

FUTURAGE

A ROAD MAP *for* AGEING RESEARCH

“A European Roadmap for Ageing and the Environment” Work Package 4

**Report from the 1st Scientific Workshop
held in Heidelberg, Germany on the 3-5 March 2010**

**Compiled by:
Hans-Werner Wahl, Heidelberg University
Susanne Iwarsson, Lund University
April 2010**

Coordinator: The University of Sheffield, Sociological Studies, Elmfield Building, Northumberland Road,
Sheffield S10 2TU, UK
<http://futurage.group.shef.ac.uk/>

Funded by the European Commission's Seventh Framework Programme
FP7-HEALTH-2007-B/No 223679



Report contents

- 1 Context and Contents of the Theme “Ageing and the Environment”
- 2 Aims of Workshop
- 3 Approach to Workshop and Methodology Used
- 4 Outcome of Workshop: Towards an Emerging Roadmap for Ageing and Environments
 - 4.1 General Issues
 - 4.2 General Priorities
 - 4.3 Examples for important research areas and questions
 - 4.4 Important cutting-across areas
- 5 Strategies for the Future

Annex 1. List of participants

Annex 2. Programme of the workshop

1 Context and Contents of the Theme “Ageing and the Environment”

The core of the research theme ageing and the environment is the better understanding of the interrelations between ageing persons and their physical-social surroundings (home environments; out-of-home environments; technology and products) including intervention and implementation. A key issue of the field is how person-environment (p-e) relationships shape outcomes (endpoints) such as functional competence, well-being or participation over time as people age. It is also very important to address the question, whether such relationships and outcomes depend on the societal, cultural and political background and may therefore be different in various European countries. It should further be noted that we understand the issue of ageing and environments as quite broad and obviously also involving substantial overlap with the other research streams and workshops within FUTURAGE. As a consequence, for the Heidelberg workshop we purposefully selected scholars from disciplines such as epidemiology, family and ageing research, health psychology and demographic research, besides researchers from urban sociology, architecture, occupational therapy and environmental psychology. We strongly believe that a roadmap for ageing and environments must incorporate many, including previously underused perspectives. In sum, we regard the area of ageing and environments as an umbrella for a wide set of research disciplines all contributing to the understanding of p-e relationships in converging manner.

2 Aims of Workshop

The aims of the Heidelberg workshop were as follows:

- To identify, analyse and integrate burning issues of the research area of ageing and environments
- To link these issues from the beginning with the ageing of our societies and with current and future societal challenges of Europe at large
- To begin a discussion on user involvement and translational issues
- To involve young scholars in all of these issues from the start
- To purposefully stay rather general with the intention to generate a first substantial direction for the roadmap and extend, enrich, and deepen the discussion with more concrete issues of theory, method and implementation during workshop 2 in Lund during June 16-18, 2010.

The driving force behind the workshop was which kind of European research agenda in terms of contents, alliances between respective fields, cutting-across issues such as methodology, and priorities / strategies in the area of ageing and environments is needed in the next 10 – 15 years to come.

3 Approach to Workshop and Methodology Used

The fundamental philosophy of the Heidelberg workshop was as follows:

- Participants were 35 scholars, including a selected group of young scholars, from Austria, Finland, Germany, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Spain, Sweden, the Netherlands, United Kingdom and the U.S. (see list of participants; see appendix).
- Participants represented a wide range of disciplines (architecture, engineering, epidemiology, geriatric medicine, health sciences, occupational therapy, psychology, sociology, transport research). In addition, the perspective of user involvement was emphasised and implemented by representatives of Help the Aged, the German BAGSO, and a member of the Swedish Parliament.
- We had various rounds of break-out groups (including a separate group session with only young scholars), focused statements and integrative discussions (see programme in the appendix)
- We concentrated on existing evidence and research gaps as well as on the need to translate existing findings to intervention and practice. In addition, we followed a rough differentiation between research primarily targeting the home environment (with a strong but not sole focus on the individual) versus out-of-home environments (with a strong but not sole focus on society and policy). With this differentiation, we covered micro, meso and macro perspectives on p-e relations along the process of ageing.
- This approach resulted in four key research challenges, i.e., (1) Individual level / home environment: additional / new evidence needed; (2) Individual level / home environments: existing evidence and interventions / translations needed; (3) Societal level / out-of-home environments: additional / new evidence needed; (4) Societal level / out-of-home environments: existing evidence and interventions / translations needed. The perspective of young scholars was integrated regarding all of these issues.

