Environmental Scan of Volunteerism in Texas

The Texas Commission
on Volunteerism and Community Service

Sarah Jane Rehnborg, Ph.D.
Katy Fallon

RGK CENTER FOR PHILANTHROPY
AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

LBJ School of Public Affairs
The University of Texas at Austin

August 31, 2001

Environmental Scan
Table of Contents

Executive Summary

109 million Americans contributed 19.9 billion hours of volunteer service in 1999. The value of the volunteer time was estimated at $225 billion.[1] In order to determine to what extent this generous phenomenon takes place in Texas, the Texas Commission on Volunteerism and Community Service (TxCVCS) entered into an inter-agency contract with the RGK Center for Philanthropy and Community Service in order to conduct an Environmental Scan of Volunteerism in Texas. The Environmental Scan is the first phase of a two-part evaluation process. The scan is designed to help the Commission select a focus for the more comprehensive study, based in part on the types of data discerned to be available in Texas and identified needs of the volunteerism community.

Sixty-four different organizations representing a cross-section of the field of volunteerism and national service were queried for the scan. The researchers obtained responses and information from 49 groups. The responses generated information about volunteer data collection, data and information needs, and impressions of and suggestions for the Commission and its work.

Key results include:

- Data on volunteerism is most commonly maintained on the local or programmatic level. Few coordinating groups collect or aggregate data. State agencies as a whole appear to keep the most reliable aggregated data on volunteer service and community participation. The limited data obtained from the scan indicates that 368,642 Texans contributed 9,833,110 hours of service for a dollar value of $151,331,563.

- Respondents indicated that comprehensive data about volunteerism would be valuable in order to raise the profile of the field of volunteerism in Texas and secure funding.

- General "how-to" knowledge and management information was requested as frequently as basic data about volunteerism in Texas. Although much information does exist, it is neither readily available nor accessible.

- The Texas Commission on Volunteerism and Community Service is best known for the Governor's Volunteer Leadership Conference. While respondents' impressions of the Commission are mixed, most expressed a lack of clarity about the office's mission and focus.

The scan also included a brief review of recent research on volunteerism. The researchers have summarized several household surveys done on state and national levels, as well as reports identifying pertinent practices, attitudes, and concerns within the field.

Respondents are looking to the Commission to assume a leading role as an advocate for volunteerism in the state. Advocacy includes the provision of data and other 'bottom-line' information about volunteerism, information about volunteer management and best practices, training and networking opportunities.

---

[1] Independent Sector, *Giving and Volunteering in America, 1999*. Executive Summary.

Background and Methodology

In September of 2000, the Texas Commission on Volunteerism and Community Service (TxCVCS or the Commission) requested funding from the Corporation for National Service (CNS) for "a state-wide evaluation of volunteer utilization." In their request for funds, the Commission wrote:

> The state-wide evaluation of volunteer utilization will survey non-profit organizations, state agencies, and faith-based groups that use volunteers to determine how volunteers are used in Texas and to identify key issues such as recruitment and retention issues, training needs, demographics of volunteerism, and the impact of volunteers in the state. Included in the utilization evaluation will be a focus on evaluating key mentoring issues, such as identifying current mentoring activities, numbers of children served, numbers of children on mentoring waiting lists, gaps in services (geographic and demographic), and needs. The key purpose of the utilization evaluation will be to develop a baseline of volunteerism in order to begin to measure the impact and effectiveness of various initiatives the Commission may undertake in the future and to target services more effectively.[1]

In December of 2000, the Texas Commission learned that it was one of six state commissions nationwide to receive Special Administrative Funding for evaluation purposes from the Corporation for National Service. Due to a change in senior leadership at the Commission, it was not until July 1, 2001, that TxCVCS entered into an inter-agency agreement with the University of Texas at Austin and the RGK Center for Philanthropy and Community Service at the LBJ School of Public Affairs in order to conduct an evaluation. Prior to this agreement, Charles Briggs, Executive Director of the Commission, requested permission from the Corporation for National Service to establish a contract with the University of Texas that, "will gauge the level of volunteerism in Texas and establish a benchmark for TxCVCS to begin measuring the effectiveness of the Commission's ability to increase not only volunteerism in Texas, but also volunteerism's effective practice." [2]

The inter-agency agreement established a two-step evaluative process. Step one, the subject of this report, is the preliminary environmental scan of available data and information pertaining to volunteerism, specifically as this data applies to Texas. A more in-depth analysis of service in Texas, the second phase of the study, will be based in part on the findings and analysis of phase one of the project.

Phase One: An Environmental Scan on Volunteerism
The contract states that "the goal of this project is to explore the level and extent of volunteerism in Texas and how the Texas Commission on Volunteerism and Community Service (TxCVCS) can better support volunteerism."[3] To achieve this goal, the contract stipulated that the RGK Center collect data regarding volunteerism in Texas and prepare a report of the findings from the

---

[1] Letter to Ben Frey, AmeriCorps Program Officer on September 20, 2000 from Christine Shakespeare, former Commission staff member.
[2] Letter to Ben Frey, AmeriCorps Program Officer, May 24, 2001.
[3] State of Texas Interagency Cooperation Contract, June 29, 2001, p 1.

data collection process.   The data would be obtained through a series of representative interviews with state and regional coordinating groups and organizations that work with or through a volunteer workforce, and a review of relevant literature.

Literature Review
For the purposes of the analysis, the literature review examined a series of household surveys that describe the incidence and frequency of volunteer behavior on the part of the American public, as well as other reports about substantive and anecdotal issues in volunteerism. Summaries of seven reports appear in the Literature Review of this report. In addition, Appendix C is a bibliography of other recent studies that may be of interest to the Commission.

Interview Questionnaire
Three open-ended questions comprised the initial survey instrument that was designed in collaboration with the Commission for the purpose of soliciting data from the respondents. The three questions appear below:

1. What information or data do you collect now, or have you collected in the past, about volunteers, volunteering, volunteerism or other forms of service initiatives? (i.e. surveys, hours of volunteer service, volunteer referrals, volunteer satisfaction information, studies of service initiatives, etc.)
    a. How frequently do you collect this information?
    b. Would you be willing to share this information with us?

2. Do you know of any group, organization or individual collecting this type of information, data, or research that we should contact?
    a. If so, whom should we contact?

3. What research, data, or information about volunteers, volunteering, or volunteerism or other forms of service initiatives would be useful to you or your organization if it were available?
    a. How would you use this data or information?

In consultation with a Commissioner, a fourth question was added to the survey for the purpose of gathering the respondent's knowledge and opinion of the mission and work of the Commission. This question was reviewed and approved by the Director of the Commission before inclusion.

