Tracker is a prerequisite.
Complete both the Overview and the Financial Decision Tracker trainings to begin training on the Family & Friends Interview.

Financial Vulnerability Assessment
This in-depth evaluation is best administered by a mental health professional. It includes the Financial Decision Tracker and adds critical contextual factors that impact the integrity of the financial decision.
Complete both the Overview and the Financial Decision Tracker trainings to begin training on the Financial Vulnerability Assessment.
REPORTING for the Individual User

RISK SCORE for each interview completed

For each interview completed:

- Your account archives all your interviews (by client ID, interview date and type)
- Each interview can be retrieved on screen and downloaded as pdf
- Next Steps & Resources for each interview

No Concerns

Based on interview responses we recommend the decisional ability grade of no concerns about financial decisional abilities to make this decision.

Risk Rating: 4

Your responses indicated a risk score of green which falls into the low risk range. The Tracker identifies no concerns about your client’s ability to make this financial decision.

RATING REFERENCE

Risk Rating: 1 - Low, 2 - Moderate, 3 - High, 4 - Very High

Next Steps for No Concerns

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

Allow the completion of the financial transaction related to this decision:

1. The financial decision has been made with awareness, integrity and autonomy at this time.

RESOURCES

- Administration on Aging: [https://wwwAdministration.aaga.org](https://wwwAdministration.aaga.org)
- National Adult Protective Services: [https://www.naps.org](https://www.naps.org)
- Consumer Financial Protection Bureau: [https://www.consumerfinance.gov](https://www.consumerfinance.gov)
- AARP: [http://www.aarp.org](http://www.aarp.org)
- American Psychological Association: [https://www.apa.org](https://www.apa.org)
- Office on Aging: [https://www.aosa.gov](https://www.aosa.gov)
- Alzheimer’s Association: [https://www.alz.org](https://www.alz.org)


Responses

- Q1: What financial decision are you making or have made?
  - Investment planning (retirement, insurance, portfolio balancing)
  - Do you agree with the respondent’s answer?
    - Yes

- Q2: Was this your idea or did someone else suggest it or accompany you?
  - Your idea
  - Do you agree with the respondent’s answer?
    - Yes

- Q3: What is the primary purpose of this decision?
  - Beneficiary (who)? - charging beneficiary from husband (died) to remaining sister and nieces and nephew
  - Do you agree with the respondent’s answer?
    - Yes
Outcomes after 1 Year

Over 400 APS workers trained and certified on at least 2 scales

Over 700 scales administered and entered into the website system
TOP 5 Financial Decisions by Older Adults that Prompt APS Investigation

• Giving a gift of money
• Making a significant purchase
• Giving to a scammer
• Allowing someone to access their personal accounts
• Having someone take over finances and management of funds
Bidirectional communication and continuous improvement

• Not uniformly used so turned to a champion, Marie Shipp, within APS for more input

• We are creating new tools to communicate importance and to communicate how to best use information from the tools
The Central Question of Every Investigation is...

Do We Need to Promote Autonomy
or
Help Provide Protection?
Why Evidence-based Tools Are Important

- Reliable
- Replicable
- Efficient
Insights by Michigan APS caseworkers who used OlderAdultNestEgg.com evidence-based interview tools

“"This gives my staff a tool—we have too few of those”

"These assessments help me educate my clients"

"It helps us ask all the questions we need to"

"It helped me communicate with other professionals"

I was able to save over $1 Million for a client"
Evidence-based Assessments for Professionals

- FDT: Financial Decision Tracker
- FVA: Financial Vulnerability Assessment
- FFI: Family & Friends Interview

VISIT: OlderAdultNestEgg.com to Get Trained and Implement Tools

OlderAdultNestEgg.com is FREE to users thanks to support from the National Institute of Justice, Foundation for Financial Health, Michigan Aging and Adult Services PREVNT Program, Michigan Health Endowment Fund, State of Michigan, Wayne State University Technology Commercialization, American House Foundation and the Mary Thompson Foundation.
Use of Financial Decision Tracker (FDT)
Older Adult Decision Tree

ADULT PROTECTIVE SERVICES

OlderAdultNestEgg.com
Does this case involve any report of financial loss? Including:

- Proven loss of financial resources
- Alleged or possible loss of financial resources
- Future or continuing loss of financial resources
Does this case involve any report of financial loss? Including:

- Proven loss of financial resources
- Alleged or possible loss of financial resources
- Future or continuing loss of financial resources

Is the older adult their own decision maker? (e.g. does not have guardian or DPOA)?

Yes

No

STOP
FDT IS NOT NEEDED
Did the report of financial loss include any of the following financial decisions?