4 Outcome of Workshop: Towards an Emerging Roadmap for Ageing and Environments

4.1 General Issues

Strategies for how to generate research questions relevant in the field

It is important for the Roadmap to suggest and follow spelled-out and transparent strategies for the generation of relevant research questions:

- What do older people want and need? For example, a common notion is that the majority of older people wants to stay put, but is that really true in 2010 and onwards? We need more differentiated knowledge in this regard, particularly better knowledge on the needs and priorities of different sub-groups (e.g., older adults with cognitive impairments, living alone in their home environment; highly educated older adults living in rapidly changing urban neighbourhoods).
- A generally important issue is that due to longer life expectancy and medical achievements, more people will live from younger ages into very old age with major chronic diseases and disabilities, i.e. ageing with a disability is an emerging field of study.
- Political initiatives result in differences between countries and such variation deserves attention in research.
- End users could be used as lobbyists for ageing and environment research and findings, able to influence research policies and prioritisations, nationally as well as at the European level.
- There is a need for adopting a bottom-up perspective, i.e., to discuss research priorities with users and stakeholders, not only to make priorities out of the researchers' internal interests. A prime example is research on technology, for which gerontology competence and end user input is needed for the generation of relevant research questions.
- We need to make more serious attempts to anticipate the situation of the next generation(s) of older persons. Therefore, it is necessary to consult people in their 30's, 40's and 50's, and not just current cohorts of older people.

- We should concentrate on modifiable risk factors to quality of life, health and well being
- We should target not only ‘types of individuals’ but also ‘types of environments’ and related interactions.
- We should bring together all the environment and ageing issues operating at different levels such as housing, transport and neighbourhood research, including technology perspectives. All of them will play a role, when well-being along the process of ageing and in old age is in the focus.

Acknowledge and exploit what already is known and available

We already know quite a lot in various areas of ageing and environments and should avoid unnecessary repetitions of research work. Still, at the same time we do not have sufficient knowledge. Therefore it is necessary to:

- gather and synthesise important knowledge from the last 20-30 years of research (we are under-using what we know already).
- analyse gaps in what has been done so far (proactive “data mining” is needed).

We also discussed the idea of a more rigorous auditing and interpreting of ongoing and completed research in the area of ageing and environments. Such a clearing-house like institution may have the following tasks:

- be a repository of knowledge, including securing the preservation of knowledge in the future.
- allow (easy) horizon-scanning for looking to the future.
- support quality assurance with respect to research & output standards.
- support career building by facilitating knowledge transfer to young researchers
- be of help in connection with funding (recognise gaps and offer appropriate research work).
- be of help in connection with ethical questions (e.g., issues of ‘control’ of rehabilitation technology).

Give specific EU related issues priority from the start

The relationship between national and EU level research agendas needs to be joined up with dialogue between them from the start. Additional issues and questions include:

- What is the added value of the funding of ageing and environments research at the EU level?
- It could well be that research topics in one country are not being addressed in another, a situation which must be spelled out systematically and may lead to better exchange and co-operation. Also, successful transfer of best or good practice models of research in one country may require in-depth evaluation of implementation in another country.
- Research goals may be developed more in terms of how they can be achieved (only) by countries working together (not comparative, but complementary)
- Capacity building in terms of European research on ageing and environments should involve the serious consideration of combining already existing resources across various European countries.
- There is also the challenge of languages across Europe, which generally deserves more attention in ageing research.

Reflect the area of ageing and environments in a broader research community perspective

In order to be able to really move the knowledge frontier in ageing and environments research forwards in a creative and efficient way, researchers must not only be aware of the potential of their findings, but also consider barriers for being successful and disseminate their outcome in the strongest way possible. Examples of such issues are:

- Values among scientists and professionals – what kind of research topics, disciplines and methodological approaches should be involved?
- Different traditions – tension between disciplines/professionals with different types of history and different attitudes to science.
- Country-specific differences in policies and legislation lead to different political priorities as concerns research and also influence the possibilities to study certain fields or phenomena. For example in Sweden, there is a very

structured approach to social policy, but this can also be perceived as too “prescriptive” – there is a need for sound criticism to reach the optimal balance.