4. What do you know about the Texas Commission on Volunteerism and Community Service and how would you describe its mission or purpose?
    a. What services or information would you like to see the Commission offer or provide?
    b. What kind of interaction have you had with the Commission?

All four questions and a letter outlining the proposed research project were mailed to each member of the Board of Commissioners. Board members were given an opportunity to provide input and recommendations via US Mail, email, or through the follow-up phone call placed to

each Commissioner. Three Commissioners responded to this communication with recommendations and suggestions. To the extent possible, these recommendations were included in the environmental scan process.

Representative Interviews

Sixty-four groups or organizations were contacted in order to determine the type of data currently collected and assess the needs of practicing professionals in the field of volunteer administration and service leadership. For the purpose of this report, *a coordinating group or organization is an entity that supports or facilitates volunteer service or volunteer involvement within a regional geographic area or according to a type of service domain or organizational purpose*.

A volunteer center is one example of a regional coordinating group in the area of volunteerism. Volunteer centers operate regionally in Texas to encourage volunteer action, support practicing professionals, facilitate volunteer recruitment for area nonprofits, and advocate for volunteerism. An example of a coordinating group in the service domain at the state level is the Texas Association of Partners in Education (TAPE). TAPE functions as a nonprofit coordinating organization that facilitates networking and the exchange of information among the leadership of community partnership programs operating in more than 100 school districts in the state. The Texas Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation, a state agency, operates a state-level "coordinating" office whose function is to support the community engagement initiatives in the state's 21 schools for the mentally retarded and hospitals for the mentally ill. In the business arena, large companies often have offices of community affairs that coordinate and track the community outreach activities of their employees and member companies. In addition, Corporate Volunteer Councils convene corporate leaders of community affairs departments to exchange information and network for professional purposes.

The researchers selected to interview a cross-section of coordinating groups and organizations for several reasons. The leaders of these groups and organizations generally have a reasonably high level of knowledge about the concerns and issues facing their members or their regional offices. Most leaders are aware of the standard business practices among their constituents and as such, it was assumed that they would know about the type of records maintained and the data that was available to, or needed by, their constituents. Furthermore, working through coordinating entities allows for the strategic collection of a relatively large amount of information representing the concerns of their constituents in a limited period of time. Finally, the extent to which these groups aggregate data might suggest the likelihood of data aggregation by similar groups.

Table 1 delineates the type of coordinating groups involved in the environmental scan interview process and response rates. A listing of all groups and organizations contacted appears in Appendix A, "Organizations and Individuals Contacted."

TABLE 1
Results of Attempted Contacts

Type of Coordinating Group	Groups or entities contacted	Partial or complete interviews	Percentage of respondents	Groups providing additional materials
Volunteer Centers – Geographic Coordinating Groups	17	13	76%	7
Nonprofits, Service Organizations, or Membership Groups	21	19	90%	8
Corporate or Business Coordinating Groups	11	5	45%	2
State/Public Sector Agencies	11	8	73%	6
Federal/National Service	4	4	100%	3
Totals	64	49		26
Usable Data Sets		49[4]		

Groups selected for participation in the interview process received either a phone call or a letter in advance of the interview for the purpose of soliciting their involvement and scheduling an appointment for either a face-to-face or telephone interview. With the permission of the respondents the interviews were tape recorded and transcribed. In addition, the researchers took notes during the interviews. Not all interviews could be tape recorded due to the timing of the phone calls or periodic equipment malfunctioning. Five respondents participated by providing written response to the questions. Permission from the respondent was granted for the use of any quote that is directly attributed to its source in this report. It should be noted that not every respondent answered every question. Therefore, in the presentation of the data in the body of the report, the reader will note differing numbers of data sets.

The research methodology, including the four-question interview instrument, was submitted to an external University evaluator for review, recommendation, and assessment. The RGK Center wishes to thank Dr. Patrick Wong, Associate Professor at the LBJ School, for his input and recommendations. The few modifications that he suggested are reflected in the design of this study and the report.

---

[4] In two situations responders served in dual capacities providing data or information representing two discrete entities. Louise Cummins, Director of the Volunteer Center of Lubbock, chairs the Texas Association of Volunteer Centers. Information from Louise appears within the category of "Volunteer Centers" as well as the category of "Coordinating Organizations or Membership Groups." Likewise, the President of the Texas Association, Directors of Volunteer Services, Ann Gabel, provided information generic to volunteer directors in hospital-based settings as well as information specific to her place of employment, Presbyterian Hospital of Dallas. Ms. Gabel's information appears as two entries within the category of "Coordinating Organizations or Membership Groups."

Question One: Responses and Analysis

> **What information or data do you collect now, or have you collected in the past, about volunteers, volunteering, volunteerism or other forms of service initiatives? (i.e. surveys, hours of volunteer service, volunteer referrals, volunteers satisfaction information, studies of service initiatives, etc.)**

Table Two summarizes categorically the type of data collected from the 46 groups and organizations that responded specifically to question one.

TABLE 2
Overview of Types of Information Collected about Volunteers

Data Information	Nonprofits	Corp. Groups	Vol. Centers	Public & CNS	Total
1. Tracks number of volunteers, service participants, or volunteers generated	8		5	9	22
2. Maintains records of volunteers and hours for specific projects such as court ordered service, public housing service, Day of Caring, etc.			5	1	6
3. Maintains records about members/partners	12		1	5	18
4. Records hours of volunteer service performed	2	1	4	8	15
5. Calculates dollar value of service hours	2		2	2	6
6. Collects demographic data (zip code, age, gender, etc.) or "types" of volunteers (intern, inmate, etc.)	6		3	2	11
7. Tracks volunteer recruitment or referrals	1		8	1	10
8. Tracks programs such as training/networking events, types of service performed	3		4	2	9
9. Registers volunteer opportunities			8		8
10. Tracks number of inquiries (phone or email)			4		4
11. Records cash & in-kind donations either received or given	1	2	2	1	6
12. Conducts volunteer/member/agency satisfaction surveys or focus groups			4	2	6
13. Measures outcomes or progress towards objectives			1	4	5
14. Has no organized or ongoing tracking system pertaining to volunteers	4		1	1	6

The frequency of data collection varied widely. Most groups indicated that information was gathered on an annual basis, although a fair number of organizations collected data quarterly, three times a year, or on a monthly basis. Others updated their records when new groups joined their collaborative or on a schedule dictated by funders. Most respondents said their data was up-to-date and accessible, however, a sizeable group indicated that their data was difficult to retrieve and often not organized in ways that facilitated public distribution.

