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Overview for today’s webinar

• Introduce cognitive aging concepts and how they affect finances
• 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
Figure 1: Components of Cognitive Ability

Cognitive ability

Crystallized intelligence
- Vocabulary & facts
- Procedural knowledge

Fluid intelligence
- Memory
- Reaction speed
- Problem solving & planning

Source: Authors’ illustration.
Figure 2b: Age-Related Changes in Episodic Memory—Adjusted

Source: Adapted from Nyberg et al. (2012).
Figure 4: Cognitive Scores Over 7-Year Period for Individuals Initially Ages 70-79
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*Cognitive score*

*Testing year: Y1, Y3, Y5, Y8*

*Source: Reproduced from Yaffe et al. (2009).*
COGNITIVE AGING AND THE CAPACITY TO MANAGE MONEY

By Anek Belbase and Geoffrey T. Sanzenbacher

Vol. 17, No.1, pp. 1-6
Cognitively healthy older adults and those with cognitive decline

• Given cognitive aging why do 95% of older adults manage debt, pay bills and maintain good credit just as well as 50 year olds?

Ans: Crystallized Intelligence (for those who have been managing finances for years).

For those taking over finances—it becomes a fluid intelligence task and not as solid in managing finances.
Now the scary part of the financial story

• Angrisani & Lee, 2019

• Health and Retirement study—longitudinal data

• Decrements in wealth linked to cognitive decline such that 10-15% decline equated to 15-18% wealth loss in 2 year period.

• 61% of sample with decrements had cognitive decline but remained untreated/diagnosed
Cognitive or Neuropsychiatric Symptoms that:

1. Interfere with ability to function in usual activities
2. Represent a decline from previous functioning
3. Not due to delirium or major psychiatric disorder
4. Cognitive impairment detected through history and objective assessment
5. At least problems in 2 domains (memory, reasoning, visuospatial, language, personality change)
Criteria for Probable AD

1. Meet criteria for dementia
2. Insidious onset
3. Clear-cut history of worsening cognition
4. Variety of presentations; amnestic most common, language (word finding), executive dysfunction
5. AD does not include extensive WMHs, LBD, or PPA

Note: WMHs may meet criteria for Possible AD
Early Detection of Dementia:

1. Self Report
2. Informant Report
3. Triggers
• Are your memory, thinking skills, or ability to reason worse than a year ago?

• If yes, has this interfered with your everyday activities (e.g., shopping, paying bills, driving)?

• Has a physician or other health care professional evaluated your memory or thinking change?
1-6 Yes/No Items

1. Repeat themselves
2. More forgetful
3. Need reminders for chores, shopping, etc.
4. Seem sad, may cry more often
5. Trouble with calculations and managing finances
6. Lost interest in usual hobbies or activities
Early Detection Screening Items

7-10 Yes/No Items

7. Needing help with ADLs
8. Irritable, agitated or suspicious
9. Concerns about driving (safety or lost)
10. Trouble finding words

Cutoff score of 4:
82% PPV, 93.5% NPV
Dementia Trigger

Communication

- Missed Office Appointments
- Confusion about Medical Conditions/Treatment Instructions
- Calling Office Frequently

- Repetitive Speech
- Missed Paying Bills
- Difficulty Following Directions
- Trouble with Handling Paperwork
Case Study Alzheimer’s disease: Classic Awful Case

• George and his wife both have dementia—wife is the caregiver
• Wife dies
• Son Leo moves in with George and becomes POA
• Leo takes George’s $425K and blows it— how much Taco Bell can you eat? Really . . .
• Leo has an attorney and financial planner come for George to sign Quit Claim Deeds . . . are you kidding me?
• Leo is not careful—signs the forms himself; attorney and planner have to admit they never saw George the day he signed
• Judge orders all property to go to Leo’s brother & refers case to Prosecutor
• “Decision making capacity is the cornerstone assessment for many cases of elder abuse while balancing autonomy, beneficence and paternalism.”

*The Gerontologist, 2014; vol. 54, p. 156*
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)
Lichtenberg et al., 2013; 2016
Clinical Gerontologist: Longitudinal Predictors

• 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
Lichtenberg et al. 2013 & 2016
Psychological Vulnerability

• 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%; $X^2 = 20.49; p < .001$).