- There is a tension between different types of research (e.g., quantitative versus qualitative).
- There are traditional divisions such as the one between gerontology, geriatric medicine and the social sciences. How can we improve the communication for more efficient research collaboration? More integrated approaches are needed.
- There generally is a need for a more balanced and conscious perspective of the user versus researcher dichotomy and there is much discrepancy beneath researchers, how this dichotomy should be treated.

It is also important in this context that current research funding is very much a political process. An overarching question is how researchers, end-users and stakeholders can influence priority setting and the mechanism involved in research funding, when it comes to the area of ageing and environments:

- How can environmental gerontology come higher on the research agenda for funders and politicians?
- Researchers must make their voices heard!
- The European Commission influences our research - and can we influence the EC?
- There is a lot of funding for technology – but there is too little communication with end users.

4.2 General Priorities

Always keep the bigger picture

For ageing and environments as a research and practice area, a critically important general issue is to always focus the “bigger picture”. For example, the issue of housing is generally crucial for our societal, cultural and political planning and action processes. Also, the issue of universal design (design for all) is important for Europe at large. It may even be the case that new housing options emerging from the

“graying” of our societies may provide a creative impetus to the unfolding of housing alternatives and models in the future. Different ways of living will involve age-integration as well as age-segregation.

At a still more general level, environmental gerontology can be linked to vitally important issues for European societies such as globalisation, climate change, sustainability and the economic crisis. For example, globalisation increasingly hits the infrastructural characteristics of European cities (e.g. neighbourhoods with pronounced migration characteristics) and older adults, particularly very old individuals, may be strongly represented among those not in a position to adapt well to such change dynamics (either via relocation or other adaptive options). Similarly, older adults are probably among those most vulnerable for climate change:

- How will climate change impact on and affect older people? (excess mortality/emergency preparedness)
- Where are the vulnerable places for older people in periods of severe weather?
- To what extent does seasonality affect older people – can there be lessons transferred here from research in harsh climates?
- What adaptations and mitigations need to take place and what changes as a result to older people’s lifestyles?
- What is the impact of natural disaster on older people?
- Green issues – how do older people view sustainability and what actions do they take?

Environmental gerontology research addressing such overarching issues is currently only beginning to emerge and should unfold much more strongly in the very near future.

Invest into conceptual issues

There is an ongoing tendency in European societies to undervalue the role of the environment, particularly the spatial and physical/material environment.

Environmental gerontology research must become much more successful in communicating the important role of the environment as people age. This means, for

example, that conceptual investments are needed in order to better define, distinguish, and communicate key meta-concepts such as place, space, environmental function, and p-e processes at large:

- Everyday interactions and fundamental needs - such as the basic need of getting to the toilet - should be used to unfold the basic argument, that is, environmental gerontology must be highly concrete in order to be successful and make a point.
- The detail of environmental characteristics for the understanding and shaping of quality of life must become still much clearer.
- The fact that well-planned environments are frequently not used as predicted/expected and such phenomena must have a more prominent place in environmental gerontology research. More research is needed to better understand the ongoing dynamics and discrepancies between the planning and designing of places and the perception of those environments and their actual use, particularly in regard to older adults. We need to learn from post-occupancy evaluation.
- The role of the environment as a fundamental aspect of health care provision also deserves much more attention. This may target the home environment, but also the work context, and the community at large. The idea of health contexts generally is highly important for future environmental gerontology research and practice. For example, the house of an older individual may be seen as a first 'port of call' in the "defence of health care." This issue can and must be connected with the "ageing in place" idea in general.
- It is also very important at the conceptual level to distinguish the visible and objective environment from the invisible meaning of housing (perceptions, attachments), of which the latter tends to be frequently neglected by the "hard facts" of health business.
- Housing and environments have also much to do with end of life issues.
- Environments can serve as a cue for relevant actions and may therefore fulfil important function within preventive activities (e.g., a visible staircase as a cue to engage in more physical activity).
- Another relevant issue is the concept of shared environment. What might be beneficial for one group might be detrimental for another group (e.g., having

everything within easy reach is beneficial for individuals with impaired mobility, but might lead to reduced physical activity levels in those without impairments, which might be detrimental for their health in the long run).