Several respondents agreed to share the data they did collect. This information appears in Table 3. It should be noted that the type and scope of data varies widely. Some data is aggregated on a statewide basis, such as the information obtained from the Texas Department of Parks and Wildlife, the Texas Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation, and the Texas Association of Hospital Auxiliaries. In other instances the data is program-specific such as the information about school or hospital programs. These variations are noted.

TABLE 3
Volunteer Service Data Acquired from Respondents

	Volunteers	*Hours*	*Dollar Value*	*Remarks*
Texas Volunteer Centers				
Round Rock Volunteer Center		142,099	$2,107,376	2000 data 24 of 104 agencies reporting
Volunteer Center of Dallas County		700,000		Court-ordered program only
Volunteer Center of Lubbock		237,166		Secondary school students
Volunteer Center of the Coastal Bend		163,047		1998 data
Volunteer McKinney		489		2000 Organizational Survey Results, 32 of 376 agencies reporting
Health Care Organizations				
Texas Association of Hospital Auxiliaries	37,820	5,431,055		2000-2001 member annual reports 244 of 289 groups reporting
Presbyterian Hospital of Dallas	394	45,558	$697,248	2000 Report
State and Local Nonprofits				
American Red Cross – Texas	67,132			
Baptist General Convention of TX	1,250			Full-time volunteers only
Big Brothers Big Sisters, Texas	7,949			1999 survey 450 of 510 programs reporting
Communities in Schools, Dallas	2,944			
GE Elfun Society, Dallas-Fort Worth	400			Member employees and retirees

	Volunteers	*Hours*	*Dollar Value*	*Remarks*
State and Local Nonprofits Continued				
Partners in Education, Austin ISD	12,303	358,619		1999-2000 report
Partners in Education, Beaumont ISD	3,081	118,312	$2,336,796	1998-1999 statistics
Partners in Education, Dallas ISD	27,430	705,635		2000-2001
Retired and Senior Volunteer Program, Travis County	1,032	111,036		10/1/00 through 3/30/01 statistics

Public Sector – State Level

	Volunteers	*Hours*	*Dollar Value*	*Remarks*
Texas Agricultural Extension Service	161,699			1999-2000
Texas Commission on Volunteerism and Community Service AmeriCorps		799,000		Different years available depending upon program Combines full-time and part-time members and generated volunteers
Texas Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation	2,946	184,807	$2,740,688	FY 2000
Texas Department of Parks and Wildlife Add'l inmate labor		554,277 282,010	$4,547,252	FY 2000
Texas Historical Commission	42,262			2000 statistics 114 of 252 county commissions reporting

Although only a few organizations provided data in response to the environmental scan interviews, the cumulative value of the information was significant. The tally indicated 368,642 Texans volunteered a total of 9,833,110 hours for 14 different state agencies and local groups. Using the Independent Sector's value of volunteer time at $15.39 an hour, this time is valued at $151,331,562.

Comparative State

	Volunteers	*Hours*	*Dollar Value*	*Remarks*
Arkansas	486,841	25,293,129	$479,144,524	2000 Report draft

National Organizations

	Volunteers	*Hours*	*Dollar Value*	*Remarks*
American Cancer Society	3 million[1]			
American Red Cross	1.2 million			
Association of Junior Leagues International	193,000			
Big Brothers Big Sisters of America	141,055			1999 survey, 450 of 510 federations reporting

	Volunteers	*Hours*	*Dollar Value*	*Remarks*
Independent Sector	109 million	19.9 billion	$225 billion	1999 Survey

---

[1] This information is at least ten years old.

In addition to data, respondents also shared reports and other publications produced by their programs. Appendix B lists the documents shared with the researchers. Information pieces are organized alphabetically by the group or organization that produced the information.

The researchers are particularly grateful to the United Ways of Texas organization. Although they do not collect data about volunteers, a survey designed to solicit information from the 120 local United Way organizations in Texas was in development at the time of the environmental scan interview process. United Ways of Texas permitted this project to add several questions to their survey. Those questions included asking each United Way the number of volunteers who serve their organization, as well as training and information needs in the area of volunteerism. The findings from this survey appear in Appendix D.

Discussion
The open-ended nature of the question allowed respondents to share thoughts and concerns pertaining to the issue of data collection. Not surprisingly, the researchers learned about the complexity of data gathering initiatives; the cost in terms of staff, time, and money of data gathering projects; and the challenges of meeting the data requirements of multiple funding bodies.

The question also elicited stories about current programmatic directions. For example, the community initiatives staff of the Child Support Division of the Attorney General's Office is engaged in a collaborative project with the Texas Workforce Commission. The local workforce development boards are working together with the regional child support divisions to provide job training and parenting skills to fathers without skills. Volunteer centers shared stories about new or innovative projects as well. One center spoke of a program to connect volunteers living in public housing projects to service opportunities. Another described a new initiative to place employees returning to work from job related injuries into light duty volunteer assignments when comparable light duty work was not available through their place of employment. Those new initiatives invigorated the sponsoring agencies and moved the interviews into new areas of discussion.

The task of data collection particularly challenged volunteer centers. Although it is possible to count phone calls and email inquiries about volunteer opportunities, it is increasingly more difficult to learn which volunteers actually follow through with a referral and assume a service position. Likewise, volunteer centers are often asked for data about volunteer involvement in their geographic service area. Agency possessiveness about service numbers and generally low response rates to surveys make this data difficult to aggregate. One center even went so far as to say that they "had to take so many creative liberties that the numbers (they were asked to gather) are meaningless."

On the other hand, there were several state-level bodies that appear to have mastered the art of data collection. After devoting more than five years to refining their process, the Texas Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation (TDMHMR) has streamlined their system of data collection and management. Utilizing moneys from the State Millennium Fund made available by the state legislature for Y2K systems remediation, TDMHMR's Central Office of

Community Relations installed JSI's Paradigm volunteer and donor tracking software in all 21 of the department's facilities (state schools, state hospitals, and state centers) across the state of Texas in early 2000. Monies from the special fund were also used to provide company-sponsored training to field staff and to underwrite an annual maintenance contract. Among the many outcomes of this effort was the ability to track the type of service performed by volunteers, as well as the number of volunteers and hours of service. As the data was tracked and analyzed, central office staff identified a shift of volunteer engagement from direct care assignments to fund development activities. As a result of this information, the department supported the initiative of the Volunteer Services State Council to develop a new "Beacons of Light" training program to increase the fundraising skills of volunteers and staff members.