• 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%; $\chi^2 = 7.85, p = .005$).
Reports from Financial Institutions: Deposit Institutions (Banks, Credit Unions) and Money Services Businesses (e.g. Moneygram, Western Union)

SAR reports quadrupled between 2013 (1300/month) and 2017 (5700/month)

2017 losses connected to SARs $1.7 Billion in 2017

80% SARs loss to an older adult; Mean loss $34,000; 7% $100K+

69% 60yo+

56% 70yo+

33% 80yo+
Comparison of FE characteristics between MSB and DI Institutions

- Money Services Businesses (MSB) - Deposit Institutions (DI)
- 69% Stranger Scams - 27% Stranger Scams
- Romance, Relative in Need, Lottery - 67% knew Suspect

- Overall: 51% Stranger; 36% Known person (70% family; 19% Fiduciary)
- Biggest losses—Fiduciary Average loss $83,600
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?

Perceived 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%
<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>
</tbody>
</table>
## CFA for Psychosocial Vulnerability Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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 re to 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 were lonely?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
#52 Has a relationship with a family member/friend become strained due to finances as you have grown older?

#53 How often has a person talked you into a decision to spend money?

#55 Did anyone ever tell you that someone else you know wants to take your money?

#57 Have you had any conflicts with anyone about the way you spend money?

#60 Has anyone used or taken your money without your permission?

#61 How likely is it that anyone now wants to take or use your money without your permission?
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
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-Filipjak MA

A Person-Centered Approach to Financial Capacity Assessment: Preliminary Development of a New Rating Scale
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Financial Exploitation, Financial Capacity, and Alzheimer’s Disease

Peter A. Lichtenberg
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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

A Short Form of the Lichtenberg Financial Decision Rating Scale

Peter A. Lichtenberg, Evan Gross & Rebecca Campbell

Conceptual and Empirical Approaches to Financial Decision-making by Older Adults: Results from a Financial Decision-making Rating Scale

Peter A. Lichtenberg, Katja Ocepek-Weiksson, Lisa J Ficker, Evan Gross, Annalise Rahman-Filipjak & Joanne A. Terezi
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
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
Formed 3 New Scales:

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

https://olderadultnestegg.com
FDT, FVA, FFI
Lichtenberg Financial Decision Screening Scale (LFDSS): Aka—“Financial Decision Tracker”

Foundational to the Rating Scale
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. By Peter A. Lichtenberg, PhD, ABPP, and Donna M. Pate, CPA

Next to medical decisions, financial decisions can have the greatest impact on an individual’s quality of life. But when it comes to working with older adults, how can professionals be confident that their clients are making an informed financial decision? Are clients no longer able to understand the older they are? Are all adults who appear vulnerable being influenced to make decisions that could be harmful to their financial well-being? Are memory problems causing them to forget what was discussed? Despite specific training, in many cases, financial professionals may struggle to recognize when an older adult is mentally impaired...
Trial Statewide Implementation

- **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 inquires to staff and supervisor for cases that had questions.
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.
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
Goals

- Training
- Certification
- Implementation

First 3 months
Meet with and have all supervisors trained and supervised

Second 3 months
APS professionals in field trained, certified and implementation begins

Last 6 months
Case reviews undertaken and weekly feedback to supervisors and to APS professionals in the field

Sites scattered across the state. Met with each of 4 groups of supervisors in person the first three months.
Met with APS staff in field the subsequent 5 months.
Website allowed me to give feedback on individual cases beginning in the 7th month.
Lichtenberg
OLDER ADULT NEST EGG

Older Adult Nest Egg helps frontline professionals review significant financial decisions to identify and protect seniors vulnerable to fraud. Older adults lose billions of dollars each year to fraud, identity theft, and scams. Now, thanks to new screening interviews created by gerontologist and researcher Dr. Peter Lichtenberg, professionals have the tools to determine awareness, influence, and judgment about an older client's recent financial decisions.

HARD TRUTHS

One out of every 20 older adults in the U.S. is a victim of financial exploitation, losing an average of $80,000 to $186,000. Nearly half of these crimes are committed by someone the older adult knows and trusts, like a relative or caregiver.

An 82-year-old man with undiagnosed vascular dementia gets caught up in the "grandparent scam," in which someone purporting to be a grandchild asks for money to get themselves out of legal trouble overseas. Over the course of one week, the man wires money from his bank account and loses $100,000.

Nest Egg Tools

FINANCIAL DECISION TRACKER
This brief 10-item interview examines a specific financial decision made by the older adult.

FINANCIAL VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT
The Financial Vulnerability Assessment is an in-depth interview used to identify areas of vulnerability.