- Environmental gerontology needs to better connect the areas of in-home environments with out-of-home research issues including liminal spaces (e.g., gardening). This is another facet of the striving toward a more holistic understanding of p-e processes and their role for ageing. Such issues also are of vital practical importance, for example in addressing old/new issues of neighbourhood responsibility.
- From a practice perspective, what do we know about the role of environments? We need a common taxonomy of environments and interventions including a system of indicators in terms of risks and opportunities for ageing well, which may be routinely collected for research as well as applied purposes.
- For efficient interventions, we need to find the right balance between facets aiming at change in the individual (e.g., perception and use of environment) and change in the environment itself.

Always keep a life course perspective

It is very important to understand p-e processes within the context of the life course. The concept of major transitions in adult human development is helpful. For example, transitions from middle adulthood into late adulthood and from early old age to advanced old age or even the phase close to death all imply major alterations of person-environment processes in terms of potentials and risks. At another level, transitions such as from normal cognitive ageing to MCI or dementia processes come with significant person-environment changes, which may support or challenge the increased vulnerability coming with cognitive loss dynamics.

We still do not understand much of such p-e transition processes and their impact on ageing well and forthcoming research should address therefore p-e transitions in much more detail.

Learn about diversity

Environmental gerontology can serve a better understanding of diversity and ageing issues. A combined local diversity x country-differences approach is important and also helps to better understand the various challenges related to various countries, particularly East European countries. Differences between European countries in terms of morbidity and mortality come strongly into the play here. Existing data sets regarding the health situation of older adults, in different countries could be exploited much better to serve the understanding of p-e diversity all over Europe. The following issues and questions are of particular importance:

- There is a need to go beyond the traditional urban-rural dichotomy and to look at embedded communities – e.g. poor neighbourhoods within wealthy areas.
- How do different types of urban and/or rural environment shape ageing outcomes (e.g. health, well-being, inclusion/exclusion etc.)?
- The increasing diversity of household types will provide challenges to land use planners, and further data on this is needed. How do we educate other professionals about such demographics and their implications?
- What variables can we use to classify place in order to learn about diversity?
- Diversity of virtual environments - what are the implications for future planning and policy making, when it comes to ageing?
- To what extent are inequalities of ageing perpetuated in particular environments?

Obviously, a plethora of research questions are connected with European cultural and countries differences in p-e use and experience. In the near future environmental gerontology needs to address these questions in a Europe-wide perspective.

Educate, communicate, translate, intervene and implement

A general issue is that new knowledge does not reach out, leading to the question, how can we as researchers make the dissemination process more efficient? Through creative interdisciplinary education and communication activities, environmental gerontology has to develop much further the understanding of the role of the environment for quality of life across the life course. Different age groups should be the target for such communication, that is, again, a lifespan perspective is important.

Particularly, middle aged individuals need to learn how person-environment processes may influence their lives in old age and what kind of health behaviours and preventive actions are possible and efficient.

Environmental gerontology should also better consider the potential audience for research findings, such as stakeholders, consumers, practitioners, producers or politicians. In the context of the key question, i.e. how to put research into practice, case studies and guidelines based on a “skilled eye” are highly important. There is also a need for an evidence-base for e.g. design for all issues. There is the necessity of user involvement at all stages of the research and implementation processes:

- It is essential to consult/involve older people, but also to younger generations (“visit the past to meet the future”).
- Involvement of the end-user is necessary at all stages of the research and implementation process.

Regarding interventions, there is a need for strategic partnerships with policy makers, age-friendly cities; healthy cities; and lifetime homes/neighbourhoods initiatives. As scientists we need to work with stakeholders to develop more sustainable environments for ageing. That is, implementation research has to operate in partnership. There is also a need of funding for implementation research, beyond that of communication/ dissemination of results. Public money used for development of practice must require not only evaluations but also requirements to practitioners to base practice developments on the scientific evidence at hand – currently, there is too much “reinvention of the wheel.”