The documented reliance on volunteers by the state's Parks and Wildlife Department was accentuated by the 2000 annual report which identifies 836,287 hours of volunteer service. As director Kevin Good noted, "Our parks right now could not function without our volunteer programs. Literally, we probably have ten percent of our workforce in volunteer labor, maybe more, and so it's pretty well organized. Volunteerism is valued by the department." In fact, the volunteer workforce is closer to 15% of the department's workforce. Not reflected in the hours count are the hundreds of dedicated citizen volunteers who teach the state's boating safety and hunting safety courses.

A number of the other state level coordinating groups focus more on services for their members such as networking activities, educational programs, and information exchange through newsletters and listservs, than they focus on information collection about specific programs or volunteer involvement. There was a general assumption voiced by many leaders of coordinating groups that this data was gathered and available on the chapter or member level. Likewise, many respondents assured the researchers that others, such as the United Ways of Texas or major national nonprofits, such as the American Red Cross or the American Cancer Society, collected information pertaining to volunteers for either the state or local level organizations.[2] As we learned from the United Ways interview, this was not the case. Calls to national nonprofits, such as the ones noted here, yielded varying levels of data. Camp Fire and the Association of Junior Leagues could identify the number of local chapters in the United States but were unable to provide Texas specific information.

Contacting the corporate departments of community affairs or the corporate volunteer councils operating in several Texas cities proved particularly difficult for the researchers. Either calls were unreturned or the researchers were directed to others who either had no information or were again not available. In more than one situation a corporate or business contact indicated that service opportunities were promoted, but systems were not in place to track the number of employees participating or the amount of service contributed. One volunteer center actively involved in working with corporate volunteer programs confirmed this concern: "Companies are eager for ways to keep track of how many volunteer hours they have contributed. It's an important marketing piece for them because they can position themselves as good corporate citizens." In brief conversations with two corporate contacts, the researchers learned that their companies kept careful files on funds donated but did not have comparable records on employee service.

---

[2] See Question Two for full list of suggested contacts.

As with corporate community service, securing information from faith-based groups was challenging. Contacts with the judicatory offices of two major denominations (Baptist and Catholic) found that if record-keeping is done on volunteer service, it occurs on the local church or parish level.

Several respondents reported impact evaluation models or performance based assessment systems as guiding current record keeping and reporting processes. The Government Performance Results Act now guides the information collection systems for the Retired and Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP), which is part of the Corporation for National Service's State Office SeniorCorps initiative. This model focuses on program outcomes rather than service hours and member numbers. However, in checking with one local RSVP program, we were able to secure the service hours, volunteer numbers and other demographic data as this information was required by the program's local sponsor. Two other respondents indicated adopting performance-based assessment systems for program evaluation purposes, but neither the volunteer center nor the state agency in question were satisfied with progress to date on this assessment method.

A number of idiosyncratic responses emerged in discussions about data collection. A few respondents questioned the value of measuring service hours. One person questioned how to define an hour. Does a service hour include preparation and transportation time as well as direct service provision, or only the time with the client? More than one person commented that they had never been asked for this information and found that the discussion raised some interesting questions. Another respondent expressed concern about the possible implications of contributed service in the eyes of funders. If the community was willing to volunteer in response to a particular need, would foundation leaders or legislators select to withdraw or reduce funding to this particular cause? A final area of concern surrounded the classification and record keeping pertaining to nonprofits' boards of directors. Did the researchers regard board members as volunteers? Although the response to this question was in the affirmative, no respondent provided data reflecting the volunteer time commitment of these directors.

Question Two: Responses and Analysis

> **Do you know of any group, organization, or individual collecting this type of information, data, or research that we should contact? If so, whom should we contact?**

When asked who else the researchers might contact to collect information or data about volunteerism, the respondents named the 60 groups and organizations listed below. In addition, one Commissioner provided a list of 71 education-related groups operating in the state of Texas. Attempts were made to reach 23 of these groups. In three instances helpful information was acquired as a result of the inquiry.

Alban Institute
America's Promise
American Red Cross
Bank One of America
Beaumont Independent School District
Big Brothers/Big Sisters of America
Camp Fire
Community Council of Dallas
Corporate Volunteer Services at the Volunteer
        Center of Dallas County
Corporation for National Service
Corporation for National Service – Service-
        Learning National Office
Cypress Fairbanks Independent School District
Directors of Volunteers in Agencies
Electronic Data Systems, Dallas
GE's Elfun Society, Dallas
Governor's Mentoring Initiative at Texas
        Commission for Volunteerism and
        Community Service
HEB
Houston Area Survey at Rice University
Houston Attorneys and Accountants for the Arts
Interfaith Ministries, Houston
JCPenney, Dallas
Jewish Community Center, Houston
Junior League
Keep Abilene Beautiful
Keep Texas Beautiful
Lake & River Clean-Up Program
MTV
Make a Difference Day – Abilene
Michigan State University / State of the State
        Survey
State Representative Elliott Naishtat
Pew Charitable Trust

Promise Fellows at TxCVCS
Retired Senior Volunteer Program
Retired Senior Volunteer Program – Abilene
State Representative Paul Sadler
Salvation Army
Sam Rayburn Museum
Scout groups
State Senator Eliot Shapleigh
Spring Branch Independent School District
Texas Accountants and Lawyers for the Arts
Texas Community Futures Forum
Texas Department of Protective and Regulatory
        Services
Texas Historical Commission – Architecture
        Division
Texas Historical Commission – Community
        Heritage Division
Texas Library Association
Texas Nonprofit Management Assistance
        Network
Texas Office of the Attorney General –
        Administrative and Legal Department
Texas State Bar
Texas State Library
Tyler Chamber of Commerce
United States Department of Education
United Way of Metropolitan Dallas County
United Way of San Antonio / Bexar County
University of North Texas
University of Texas Office of Campus and
        Community Involvement
Verizon, Dallas
Volunteer Centers
Williamson County Health Dept
YMCA

Questions Three and Four: Responses and Analysis

> **What information, data, or research about volunteers, volunteering, volunteerism, or other forms of service initiatives would be useful to you or your organization if it were available? How would you use this data or information?**
>
> **What services or information would you like to see the Commission offer or provide?**

Because of the high degree of similarity between these two questions, the data will be presented together. In the case of Question 3, 26 records provided information and 28 groups responded to Question 4.

> **What information, data, or research about volunteers, volunteering, volunteerism or other forms of service initiatives would be useful to you or your organization if it were available**?

Volunteer Management Resources
There is an *overwhelming* desire to secure up-to-date, credible information about issues affecting the recruitment and management of volunteers. Requests for information fell into four broad categories:

- Recruitment information requested by respondents included how social and economic trends affect service; the demographics of who is volunteering; and information about how ethnicity, race, age, professional status, income, and educational level affect volunteering.