FAMILY & FRIENDS INTERVIEW
The Family & Friends Interview asks a series of questions to the intended beneficiary and other family and friends.
Create a user account and select profession from drop down
Get Certified

Scroll to bottom of home page and click “Start Training” to use the Interviews

OR

Select Tools at top menu A new sub menu will appear. Click “Training & Education” then select “Start training” below

OlderAdultNestEgg.com
REPORTING

RISK SCORE for each interview completed

OLD AGE & ADULT NEST EGG DECISIONAL ABILITY SCORE

No Concerns

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

Risk Rating: 4

Your client’s 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

NO CONCERNS
People who score in this range are generally not experiencing any difficulty with making informed decisions about financial affairs (rating 1-4)

SOME CONCERNS
People who score in this range are demonstrating some difficulty with making an informed financial decision but with the need for support (rating 5-7)

MAJOR CONCERNS
People who score in this range are demonstrating significant difficulty with making an informed financial decision (rating > 7)

Your Account keeps an archive of your interviews
(by client ID, interview date and type)

Interviews

Search: [ ]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview ID</th>
<th>Date Entered</th>
<th>Survey Name</th>
<th>Client ID</th>
<th>Interviewer</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F021201-042-010-044</td>
<td>1/28/17 6:59 PM</td>
<td>Financial Decision Tracker</td>
<td>ADR: 85, Female: White - Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>Elizabeth Zetlin</td>
<td>View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F021201-017-011-055</td>
<td>1/28/17 6:59 PM</td>
<td>Financial Decision Tracker</td>
<td>ADR: 85, Male: White - Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>Sheri Remington</td>
<td>View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F021201-044-013-059</td>
<td>1/28/17 6:59 PM</td>
<td>Financial Decision Tracker</td>
<td>ADR: 85, Female: Other</td>
<td>{Redacted}</td>
<td>View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F021201-044-014-068</td>
<td>1/28/17 6:59 PM</td>
<td>Financial Decision Tracker</td>
<td>ADR: 85, Female: White - Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>Leslie Davidson</td>
<td>View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F021201-044-043-070</td>
<td>1/28/17 6:59 PM</td>
<td>Financial Decision Tracker</td>
<td>ADR: 85, Female: Other</td>
<td>Jessica Stacey</td>
<td>View</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next Steps & Resource recommendation for each interview

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://www.aoa.gov/about/about-aoa/about-administration-aging

National Adult Protective Services
Contact to find your nearest state chapter to report suspected abuse or exploitation
https://www.naps.org/about-how-to-help/

Adult Protective Services of Michigan
1-800-448-3921

Alzheimer’s Association
Guidance, education and tools about cognitive assessments and how to

Each interview can be retrieved on screen and downloaded as pdf

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?
Benefit family (who?) - changing beneficiary from husband (died) to remaining sister and nieces and nephew
Do you agree with the respondent’s answer
Yes
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

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 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

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
The Central Question of Every Investigation is...

Do we need to *Promote Autonomy* or *Help Provide Protection*?
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
Why Evidence-based Tools Are Important

Reliable

Replicable

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

634 INTERVIEWS by Michigan Adult Protective Service Caseworkers

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

“It helps us ask all the questions we need to”

“These assessments help me educate my clients”

“I was able to save over $1 million for a client”

It helped me communicate with other professionals
Evidence-based Assessments for Professionals

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

VISIT: OlderAdultNestEgg.com to Get Trained and Implement Tools

OlderAdultNestEgg.com is FREE to users because of support from National Institute of Justice, Foundation for Financial Health, Michigan Aging and Adult Services PRVNT Program, Michigan Health Endowment Fund, State of Michigan, Wayne State University Technology Commercialization, American House Foundation and the Mary Thompson Foundation.
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
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
# Michigan Implementation Study

## Table 1 Descriptive Statistics for the sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics &amp; FDT</th>
<th>Overall Sample</th>
<th>Interviewer Score</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n= 445)</td>
<td>Concerns (n = 222)</td>
<td>No Concerns (n= 223)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>78.3 (9.2)</td>
<td>77.3 (8.8)</td>
<td>79.3 (9.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years M (SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>262 (58.9%)</td>
<td>128 (57.7%)</td>
<td>134 (60.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female N (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>53 (11.9%)</td>
<td>32 (14.4%)</td>
<td>21 (9.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black N (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>291 (65.4%)</td>
<td>141 (63.5%)</td>
<td>150 (67.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school &amp; beyond N (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDT</td>
<td>5.4 (3.9)</td>
<td>8.4 (2.8)</td>
<td>2.3 (2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Score M (SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * < .05; **<.01
# Michigan Implementation Study