The following issues regarding the complexities of dissemination should always be kept in mind:

- Not just ‘knowledge’ should be in the focus but also questions of interests, values and conflicts of interest
- We need to work out systems which change motivation (think of the ‘smoking doctor’ who should know the consequences of his behaviour, but does not behave accordingly)

- Empowerment strategies for older people and users, representing another type of "knowledge transfer", are important and should be developed.
- Moreover, we should in many cases talk not so much about knowledge transfer but 'knowledge exchange', for instance when other disciplines or different target groups of research are concerned (empowerment should function via knowledge exchange, for instance).

4.3 Examples for important research areas and questions

- Future environmental gerontology research needs to improve the knowledge on different aspects of ordinary housing for people with cognitive impairments (dementia, technology, home environment, transitions to institutional care).
- Research on institutional settings and "planned environments" must remain a significant area of environmental gerontology research. This research stream must also have a strong connection with health issues, because institutions are increasingly used by older adults with multi-morbidity and frailty.
- Connected to the former issue is the more general question concerning the role and meaning of home-like settings for today's and future older adults. It could well be, for example, that a technological environment, not seen as home-like in the extreme case (e.g., robotics) may serve the needs of older individuals better than home-like environments.
- There is also a strong need to become concrete and specific in environmental gerontology research. For example, research on the role of the kitchen may prove as very important. At a more general level, the fundamental question in this context may be framed like this: Do we know enough on the meaning of specific places over time and on cohort-related understanding of such specific places?
- An important area also is the work environment of older individuals: Stress associated with the work environment is under researched - how do the ergonomics of the workplace contribute to stressful outcomes for older people? Distance and travel to work, care and home. How can the environment around work be optimised to ensure longer working lives? Older

people working outdoors; what impact does the work environment have in decisions to retire or remain longer at work?

Important research questions are also related to the issue of *functionality*, examples for such research questions are:

- How can we create environments that optimise functionality in terms of physical activity (improving; maintaining) and social integration? How do we create mobilising environments?
- How does cognitive impairment and/or sensory impairment affect older people's views of the environment - is the environment a facilitator or barrier?
- Can we define vulnerable environments (in a similar way to which we define vulnerable people – but is this definition useful?) and how do these map onto ageing?
- How will ICT influence outdoor mobility and make the environment much more attractive?
- What is the connection between the perception of the environment (perceptions of safety, crime, ease of use) and its functionality?
- What makes places and people resilient?
- How do we create environments that matter to older people - for example with sufficient and appropriate car parking, places to sit etc?

4.4 Important cutting-across areas

Invest into the issue of interdisciplinarity

It has to be spelled out most clearly that only an interdisciplinary approach is able to serve environmental gerontology's intended holistic understanding of ageing.

Besides the classic bridges with disciplines such as architecture, the social sciences and urban studies under the umbrella of environmental gerontology, there is also a need for new interdisciplinary liaisons such as with biology. For example, is there a linkage between brain plasticity and the arrangement and demand characteristics of spatial arrangements? Future environmental gerontology should work on such new interdisciplinary synergies and conduct respective research.

Consider forthcoming cohorts of older individuals

Environmental gerontology can contribute much to better understanding of forthcoming cohorts. In particular, new cohorts of older people are coming with new environmental habits and lifestyles. Research on such issues will significantly drive the understanding of the role of cohort change at large in gerontology as well as in European societies.

Invest into the improvement of methodology

There is a plethora of issues connected with methodological challenges of environmental gerontology. These issues range from fundamental environmental assessment instruments to randomised-controlled trial (RCT) related challenges and the distinction between statistical and practical significance. Important is also to target the stability of person-environment outcomes as people age as a methodological challenge. Interdisciplinary research requires triangulation of methods and mixed-methods approaches.

Build new alliances

A highly important new alliance should be built between the area of housing and public health. A crucial question here is for example: How can environments be designed to engage people in positive health behaviours? Lifestyle change issues must in any case include the environment, which can support or hinder the implementation of preventive measures and important health behaviours. The important issue of cognitive decline in old age asks for a stronger alliance between environmental gerontology and cognitive ageing psychology. For example, we do not possess much knowledge on the stimulating role of the home environment for cognitive decline trajectories.

Invest into young scholars

Environmental gerontology should become a much stronger “training area” for young scholars. For example, European architectural competitions may serve the goal to attract young scholars for the area of ageing and the environment.