- Management information requests included a desire for information and resources pertaining to the parameters of a "good volunteer experience;" information about motivation, retention, marketing, recognition and methods of evaluation; and accountability. For youth volunteers questions centered on the influence of school policy, extracurricular events, and peer pressure on serving behaviors.

- Best practices and setting-specific data were frequently requested. Respondents were interested in information about volunteer programs and volunteer utilization in schools, hospitals, public sector organizations, community restitution volunteering, and service learning. Participants were interested in resources that would help them to "benchmark" their programs against others in similar service categories.

- Basic resource lists were requested. Respondents requested up-to-date lists of volunteer centers, Directors of Volunteers in Agencies groups, and corporate volunteer program service interests. Others wanted to know the current dollar value ascribed to volunteer service by the Independent Sector.

Although less frequently requested, there was an interest in knowing more about the uses of technology and software programs that support program administration. One person expressed an interest in how to do a community needs assessment. Two wanted additional information about awards programs, including how to participate, and ways to gain recognition for both programs and individual volunteers.

Although there was a strong desire to see the Commission as a central information hub, no one suggested that the Commission must necessarily have all the answers.   Many respondents wanted to be able to call the Commission and be directed to the person or program that could respond to their concern.

Facts and Figures about Service and Volunteerism
After information about volunteers and the management of volunteers, respondents requested "hard numbers" and "bottom line" data. One respondent said,

> It's hard to explain to people how important volunteerism is. Volunteers that are actively volunteering don't need an explanation, but sometimes it's hard to explain to the community why we do what we do. If we had statistics available, I think that would be very useful to substantiate what we do.

Another respondent said, "volunteerism is a multi-million dollar industry – we need figures to confirm that statement." A third concluded, "Texas is not paying attention to service initiatives. Numbers get attention."

One respondent indicated that numbers are important for "getting to yes." By this the respondent meant that numbers help make the case for volunteerism and attract interest to the world of service. However, service providers need good management information if they are to deliver on the promise of effective citizen participation and meaningful community engagement.

In addressing the power of numbers, one respondent made a case for an annual report on volunteer service in Texas:

> I think the Commission could develop an annual report that would promote the wonderful work that is done by volunteers through state agencies. It would be an excellent document to support what happens all over the state and the contribution volunteers make to effective state government and state service. In addition, such a publication would also make us more accountable to the taxpayers.

Training
Several respondents noted a desire for training in the field. The Governor's Volunteer Leadership Conference was cited as an important educational resource, however, many groups

noted that the conference needs more focus and clarity of direction. Respondents noted an interest in seeing the conference move around the state to provide all Texans with an opportunity to attend. Several respondents addressed the need for regionally based continuing education programs to meet the needs of volunteer leadership. One suggestion involved partnering with a national professional association to provide a sound, respected curriculum as well as a meaningful certificate of attendance. Another respondent noted the need to develop a graduated series of educational events whereby participants could attend components of the curriculum in various locations around the state with all components leading toward a more advanced certification.

Advocacy

There seemed to be a desire for the Commission to speak on behalf of the field and to advocate for its importance to persons and organizations in positions of power and influence. "What I would like is some kind of advocacy at a state level and at a public level," noted an experienced director. Another respondent noted the importance of advocacy at the organizational level:

> My larger concerns are the organizational capacity for volunteers and volunteering. Much of the volunteer experience depends upon the quality of the preparation and the management of the experience, and that's a capacity issue in organizations…. Projects that work well have good preparation and good oversight.

This type of advocacy was echoed when an interviewee commented on the importance of a positive volunteer experience:

> If you focus on how to make the volunteer experience meaningful, not only will you get the best out of your volunteers, but excited volunteers will enlarge the volunteer base. Unfortunately, some of the small not-for-profits have no clue about how to use a volunteer.

In addition, several respondents argued for a more extensive and well-publicized volunteer recognition event as a viable form of advocacy. One person encouraged the creation of a recognition event that focuses on organizational excellence in volunteer involvement as well as examples of individual serving.

Public Policy

Funding for the Service Sector: Finding dollars to support the volunteer sector and its infrastructure was a consistent theme. Public sector respondents noted the need to find resources to sustain project initiatives as well as support staff salaries.

> I'd really like to see the Commission lead the effort to raise the classification level for our profession. I don't know if it's happening at other agencies, but we're losing good people because they're taking jobs that pay more and I think that while the old system (1970-80s) was

wonderful for a time, it hasn't been updated since. Salaries need to be updated.

Volunteer center leaders repeatedly acknowledged the primacy of adequate funding to sustain program operations and offer expanded services. When asked what the Commission could do for her, one volunteer center director responded succinctly, "Send cash!" Speaking more seriously about the concern of sustaining volunteer centers, another director noted:

> I really do think that what we're going to have to do as we move forward is for funding models for nonprofits to be more corporate-like and less dependent on donations. We need to find more ways to identify reasonable targets for support that can help bear the costs. In most cases, it might be public funds, where we do cooperative ventures between tax money and private resources. We need to view a public allocation as an investment that comes back to the community through volunteer help rather than a give-away.

Across all sectors, respondents wanted information about private funding sources as well as other public initiatives that may support service projects such as school to work funds.

> Changes in the nonprofit world affect the public sector and the public sector affects the nonprofit world – the two go hand-in-hand. More and more I'm seeing the volunteer sector and the fundraising sector coming together. Volunteers who volunteer for an organization usually give money there. That's what's happening in our world.

Insurance and Liability Issues: Although public sector constituents more frequently noted this concern, the issue of insurance and liability coverage for volunteers was a challenge for the nonprofit respondents as well. Each state agency independently must negotiate insurance coverage, a cumbersome and expensive undertaking. Both Parks and Wildlife and Texas A&M Extension Service noted that insurance and policy as it pertains to volunteer drivers are critical issues affecting the capacity to engage volunteers in service delivery. Three years ago a volunteer park host became involved in a minor fender-bender with a state vehicle. Staff at Parks and Wildlife offered the following impression of state laws regarding volunteers for state agencies after an Attorney General's ruling regarding liability claims against the state: "'Yes, we want people to come to volunteer for us, but if anything happens, we're not accepting responsibility. You're on your own.'"

Workmen's compensation coverage for volunteers injured on the job, a benefit available to volunteers in some states, is not currently available in Texas, with the exception of volunteer fire-fighters operating in certain settings. These and comparable concerns promoted a number of respondents to want state-to-state comparative information about offices of volunteerism, commissions, and state statutory guidelines.