## Table 2 Types of Financial Decisions Being Investigated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Decision</th>
<th>Overall Sample (n= 445)</th>
<th>Interviewer Score</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concerns (n = 222)</td>
<td>No Concerns (n = 223)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Making a gift</strong></td>
<td>119 (27%)</td>
<td>55 (25%)</td>
<td>64 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Making a purchase</strong></td>
<td>40 (9%)</td>
<td>17 (8%)</td>
<td>23 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Participating in a scam</strong></td>
<td>73 (16%)</td>
<td>57** (26%)</td>
<td>16 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Allowing someone else access to your money</strong></td>
<td>37 (8%)</td>
<td>19 (9%)</td>
<td>18 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Allowing someone else to take over your finances (bill etc.)</strong></td>
<td>172 (39%)</td>
<td>72 (32%)</td>
<td>100** (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. Other</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G. Don't Know/inaccurate</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Michigan Implementation Study

**Table 3 Concurrence of Rater and Risk Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rater Agreed with FDT Risk Recommendation</th>
<th>Rater Reduced Concerns Compared to FDT Risk Recommendation</th>
<th>Rater Increased Concerns Compared to FDT Risk Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case N (%)</strong></td>
<td>391 (87.9%)</td>
<td>27 (6.1%)</td>
<td>27 (6.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

Yes  No
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

If No, FDT IS NOT NEEDED

If Yes,

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

- Yes
- No

If No, STOP

If Yes, 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)?

- Yes
- No

STOP

FDT IS NOT NEEDED
Does the older adult appear to be a vulnerable adult?

FACTORS INCLUDE:

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

Person may need protection
Administer FDT*

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

Administer FDT*

Person may need support for autonomy

Administer FDT*

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

Family & Friends Interview (FFI)
Case Example: Using FDT and FFI

- 88 year old man befriended by 33 year old woman
- Woman moved into man’s home and then brought a second female friend into the home
- Woman was a convicted felon
First Step--FFI

• Used the FFI first individually with daughter and grand-daughter
• Helped determine what issues to focus on
APS worker went to the home

• Although man was somewhat suspicious at first and woman hostile, he managed to get them separated for interview
• Used the FDT to help the man open up to him
• Man lacked understanding that woman might be taking advantage of him, and did not appreciate the risks
• Had the woman complete the FFI as “assistance” to the worker—changed her tone and even thanked him.
Value of the tools

• APS worker knew woman already had man’s vehicle and access to bank accounts—went to prosecutor. Man vulnerable due to recent loss of wife, and had diagnosis of depression.

• Detective who made wellness checks on man vehemently disagreed that man was vulnerable.

• The tools helped the detective change his tune

• Discovered from tools that cognitive problems likely existed and then verified that
Happy Endings

• Man was deemed unable to make informed decisions
• Got reunited with his family
• Became much happier
• “the tools came to work in this case in a lot of different ways”
Different ways tools came to work

• FFI helped focus APS worker on issues at hand
• FDT helped identify possible decision-making incapacity
• FFI with perpetrator made her feel like she was helping and information was so contrary to the family members that it revealed her tactics.
• Tools were objective evidence that detective considered and changed opinion
• Helped to make the case for cognitive decline and incapacity
Assessment of financial decision making: an informant scale

Rebecca C. Campbell, Peter A. Lichtenberg, Latoya N. Hall, Jeanne A. Teresi & Katja Ocepek-Welikson
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?
**Appropriate**: A financial decision has been made

Example:

Q1. What financial decision are you making or have made? 
   Turn over bill paying to someone else

Do you agree with the respondent’s answer
Yes

**Inappropriate**: No financial decision made

Example:

Q1. What financial decision are you making or have made? 
   Scam, fraud, theft (suspected)

Do you agree with the respondent’s answer
Yes

Q4. What is your primary financial goal for this decision? 
   Other (describe) "Client was unaware of stolen checkbook"

Do you agree with the respondent’s answer
Yes
Appropriate Use of the Scale: interviewer is responding based on what they know and believe

Q1  What financial decision are you making or have made?
    Giving a gift or loan (pay bills/tuition for grandchild, purchase home for child)

    Do you agree with the respondent's answer
    Yes

    Notes: Client was aware of how much money she gave, when this happen, and who the family member

