

Technology and Caregiver Navigation

Perspectives from Pilot Sites

In June 2026, the grant team hosted a listening session with caregiver navigation pilot site grantees to explore how technology and artificial intelligence (AI) are shaping their work with family caregivers. Staff from area agencies on aging and community-based providers came together to share their on-the-ground perspectives.

Purpose of the Grantee Listening Session

With Artificial Intelligence (AI) increasingly present in public discourse and in the tools caregivers encounter day-to-day, there is a growing need to understand how navigators are discovering, evaluating, and recommending tech-enabled solutions. The session was organized around four key areas of inquiry: how navigators learn about new technology-based tools and resources; where in their work they see technology as a potential asset for themselves and the caregivers they support; their confidence in responding to caregiver questions about AI tools; and real-world examples of technology or resource recommendations made in practice. The insights gathered reflect the on-the-ground experiences of those at the frontlines of caregiver support and are intended to inform how the field can better equip navigators to meet caregivers where they are.

Key Themes and Insights

Early-stage adoption

- Most organizations are experimenting with AI but lack formal policies or structured implementation policies.
- Participants reported primarily learning about new tools through self-directed research, peer sharing, and from caregivers themselves.
- Participants reported limited but growing use of AI tools, primarily for drafting emails and communication, grant writing and content development, brainstorming support group topics, basic research and language refinement.
- Use is typically assisted (human-in-the-loop) rather than autonomous, with strong consensus around the need to critically review outputs.

High interest, cautious approach

- Organizations possess a strong curiosity about AI tools balanced with concerns about privacy, ethics, and safety.
- Some of the main concerns that contribute to organizational hesitation include:
 - Autonomy and dignity of care recipients
 - Ethical use of monitoring tools (cameras, tracking devices)
 - Data privacy and ownership (Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) implications, personal data exposure)
- Organizations are motivated to explore AI and other tech-enabled solutions but require clearer guardrails, trusted recommendations and practical, low-risk entry points.

- Participants identified high-impact opportunities where technology could deliver immediate value for caregiver support staff:
 - Integrating case management
 - Reducing duplicative documentation
 - Streamlining data analysis and reporting

Caregiver readiness and access challenges

- Immediate needs (e.g. respite) often take priority over technology solutions.
- Technology adoption requires broad infrastructure (devices, broadband, support).
- Solutions must account for caregiver capacity, technology access and digital literacy.

Trusted guidance needed

- A dominant theme was the need for trusted intermediaries to vet and validate technology.
- Trust is tied to perceived objectivity, mission alignment, and protection of caregivers and care recipients.
- Participants identified national aging organizations as key resources that protect against biased, unsafe or exploitative technologies.

Opportunities Identified

Participants expressed clear needs for structured, actionable guidance rather than just awareness about technology and AI. Suggestions for practical tools included:

- Clear guidance on privacy, ethics, and safe use
- Training and practical use cases tailored to aging services
- Simple evaluation frameworks (e.g., a scorecard to assess caregiver-facing technologies)

This publication is supported by the Administration for Community Living (ACL), U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) as part of a financial assistance award totaling \$3,528,000 with 75 percentage funded by ACL/HHS and \$882,000 amount and 25 percentage funded by non-government source(s). The contents are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the official views of, nor an endorsement by, ACL/HHS, or the U.S. Government.