Research
Respondents were quick to identify research questions and concerns of significance to their programs and areas of work. Representative concerns included:

- How do people hear about service opportunities?
- What causes people to serve, and more importantly, why do they keep serving?
- How does age factor into a student's ability to volunteer?
- What is it that draws youth toward service and volunteering?
- How is school-based service related to learning?
- What is required to have a good volunteer experience?
- What is known about community restitution volunteering and recidivism rates?
- What is required to have a good volunteer experience?
- How do ethnic and racial differences affect volunteering behaviors?

How would you use this data or information?

Five general response categories emerged in the analysis of this question. The categories are presented by frequency of response.

- Improved program practices: Respondents were eager for information that would help them do their jobs more effectively. They requested information for internal analysis purposes, to improve practices, and to benchmark their work against the efforts of others in the community and state. Improving program practices also included increasing skill levels in the area of criminal background checks, reference checks and volunteer recognition event ideas.

- Public relations, marketing, and promotional purposes: Respondents expressed a strong need for assistance in "telling the story of service" in their local community. One respondent requested public service announcements that could be individualized for their service area, another wanted facts and figures to influence city council, and many were searching for assistance in developing a comprehensive marketing plan.

- Recruitment support and assistance: In line with the desire for additional information about recruitment, respondents indicated that new information in this area would be applied in their search for volunteers.

- Grant applications and fund development: Those respondents stressing the need for facts and figures emphasized how helpful this information would be in development work. Respondents want the data to build their case for funding.

- Job improvement and professional enhancement: Knowledge, information, and data would help respondents do their jobs more effectively. Information would be built into training programs sponsored by many of the agencies participating in the scan. It would be shared

with constituents served by these groups and would help promote and advocate for community engagement positions in agencies and organizations.

What services or information would you like to see the Commission offer or provide?

Services and information requested of the Commission closely parallel the information and data that respondents indicated would be of use to their programs or constituents. This information is presented in weighted order beginning with the forms of service or types of functions respondents most frequently identified as important.

The Commission as an Information Hub

Respondents were resolute in their desire to see the Commission as the field's centralized hub for information in the field of volunteerism and community service. As one respondent noted, the Commission "could be a wellspring for information if they were positioning themselves that way." Another suggested the Commission act as the field's standard bearer:

> Our vision for the Commission is that it becomes very similar to the *Good Housekeeping* seal of approval. This is *the* volunteer management book, or this is *the* 'How To' series, or whatever it is, it has the recommendation of the Commission which carries the clout. I think they should be driving the push to get to that level.

Respondents are eager to see the Commission as the place to turn to for facts and figures, policy guidelines, best practices, funding information, and other current resources. Many felt that the web site should be expanded and the newsletter developed as a regular vehicle for timely information. Several persons requested Commission-sponsored networking activities to facilitate information exchange. One network mentioned as important was a state agency task force to convene the directors of volunteers and community initiatives from the major state agencies based in Austin. Likewise, volunteer centers and Directors of Volunteers in Agencies groups suggested that the Commission provide networking opportunities and work more closely with them to extend the reach of the Commission.

Training and Technical Assistance

Although the Governor's Volunteer Leadership Conference (GVLC) received mixed reviews in terms of its current programmatic focus and organizational management, there was uniform agreement that the GVLC provides an important vehicle for training in volunteerism and national service issues in the state. While respondents stressed the importance of the GVLC, they also voiced an interest in seeing the Commission operate as a technical assistance provider and a conduit for regional training. To meet the needs of volunteer groups around the state, one group suggested that the Commission create a speakers bureau of credible trainers available to speak to local groups and provide skill development workshops.

Advocacy and Legislative Support
Several respondents recommended that the Commission operate as a state service board in advocating for policies conducive to citizen participation. The theme of insurance coverage and liability protection re-emerged as did the need for funding to support service ventures.   Others felt that an expanded awards program and other recognition efforts would help draw attention to the field. Another respondent suggested a salary survey of professionals operating in the field.

Question Four: Responses and Analysis

What do you know about the Texas Commission on Volunteerism and Community Service? How would you describe its mission or purpose?

This summary is based on 28 data groups of information. Some people provided extensive insight into their knowledge of the Commission, while other responses were exceptionally brief.

Knowledge and Perceptions about the Commission
The Commission is known best for the Governor's Volunteer Leadership Conference. Although people expressed mixed reactions to the conference, a subject addressed later in this section, the annual conference is the Commission's most visible product. There were a few respondents who admitted no knowledge of the Commission itself as an entity, though they did know of the conference and may have actually attended the event.

Approximately half of the respondents were aware of the Commission's role in AmeriCorps program development and funding. One respondent characterized the Commission as a "super-sized grant-making organization," while another expressed a desire to know more about the funding stream and how these funds could be accessed.

Respondents named other functions of the office. In addition to the GVLC, the office was credited with the Governor's volunteer awards program, America's Promise, the newsletter, the web site, the mentoring initiative, Campus Compact, the Unified State Plan, and service learning. Several respondents with knowledge of the Commission assessed the office as a political entity tied closely to the wishes of the Governor.

Although most of the respondents had heard of the Commission, there was considerable confusion about the Commission's mission and function. "There's no direction, no clear message, no defined intent, no definable outcomes," commented a survey participant. Others were confused about what exactly the Commission was attempting to do, indicating that it seemed to try to be "all things to all people."   Another respondent with basic knowledge of the Commission was surprised to find that the Commission "still" operates as the Governor's Office of Volunteerism. With the "Governor's Office" designation, the question was then asked why the office was located within the Texas Workforce Commission. Still another felt the Commission had lost sight of volunteerism and had focused its efforts only on the world of national service.

Several respondents commented on the issue of staff turnover, characterizing the Commission as a "revolving door." Staff have been pleasant, seemed to be the consensus, but "all the turnover has hurt at every level." Others commented on meetings they attended. "Committees have been unproductive social gatherings." Another person said "under two directors, visioning committees come in, look at a vision, look at a strategic plan, but again, no follow-up. To me, the bottom-line is I don't think it's reached its potential." In light of the perceived absence of clarity of purpose and the issue of staff turnover, one respondent suggested:

> Now is the time for the Commission to re-invent itself. It could
> become a piece of developing a stronger nonprofit sector infrastructure
> for the state of Texas. It could address the needs of volunteer centers,
> and the needs of centers for nonprofit management.

The Governor's Office of Volunteerism

Of the 25 respondents answering the question, "Did you know that TxCVCS is the Governor's Office of Volunteerism?" 13 said yes, 7 were uncertain and 5 said no. One respondent refers to TxCVCS as the Office of Volunteerism and was unaware of the Commission designation. Another thought the Governor's Office became the Commission, and still another felt that the designation was a misnomer adding to the confusion surrounding the office. As noted above, another respondent could not connect the Governor's Office of Volunteerism with the office's position within the Texas Workforce Commission. On learning that TxCVCS is designated as the Governor's Office of Volunteerism, one volunteer center spokesperson commented, " It seems to me like they would be working to improve relations with volunteer centers and wanting to work closely with us in order to promote volunteerism through us."