Q2  Was this your idea or did someone else suggest it or accompany you?
    Someone suggested/accompanied you (who?) - reported it was family members idea and client's idea

    Do you agree with the respondent's answer
    No

    Please select what you feel the correct response to be
    Your idea

    Please provide input on why you do not agree
    possibly some persuasion by others

    Notes: na
**Inappropriate use:** Unable to determine deficits around decisional capacity due to unacknowledged financial decision and insufficient notes

| Q1 | What financial decision are you making or have made?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Don't know or inaccurate response</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you agree with the respondent's answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Notes: The client has not been exploited. The client has a guardian to make sure he is not exploited.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Q2 | Was this your idea or did someone else suggest it or accompany you?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Don't know or inaccurate response</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you agree with the respondent's answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Notes: The client has not been exploited. The client has a guardian to make sure he is not exploited.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Q3 | What is the primary purpose of this decision?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Don't know or inaccurate response</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you agree with the respondent's answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Q4 | What is your primary financial goal for this decision?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Don't know or inaccurate response</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you agree with the respondent's answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>How will this decision impact you now and over time?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Don't know or inaccurate response</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you agree with the respondent's answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
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.

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
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
Legal Statute for Unjust Enrichment: Michigan

MCL 750.174a states:
A person shall not through fraud, deceit, misrepresentation, coercion, or unjust enrichment obtain or use or attempt to obtain or use a vulnerable adult's money or property to directly or indirectly benefit that person knowing or having reason to know the vulnerable adult is a vulnerable adult.
73-year-old man with early dementia
Lives surrounded by family
Loaned money to brothers and nieces, but never more than $3500 and kept careful account
Brother who lives down the road interacts with him daily
Man almost a victim of sweepstakes scam but wife alerted brother who deterred it
Brother takes man to bank, gets man to cash in IRA for $100K so brother can “pay off his mortgage”
Prosecutor charges man with unjust enrichment
Case Study

• Memory and executive functioning deficits
• 10-item scale: Lack of understanding and appreciation
• Wife takes care of all money and learned of IRA withdrawal only when bank statement came out
• Lack of awareness/minimization of deficits
• Deception, tactics, susceptibility all consistent with undue influence
• My report concludes he is a victim of unjust enrichment by brother
Q5 How will this decision impact you now and over time?
No impact

• Do you agree with the respondent's answer? No

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

Q6 How much risk is there to your financial well-being?
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
  May need services himself

Q2 Was this decision their idea or did someone else suggest it?
Someone else's idea (describe)

Q3 Now and over time, how do you think this decision or transaction will impact your relative or friend financially?
Will have a major negative impact

Q4 How much risk is there that this decision could result in a negative impact, such as loss of funds?
Moderate risk

Q10 Does your relative or friend regret or worry about a financial decision or transaction they made or intend to make?
Yes (describe) - Very worried about money

Q11 Would others, who know your relative or friend well, say the current major financial decision is unusual for them?
Yes; this could be seen as very unusual
Summary and recommendations:

1. Mr. J has suffered from memory problems since 2014 and carried a diagnosis of dementia since early 2016, and this dementia is further documented by my evaluation.

2. Mr. J was unable to make an informed financial decision in giving the gift of $100,000. He lacked reasoning, understanding and appreciation both in his wife’s report and the police description of their interview with Mr. J in 2016, as well as in my assessment.

3. Mr. J was highly susceptible to influence and being victim of unjust enrichment due to his cognitive difficulties, his lack of decisional abilities and his lack of awareness of deficit.

4. Mr. E used a confidential relationship with his brother, as well as deception in order to obtain the $100,000 from Mr. J. In addition, due to his daily interactions with Mr. J, and an event whereby Mr. J almost lost monies to a sweepstakes scam a mere two months prior to the $100,000 transaction, Mr. E knew or should have known that his brother was vulnerable to influence and financial exploitation.

In my professional opinion, and based on the records reviewed and evaluation completed at this time I believe, with a reasonable degree of certainty that Mr. J was a victim and his brother Mr. E unjustly enriched himself.
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”
Presentation Topics

Professionals
The SAFE Program
Older Adult Nest Egg (OANE)

Older Adults
COVID 19 Scams
Protecting Yourself from Scams and Identity Theft
All About Credit
Household Finances (Budgeting)

Caregivers
Difficult Conversations Around Finances
Managing Someone Else's Money
Detecting Financial Mismanagement
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
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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 Mean (SD) or % (n = 21)</th>
<th>SAFE Mean (SD) or % (n = 21)</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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
Money Matters: Help for Caregivers Who Handle Other People's Finances

We Can Help

We specialize in educating caregivers to handle the critical money issues of the people they care for. Learn. Assess. Protect.