- Giving a gift
- Making a purchase
- Giving money to a scam
- Allowing someone else access to finances/money
- Having someone take over personal finances

Is the older adult their own decision maker?

(e.g. does not have guardian or DPOA)?
Does the older adult appear to be vulnerable?

FACTORS INCLUDE:

- Cognitive impairment
- Frail appearance
- Dependency / Unable to perform own activities of daily living (ADLs)
- Lack of control over own finances

Yes

Person may need protection
Administer FDT*

No

Person may need support for autonomy
Administer FDT*
Person may need support for autonomy
Administer FDT*

Person may need protection
Administer FDT*

If a relative, friend or caregiver is available, also conduct:

Family & Friends Interview (FFI)
Case Example 1: Romance Scam

Q1
What financial decision are you making or have made? *(CHOICE)*
Don't know or inaccurate response

Do you agree with the respondent's answer? No

Please select what you feel the correct response to be: Scam, fraud, theft (suspected)

Please provide input on why you do not agree. Client is currently being heavily influenced by a much younger female.

Q2
Was this your idea or did someone else suggest it or accompany you? Someone else
Suggested/accompanied you (who?) - Sons

Q3
What is the primary purpose of this decision? Please or satisfy someone else (Who?) - Prove that everyone is wrong

Do you agree with the respondent's answer? Yes

Q4
What is your primary financial goal for this decision? Lifestyle (no monetary goal; meet a need or desire)

Do you agree with the respondent's answer? Yes
Case Example 1 Cont.:
Romance Scam

Q5
How will this decision impact you now and over time?
(UNDERSTANDING) No impact

Do you agree with the respondent's answer? No

Please select what you feel the correct response to be. Negative impact/debt

Please provide input on why you do not agree. Financially restricting and overall detrimental to health

Q6
How much risk is there to your financial well-being?
(APPRECIATION) Low risk or none

Do you agree with the respondent's answer? No

Please select what you feel the correct response to be. Moderate risk

Please provide input on why you do not agree. Spending over double the amount per month than he had been prior to becoming involved with this female.

Q7
How might someone else be negatively affected? No one will be negatively affected

Do you agree with the respondent's answer? Yes
Case Example 1 Cont.:
Romance Scam

Q8
Who benefits most from this financial decision? (UNDERSTANDING)
You do

Do you agree with the respondent's answer? No

Please select what you feel the correct response to be. Friend (Who?)

Please provide input on why you do not agree. Female acquaintance

Q9
Does this decision change previous planned gifts or bequests to family, friends or organizations? No

Do you agree with the respondent's answer? Yes

Q10a
To what extent did you talk with anyone regarding this decision? Not at all

Do you agree with the respondent's answer? Yes

RISK SCORE = 11/ABOVE CUTOFF

Major Concerns—evidence for deficits in informed decision making
Case Example #2: Major Purchase

Q1
What financial decision are you making or have made? Major purchase or sale (home, car, renovations, services)

Do you agree with the respondent's answer? Yes

Q2
Was this your idea or did someone else suggest it or accompany you? Your idea

Do you agree with the respondent's answer? Yes

Q3
What is the primary purpose of this decision? Don't know or inaccurate response

Do you agree with the respondent's answer? Yes

Q4
What is your primary financial goal for this decision?
Earn money (or retain value of investment)

Do you agree with the respondent's answer? Yes

Notes: It is unknown whether or not this client came up with the idea to purchase the vehicle on his own. His son may have brought up the idea and he went along with it.
Case Example #2: Major Purchase

Q5
How will this decision impact you now and over time? (UNDERSTANDING)
Improve financial position

Do you agree with the respondent's answer? No

Please select what you feel the correct response to be.
Negative impact/debt

Please provide input on why you do not agree. I think the amount of debt client will incur for the amount of potential income it could provide would not equal out or be profitable.

Q6
How much risk is there to your financial well-being? (APPRECIATION)
Low risk or none

Do you agree with the respondent's answer
No

Please select what you feel the correct response to be
Moderate risk

Please provide input on why you do not agree
I think, based on the income the client has coming into the home, will not be sufficient for him to make this vehicle purchase.

Q7
How might someone else be negatively affected?
(APPRECIATION) No one will be negatively affected

Do you agree with the respondent's answer? No

Please select what you feel the correct response to be.
Family member(s) (who & why?)

Please provide input on why you do not agree.
There is a plausible chance the vehicle is being purchased for the son's use as he has a job and is seeking more income earning opportunities.
Case Example #2: Major Purchase

Q8
Who benefits most from this financial decision? (UNDERSTANDING) You do
Do you agree with the respondent's answer?
No
Please select what you feel the correct response to be. Family (who?)
Please provide input on why you do not agree.
I am not sure I agree that the client would benefit the most from the vehicle purchase. I would gather maybe the son would be using it the most.