Programmatic Comments and Perceptions

Governor's Volunteer Leadership Conference

While comments about the Conference were mixed, the respondents clearly valued the event and its contribution to the field. "The GVLC is one of the best conferences in the field," said one respondent. Another offered, "the GVLC offers some of the finest education on volunteerism that we have in the state."

There are obstacles to maximum participation in the GVLC. Several persons cited travel expenses as preventing their attendance, another indicated that the timing conflicted with greater United Way participation, and a third indicated that the generally late arrival of publicity materials prevented participation. Several respondents recommended that the conference travel around the state to ensure that more people have the opportunity to attend. Others recommended the conference be held bi-annually with regional training events during the off year.

Some confusion was expressed about the focus of the conference. While one state agency director indicated that she sent her entire staff to the meeting, another state agency director questioned the value of the conference to her staff. Several people suggested that the conference had, in recent years, become too focused on national service programs. One respondent targeted the issue of conference focus with this comment:

> I personally worked with one of their GVLC planning committees and
> at no time could they clearly identify their audience or even their goals
> or outcomes of the training.

State Agency Task Force
Approximately two years ago, the Commission was involved in a series of meetings with state agency directors of volunteer and community initiatives programs. These people came together every few months under the auspices of the Commission. This networking group became known as the State Agency Task Force. For several of the state agency volunteer directors who participated in the environmental scan, this now defunct group was a significant focus of attention as well as frustration.

All of those who mentioned the task force missed the opportunity to network, but none seemed to miss the way in which the group was managed or organized. "It wasn't focused, and it was open [to all levels of directors] – all things to all people – and it was a waste of my time, frankly. I got so tired of going to the meetings and meeting one more new staff person from some agency who wanted to start a volunteer program who knew nothing." Suggestions for future gatherings included good leadership and improved follow through. It was also proposed that the group be divided so that full-time, experienced directors could convene for policy discussion, while training opportunities could be made available for employees given the responsibility of developing volunteer programs in the public sector.

Governor's Volunteer Leadership Awards
Kathy Graves, of the Texarkana Volunteer Center, permitted the researchers to include in the scan report her experience:

> In 1999 I asked the Commission for assistance with our 30th anniversary celebration. We were going to be honoring several volunteers who were main-stays of the community. I requested assistance from the Commission. I learned that the Governor recognizes 8 people annually ('Let me get this straight,' I said. In a state as big as Texas you recognize 8 people annually?!') There was nothing else that we could get. No recognition out of that office, out of the Office of the Texas Commission on Volunteerism, to help us or our program. I tried to get them to come to this 30th celebration to help us celebrate our anniversary and they were not interested. The Arkansas Commission on Volunteerism, however, wrote letters to every volunteer that I sent to them in a list. They wanted to know how many years of service they had put in. They sent them letters signed by the Governor and they sent two representatives down from the office on the night of our celebration.

It should be noted that this excerpt represents the most vocal, disappointed respondent. One respondent knew of the Commission because a volunteer she nominated had been the recipient of one of the Governor's Awards. Others suggested ways to expand or improve upon the awards program. Ideas included recognizing an entire nonprofit organization for exemplary volunteer involvement, or perhaps categories of service providers, such as volunteers engaged in hospice work, public safety, or conservation issues, thereby greatly expanding the number of award recipients.

Visibility within the Texas Workforce Commission and State Government
Two respondents shared their involvement in State of Texas policy-related concerns. The following anecdotes illustrate that TxCVCS is not highly visible within the organization, nor within the Texas legislature.

- One respondent related a recent exchange with a legislator from Texas who became interested in a Kansas-based program where seniors mentor welfare families. The Representative contacted the Texas Workforce Commission (TWC) who then referred the legislator to an external agency to discuss the idea. When that agency director suggested that the Commission might be involved in this (the Governor's Mentoring Initiative, for example), the TWC staffer seemed to have forgotten that there was an office within TWC.

- The Office of the Attorney General's Division of Child Support has been working aggressively with TWC and the local workforce development boards to build partnerships to provide support to fathers in need of job training and parenting skills. Neither TWC nor the Attorney General's Office thought to involve the Commission in this effort or to share the ways in which the volunteer management staff has been working to build community partnerships.

Literature Review
Reports in Volunteerism

To assist in analyzing the possibilities for how information on volunteerism might be collected, seven important state and national studies were reviewed, highlighting methodology and findings. The following section provides brief summaries of the procedures and key findings of reports conducted for:

- The Arkansas Department of Human Services Division of Volunteerism
- Independent Sector
- Nonprofit Michigan Project
- Points of Light Foundation
- The Prudential
- United Parcel Service
- The Utah Commission on Volunteers

In addition to these seven, there are three reports deserving mention with varying levels of relevance to this study. They are:

- *Americans Volunteer – 1974*. Although out of date, this still stands as the most complete survey of volunteerism in the United States. Comprised of data collected by the Census Bureau during their Current Population Survey, this report includes comprehensive information on volunteer numbers, demographics, and tasks performed.
- *Dallas Survey on Corporate Giving*. This 1999 report from The Dallas Foundation does not concern the logistics of volunteerism but rather analyzes the giving priorities of businesses in the Dallas area.
- *Houston Area Survey*. The Rice University Survey indicates that 31% of adult residents of the Houston area had volunteered in the past 30 days. Further demographics are available from the survey that has been conducted annually since 1995.

Also deserving mention is *Measuring Volunteering: A Practical Toolkit* prepared by Independent Sector and United Nations Volunteers. This report provides many useful guidelines for consideration in executing any research initiative for measuring volunteer activities. It includes sections on planning the research; designing the survey; and collecting, processing, and disseminating the information, as well as survey examples and other useful resources.

Arkansas Department of Human Services Division of Volunteerism and University of Arkansas at Little Rock, Institute for Economic Advancement, College of Business Administration. *The Economic Impact of Arkansas Volunteers*. 1999.

The Arkansas Division of Volunteerism (AdoV) surveyed agencies, counties, cities, public school districts, United Community Organizations of Arkansas (UCOA), United Ways, veterans groups, civic clubs, National Service Organizations, a senior organization, private/parochial schools, and youth organizations. The purpose of the study is to document the volunteer hours worked in Arkansas in 1999.