Overall, specialized BA/MA level education does not attract enough students to gerontology. It could be worth while to introduce gerontology in various other disciplines (psychology, medicine, communication science, etc.) in short modules, so that students do become aware of its existence and relevance. More post-graduate training would then be needed for specialized education. The personal benefits of a career in gerontology should be stressed more.

Because (environmental) gerontology is a small domain of research, young scholars often only have their supervisors as nearby persons with the same specialization. Virtual networks should be developed, but need to be built on face-to-face contacts. This implies that fundraising for travel is needed, and that students have to be supported and trained in doing so.

International contacts and collaboration are highly important, but real “European” careers – i.e., working and living in different places for longer periods - often are in conflict with the life stage of young researchers; they often have family obligations that restrict their international mobility. The challenge is to work nationally and at the same time at an international level, e.g., staying in the home country, but maintaining an intensive international network.

There is a general lack of professional and academic career perspectives in gerontology in European countries. The extent and reason for this lack may differ per country, but this aspect generally deserves much action. This is also true for the area of ageing and environments.

5 Strategies for the Future

- Instead of working in parallel, we should work more integrated
- We should utilise ICT, e.g. Skype, etc., much more – would develop collaboration
- We need to find more efficient ways to build research consortia, and to generate research questions and strong proposals
- Make inventories of creative ideas, novel thinking, innovative approaches and to communicate among researchers
- Make inventories of research questions in different countries – to utilise and build on the joint knowledge base
- Researchers should collaborate with health care and social services principals

It may be especially relevant as a general strategy to establish scenarios. Also, horizon scanning is necessary; looking to the future is needed for scenarios, which is an element of risk. To look into the past in order to look into the future is obviously necessary: What happened to earlier scenarios, what were the errors, how can we improve by looking at past processes?

In conclusion, the Road Map will have various turnings, signposts and directions as well as landmarks and navigational aids. We have an exciting opportunity to shape with the Roadmap research on ageing and environments to come.

Next Steps

There will be a continuation of the Heidelberg discussions in a second workshop in Lund during June 16-18, 2010. The intention is to deepen in Lund the discussion with more concrete elaborations in terms of theory, methodological issues and implementation research. We also used the Heidelberg workshop to get feedback for the planning of workshop 2.

Evaluation

The evaluation of the Heidelberg workshop was very positive based on a structured evaluation form approach. Detailed evaluation results will be sent to the central FUTURAGE unit at Sheffield University.

Appendix

- **List of participants**
- **Programme of Heidelberg Workshop**

Annex 1. List of participants

	Family Name	First Name	Institution	E-mail
1.	Barnes	Angela	Help the Aged, London, N1 9UZ United Kingdom	Angela.Barnes@helptheaged.org.uk
2.	Becker	Clemens	Klinik für Geriatarische Rehabilitation Robert Bosch Krankenhaus, D-70376 Stuttgart Germany	clemens.becker@rbk.de
3.	Benzinger	Petra	Robert-Bosch-Krankenhaus, 70376 Stuttgart, Germany	Petra.Benzinger@rbk.de
4.	Borell	Lena	Karolinska Institute, SE - 17177 Stockholm, Sweden	lena.borell@ki.se
5.	Chiatti	Carlos	Italian National Research Centres on Ageing, I-60124, Ancona, Italy	c.chiatti@inrca.it
6.	Classen	Katrin	University of Heidelberg, 69115 Heidelberg, Germany	Katrin.Classen@psychologie.uni- heidelberg.de
7.	Dahlin Ivanoff	Synneve	Academy at the University of Gothenburg, SE-405 30 Göteborg, Sweden	synneve.dahlin-ivanoff@gu.se
8.	Deeg	Dorly	VU University Medical Center - EMGO Institute - LASA, NL-1081 BT Amsterdam, The Netherlands	djh.deeg@vumc.nl
9.	Fernandez- Ballesteros	Rocio	Autonoma University of Madrid - Faculty of Psychology, E-28049 Madrid, Spain	r.fallesteros@uam.es
10.	Goodwin	James	Head of Research - Help the Aged, London, N1 9UZ, United Kingdom	james.goodwin@helptheaged.org.uk
11.	Iwarsson	Susanne	University of Lund, SE-221 00 Lund, Sweden	Susanne.Iwarsson@med.lu.se
12.	Jagger	Carol	University of Leicester, Leicester LE1 6TP, United Kingdom	cxj@le.ac.uk
13.	Kettle	Anouska	University of Sheffield, Sheffield S10 2TU, United Kingdom	a.kettle@sheffield.ac.uk
14.	Marcellini	Fiorella	INRCA (Italian National Institute on Aging), I- 60100-Ancona, Italy	f.marcellini@inrca.it