Q9
Does this decision change previous planned gifts or bequests to family, friends, or organizations? No
Do you agree with the respondent's answer?
Yes

Q10a
To what extent did you talk with anyone regarding this decision? Mentioned it (to who?)
Do you agree with the respondent's answer?
Yes

RISK SCORE = 10; MAJOR CONCERNS
Evidence of impaired informed decision making
Continued Communication and Implementation Research

Marie Shipp convened two groups for feedback on forms and usage. My research team is looking at the cases collected and examining:

Scale usage, accuracy of risk scores

&

Base rates of decision-making deficits
Successful Aging thru Financial Empowerment
SAFE Program
Patterned after Lifespan Program, Rochester, NY

- To help older adults recover their financial footing after being victims of scams and identity theft.

- Enhance public education around scams and identity theft through public presentations

- Enhance financial literacy of older adults through the interactive workshop “Taking Control of Your Financial Health”
SAFE Program Outreach Numbers

100+
Older adults provided with one-on-one services

9,000+
Older adults and professionals educated on scams and identity theft
One-on-One Services

- Filing police and consumer reports
- Contacting credit reporting agencies
- Disputing information on credit reports
- Contacting creditors and closing accounts
- Placing fraud alerts on credit reports
- Assistance with closing and reopening financial accounts
- And more . . .
Providing Assistance for Older Adult Financial Exploitation Victims: Implications for Clinical Gerontologists

Peter A Lichtenberg Ph.D., ABPP, Latoya Hall MSW, Evan Gross & Rebecca Campbell
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The SAFE program has four major goals in its work with older urban adults, many of whom are African American:

1. To educate older adults on finances and financial management.

2. To disseminate information on fraud and identity theft to older adults and professionals who serve older adults.

3. To provide on-on-one services to older adults who have been the victims of frauds and identity theft.

4. To determine whether those who seek services are more psychologically or cognitively vulnerable than those who are not victims of financial exploitation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>SAFE</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD) or %</td>
<td>Mean (SD) or %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>69.57 (6.4)</td>
<td>69.19 (7.0)</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Education</td>
<td>15.33 (2.1)</td>
<td>13.35 (2.2)</td>
<td>-2.98**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Problems</td>
<td>2.04 (1.1)</td>
<td>3.71 (2.0)</td>
<td>3.30**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-rated Health</td>
<td>3.48 (0.7)</td>
<td>2.67 (1.3)</td>
<td>-2.56**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IADLS</td>
<td>38.76 (1.7)</td>
<td>34.62 (6.4)</td>
<td>-2.88**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRAT TOTAL</td>
<td>54.90 (8.1)</td>
<td>49.56 (13.2)</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMSE</td>
<td>28.86 (1.3)</td>
<td>26.86 (2.3)</td>
<td>3.53***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails B</td>
<td>99.75 (34.8)</td>
<td>184.75 (77.6)</td>
<td>4.49***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroop CW</td>
<td>31.19 (10.6)</td>
<td>24.45 (10.0)</td>
<td>-2.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS)</td>
<td>.90 (1.1)</td>
<td>4.19 (3.4)</td>
<td>4.17***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geriatric Anxiety Inventory (GAI)</td>
<td>.52 (1.4)</td>
<td>4.76 (4.9)</td>
<td>3.84***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Stress Scale (PSS)</td>
<td>6.16 (3.8)</td>
<td>16.40 (7.2)</td>
<td>5.61***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lichtenberg Financial Decision Rating Scale (LFDRS) Risk Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational Awareness Risk</td>
<td>5.00 (1.9)</td>
<td>6.62 (3.6)</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych. Vulnerability Risk</td>
<td>2.38 (1.9)</td>
<td>4.19 (2.2)</td>
<td>2.64**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Factor-Current Decision</td>
<td>2.48 (1.6)</td>
<td>4.33 (3.3)</td>
<td>2.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susceptibility Risk</td>
<td>1.19 (1.98)</td>
<td>2.67 (27)</td>
<td>2.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFDRS Total Risk</td>
<td>10.19 (6.6)</td>
<td>17.48 (8.7)</td>
<td>3.40**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*<.05
**<.01
***<.001
Clinical Implications

- Clinicians need to be mindful of the interconnections of financial health, mental health, and physical health.

- Older clients who cannot resolve their credit or other financial issues demonstrated reduced cognitive and mental health functioning.

- Assessment and intervention in basic financial matters will likely emerge as an important skill for clinical gerontologists.