The easy-to-follow workshops teach the basics of good money management for older adults. Our brief online assessment can help determine the quality of your loved one's financial decision-making and give next steps to preserve and protect funds.

Free Online Learning

Learn the warning signs of early cognitive impairment, how to hold difficult discussions, the clues to detecting financial mismanagement, and the basics of managing another person's money.

Resources for Caregivers

From where to get help in your community to news and research, fraud alerts and more - explore resources for families and friends caring for older adults. We didn't cover something? Ask us a question.

View Resources for Caregivers

View all of our Online Learning Segments

OlderAdultNestEgg.com
Caregiver Resources

Caregiving duties can overwhelm even the most well-intentioned relative or friend. The organizations, workshops and resources below are reliable, accurate and trustworthy. Use them with peace of mind that they have the best interests of you and the person you care for at heart.

Want to report a scam so others won’t be fooled? Contact the Federal Trade Commission.

HELPFUL ORGANIZATIONS

Groups and websites you can trust to help with caregiver needs:

- AARP Fraud Watch Network
  Fully updated national fraud resource and information website. Includes a scam-tracking map and educational podcasts.
  Helpline at (877) 908-3360 if you suspect fraud.
  https://www.aarp.org/money/scams-fraud/

- National Adult Protective Services
  Investigates abuse, neglect and exploitation in older adults.
  (202) 370-6292
  https://www.naps-now.org/help/how-aps-helps/

- CaringKind
  Services are New York based, but most educational information applies nationwide.
  24 Hour Helpline (646) 744-2900
  https://caringkind.org/

- HealthInfoAging.org
  Info & advice by American Geriatrics Society’s Health in Aging Foundation
  (800) 563-4916
  http://www.healthinaging.org

- Caregiver Action Network
  The nation’s leading family caregiver association providing education, peer support and resources.
  (202) 454-3970
  http://www.caregiveraction.org

- Family Caregiver Alliance
  National nonprofit to serve the needs of those caring for a friend or relative with serious cognitive impairment.
  (800) 445-8106
  http://www.caregiver.org

FRAUD ALERTS

Be aware of the latest scams targeting older adults so you can warn vulnerable persons in your care:

- Protecting Finances During COVID-19
- Coronavirus Scams Targeting the Vulnerable
- Romance Scams Steal $2 Billion in 2019
- Scammers Pretend to be Federal Trade Commission
- Social Security’s Not Trying To Take Your Benefits
- Medicare does not give out DNA kits
- Scammers targeted by oil card scam
- FDA warns teens to be vigilante for consumer loss reports

Sign up to see the latest scams identified by the Federal Trade Commission: FTC Scam Alert Page

Consumer Protection: Are you a consumer who’s been taken advantage of? Would you like a professional to investigate your case? Visit The Fearless Consumer to lodge your complaint and read eye-opening cases from investigative reporter and consumer advocate Barbara Nordin.

ASK US ON FACEBOOK

Have a question about financial victimization of older adults?
Message us on facebook or visit our Facebook feed to hear what other informal caregivers and experts have to share on the topic.

Institute of Gerontology at WSU

Receive Alerts
View the latest Scam Alerts and sign up to receive FTC notifications.

Engage with Experts
Follow the Institute of Gerontology on Facebook to learn about current online events or ask and expert a question.

Connect with Organizations
Download Resources

CAREGIVER RESOURCES
Sign up to Receive our Caregiver Connection Newsletter

- Here stories from other caregivers
- Learn about online events
- Get remote help with scams, fraud, identity theft & managing money as a caregiver
- and more
OlderAdultNestEgg.com
For Family & Friends

Peter A. Lichtenberg, PhD, ABPP
Director, Institute of Gerontology, Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan
plichtenberg@wayne.edu
Clinical Implications

• Clinicians needs 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.
Takeaway messages

• Financial decision making is often a key element to important financial transactions

• Cognition, financial management, financial decision-making all play a key role in financial exploitation

• Online narrated training and Empirically validated clinical tools to assess informed financial decision making are available at no charge on www.olderadultnestegg.com

• SAFE program is available to your clients and we will collaborate with you