15.	Mollenkopf	Heidrun	Expertenrat der BAGSO e.V., 69126 Heidelberg, Germany	heidrun.mollenkopf@web.de
16.	Oswald	Frank	Johann Wolfgang Goethe- Universität, 60054 Frankfurt am Main, Germany	oswald@em.uni-frankfurt.de
17.	Peace	Sheila	The Open University School of Health and Social Welfare, Keynes MK7 6AA, United Kingdom	S.M.Peace@open.ac.uk
18.	Phillips	Judith E.	Swansea University, Swansea SA2 8PP, United Kingdom	judith.e.phillips@swansea.ac.uk
19.	Rantakokko	Merja	University of Jyväskylä , Fin- 40014 University of Jyväskylä Finland	merja.rantakokko@jyu.fi
20.	Reidick	Ortrun	University of Heidelberg, 69115 Heidelberg, Germany.	ortrun.reidick@psychologie.uni- heidelberg.de
21.	Risser	Ralf	FACTUM Vienna, A-1040 Wien Austria	ralf.risser@factum.at
22.	Rönn	Magnus	KTH - Royal Institute of Technology, SE-105 71 Stockholm, Sweden	magnusr@arch.kth.se
23.	Rudinger	Georg	Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms- Universität, 53111 Bonn, Germany	rudinger@uni-bonn.de
24.	Sanford	Jon A.	Center for Assistive Technology and Environmental Access CATEA, GA Tech, Atlanta, GA 30318, U.S.A.	jon.sanford@coa.gatech.edu
25.	Scharf	Tom	Keele University Research Institute for Life Course Studies, Keele Staffordshire ST5 5BG United Kingdom	t.s.scharf@appsoc.keele.ac.uk
26.	Schellenbach	Michael	Max Planck Institute for Human Development, 14195 Berlin Germany	schellenbach@mpib-berlin.mpg.de
27.	Stepukonis	Faustas	Klaipeda University Public Health Department, Klaipeda, Lithuania	faustep@balticum-tv.lt
28.	Svensson	Torbjörn	Lund University, SE-221 00 Lund Sweden	torbjorn.svensson@med.lu.se

29.	Tesch-Römer	Clemens	German Centre of Gerontology, 12101 Berlin, Germany	clemens.tesch-roemer@dza.de
30.	Thomése	Fleur	VU University Amsterdam Faculty of Social Sciences, NL-1081 HV Amsterdam, The Netherlands	gcf.thomese@fsw.vu.nl
31.	Tochihara	Yutaka	Kyushu University Faculty of Design, Fukuoka 815-8540 Japan	tochi@design.kyushu-u.ac.jp
32.	Wahl	Hans-Werner	University of Heidelberg, 69115 Heidelberg, Germany	h.w.wahl@psychologie.uni- heidelberg.de
33.	Westerholm	Barbro	Parliament of the Kingdom of Sweden, SE-100 12 Stockholm, Sweden	barbro.westerholm@riksdagen.se
34.	Ziegelmann	Jochen	Freie Universität Berlin, Dept. of Health Psychology, 14195 Berlin Germany	jochen.ziegelmann@fu-berlin.de
35.	Zvidrins	Peteris	University of Latvia, Riga, LV 1586, Latvia	Zvidrins@lanet.lv

Countries

Austria	1
Finland	1
Germany	11
Italy	2
Japan	1
Latvia	1
Lithuania	1
Sweden	6
Spain	1
The Netherlands	2
United Kingdom	7
U.S.A.	1

Annex 2 - Programme of Heidelberg Workshop

**Coordination Action „Roadmap for Ageing Research“, funded by the European
Commission under the Seventh Framework Programme, Grant Agreement No.**

223679

(Coordinator: Alan C. Walker)

Workshop “A European Roadmap for Ageing and the Environment” (Part 1)

Heidelberg, March 3-5, 2010

Chairs:

Hans-Werner Wahl, Heidelberg University, Germany, and

Susanne Iwarsson, Lund University, Sweden

**Workshop site: Internationales Wissenschaftsforum Heidelberg (IWH),
Heidelberg University, Hauptstrasse 242, 69117 Heidelberg**

Wednesday, March 3, 2010

Morning and afternoon:

Internal preparatory meeting of organisers from Heidelberg and Lund

Afternoon and evening:

Arrival of workshop attendees; no formal meeting

Public lecture given by Prof. Clemens Tesch-Römer on “Gesundheit im Alter: Wie
gesund werden wir in Zukunft alt?” (Psychologisches Institut, Hauptstrasse 47-51,
Hörsaal II, 18:00)

Day 1, Thursday, March 4, 2010

09:00 – 09:30 Welcome and introduction

Hans-Werner Wahl & Susanne Iwarsson

Chair: *Torbjörn Svensson*

09.30 – 11:00 20-minute statements on current research needs in the area of ageing and environments:

a) Individual level (focus on home environments): additional/new evidence needed

Hans-Werner Wahl, Heidelberg University, Germany

b) Individual level (focus on home environments): existing evidence base, interventions needed

Susanne Iwarsson, Lund University, Sweden

c) Societal level (focus on out-of-home environment): additional/new evidence needed

Ralf Risser, Vienna University, Austria

d) Societal level (focus on out-of-home environments): existing evidence base, interventions needed

Thomas Scharf, Keele University, United Kingdom

11:00 – 11:30 Coffee break

11:30 – 13:00 Four break-out groups

Chaired by Hans-Werner Wahl, Susanne Iwarsson, Ralf Risser and Thomas Scharf as group discussion facilitators

Organised according to the above themes

Major task: Developing a very first draft of the roadmap (key issues, priorities, cutting across themes (e.g. technology, methodology, conceptual/theoretical base)

Backed by additional background material to be distributed in advance of the workshop

13:00 – 14:00 Lunch break

Chair: *Susanne Iwarsson*

14:00 – 16:00 Additional input into the roadmap (20 minutes each + 10 minutes general discussion)

a) Key challenges of environmental gerontology today and into the future

Jon Sanford, Georgia Institute of Technology, U.S.A.

b) Cross-country perspectives: important data for ageing and environments research in Europe from an East European Perspective

Peteris Zvidrins, University of Latvia, Latvia

c) Technology and ageing: The Asian perspective

Yutaka Tochihara, Kyushu University, Japan

d) Technology and ageing: The Western perspective

Louise Nygård, Karolinska Institute, Sweden

16:00 – 16:30 Coffee break

16:30 – 17:30 Four break-out groups (same as in the morning)
Additional reflection of the roadmap in the light of foregoing presentations

In parallel:

Working group of young scholars (chaired by *Fleur Thomése, Free University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands*)

Roadmap ideas and requests (contents, infrastructural) from a young scholar's perspective

19.30 – 22.00 Joint festive dinner (Restaurant "Weißer Bock", Große Mantelgasse 24, 69117 Heidelberg)

Day 2, Friday, March 5, 2010

Chair: *Torbjörn Svensson*

09:00 – 10:30 Reports from break-out-groups (20 minutes each group)
10:30 – 11:00 Coffee break
11:00 – 11:30 Report from young scholars' meeting (Fleur Thomése)

Chairs: *Hans-Werner Wahl & Susanne Iwarsson*

11:30 – 13:00 Closing discussion and Planning of Workshop2:
FUTURAGE Roadmap "Environments and Ageing" 1.0
Planning of workshop 2 in Lund, Sweden.
Evaluation of workshop 1
13:00 – 13:15 Farewell
13:15 – 14:00 Closing lunch

14:00 – 16:00 Internal post-workshop meeting of workshop organisers from
Heidelberg/Lund

Contact:

Mrs. Ursula König

ursula.koenig@psychologie.uni-heidelberg.de

Phone: +49-6221-548111 or +49-173-3058731 (mobile H.-W. Wahl)

Mrs. Kerstin Herzog / Mrs. Vera Gailing (research assistants of the conference)

kerstin.herzog@psychologie.uni-heidelberg.de / vera.gailing@psychologie.uni-heidelberg.de

Acknowledgement

We like to very much thank the European Commission for the funding of this workshop.