This data has been collected annually in Arkansas since 1984. The study's findings include:

- In 1999, 388,725 people volunteered 13,117,007 hours of their time and delivered service valued at $285,154,659.
- The 2000 survey has not yet been published in a report form, but the survey results indicate that 486,841 Arkansans volunteered 25,293,129 hours of their time, delivering services valued at $479,144,524.
- The 1999 survey also analyzed types of volunteer service and compared results of similar organizations throughout the history of the survey.

Methodology: Annual survey of twelve major groups on number of volunteers and hours volunteered consisting of 1,277 questionnaires. The survey overall had a 67% response rate. The constituency of the survey was based upon an extensive database maintained by AdoV. Each responding organization's volunteerism statistics are published in the report.

Definition of Volunteer: No.

Study Performed by: University of Arkansas at Little Rock, Institute for Economic Advancement, College of Business Administration.

Study Performed for: Arkansas Department of Human Services Division of Volunteerism and University of Arkansas at Little Rock, Institute for Economic Advancement, College of Business Administration.

Timeframe: Completed at the end of each year.

Published date: The 1999 edition was published on July 1, 2000.

Independent Sector. *Giving and Volunteering in the United States: Findings from a National Survey*. 1999 Edition.

Independent Sector conducts a survey every two to three years on giving and volunteering in the United States. The survey is extremely comprehensive and includes levels of volunteering such as number of hours, frequency, and type of volunteer work; demographics of volunteers such as age, gender, race, education level, and income level; and information on giving including frequency, amount, method, whether respondents itemize taxes, type of charity to which they contribute, and reasons to contribute or not. Other questions look at childhood events, attitudes toward charitable organizations, religious involvement, influential factors affecting giving and volunteering, and methods by which people have been approached to donate time or money. Independent Sector then examines relationships between some of these characteristics. The Gallup Organization conducts the survey for Independent Sector every two to three years.

The study found:

- 55.5% of American adults volunteered in 1998. This is a 13.7% increase in the rate of volunteering since 1995.
- More women volunteered than men (62% v. 49%), however men who did volunteer gave more time per week than female volunteers (3.6 v. 3.4 hours weekly).
- 67% of people aged 35 to 44 years old volunteered, making that the age group to volunteer the most, followed by 63% of 45 to 54 year olds.
- 43% of seniors aged 75 and older volunteered, 46% of 18 to 24 year olds volunteered, 46% of Hispanics volunteered, and 47% of African-Americans volunteered. The percentages of these three demographic groups all increased at least 6 percentage points since 1995.
- 41% volunteered sporadically, 39% volunteered at a regularly scheduled time, and 9% volunteered only for special occasions.
- 19.9 billion hours were volunteered in 1998, representing the equivalent of 9 million full-time employees and a value of $225 billion.
- The total hours contributed in 1999 declined slightly to 19.9 billion from 20.3 billion in 1995. This decline represents a decrease in informal volunteering.
- Average hours volunteered weekly also declined, from 4.2 in 1995 to 3.5 in 1999.
- Popular types of volunteer work performed were: direct service activities such as serving food or running errands for others (24%); fundraising (16%); informal volunteering (15%); and religious activities (14%).
- 90% of people volunteered when asked. 86% of people volunteered because they felt compassion for those in need; 72% of volunteers had an interest in the activity or work; 70% volunteered in order to gain a new perspective on things; and 63% volunteered because of the importance of the activity to someone the volunteer respects.
- People reported being asked to volunteer most by friends (50%), someone from their religious establishment (32%), a family member or relative (19%), or someone at work (12%).

- Respondents were most educated about volunteer opportunities by places of worship (56%), workplaces or employers (24%), schools or colleges (15%), service clubs or organizations (13%), and other voluntary organizations (13%). The only significant change in these results is that fewer people are learning about volunteer opportunities from their places of worship, as compared to 60% in 1995.
- 42% of the volunteers found out about activities through personal contact while 35% found out through participating in an organization. One percent of respondents learned about volunteering on the Internet.
- Contributing households with a volunteer gave more than twice the percentage of household income than contributing households that did not engage in volunteering. In 1998, 47% of households contributed and had a volunteer. These households gave an average of 2.5% of their household income, compared with 1.2% among the 23% of households that contributed but did not volunteer. Contributing households in which the respondent volunteered gave 84% of total household contributions in 1998. In 1991 and 1993, the decline in the economy did not reflect an equal decline in levels of giving or serving.

Methodology: In-home personal interviews with 2,553 American adults 18 and older. Questions about contributions were based on the entire household, while volunteering questions were based on the individual responding. Sampling error was +/- 3%.

Definition of Volunteer: No. Earlier versions of same study used "working in some way to help others for no monetary pay" (1981) but no definition was specified in the 1998 edition.

Study Performed by: Gallup Organization.

Study Performed for: Independent Sector.

Timeframe: Done every two to three years consistently over the past twenty years. This edition assessed contributions in the calendar year 1998, volunteering from May 1998 to May 1999, and attitudes in May 1999, but refers to all of its results as the 1998 survey.

Published date: Executive Summary was published in 1999.

Nonprofit Michigan Project. *Helping Others: A Profile of Michigan Volunteers.* 1997.

The Institute for Public Policy and Social Research at Michigan State University conducts their State of the State Survey on a quarterly basis. The 1997 survey taken of about 1,000 adult Michigan residents was focused upon government performance, community needs and MSU Extension, charity and nonprofits, and assisted suicide. The survey considered standard demographics, political party and affiliation, took into consideration the area of residence within Michigan, and the sample was thereby weighted to be representative of the state. The survey also asked if households contributed to charities and why people don't volunteer. The article, "Helping Others," only summarizes the results relevant to volunteering in Michigan. The instrument, exact results, and graphics are all available.

The study shows:

- 41% of Michigan residents volunteered in the past year.
- Men were slightly more likely to volunteer than women (42% v. 40%).
- More people between the ages of 35 and 54 volunteered than other age groups (49%).
- 44% of whites volunteered while 20% of African-Americans volunteered.
- Two-thirds of people with household incomes of more than $50,000 volunteered, while only one-third of people whose household income was less than $50,000 volunteered.
- Republicans and political independents volunteered more than Democrats and those with no political affiliation (47%, 47%, 35%, and 30% respectively).
- Of all religious groups, Catholics volunteered the most (49%) while those with no religious affiliation volunteered the least (23%).
- Statewide, the lowest volunteerism rates occurred in the Detroit area (26%), and the highest in East Central and Northern Michigan (52% and 51% respectively).
- 58% of non-volunteers cited not having enough time as their primary reason for not volunteering.
- 80% of people who financially supported an organization also supported it by volunteering.

Methodology: A quarterly weighted survey of 1,000 Michigan residents.

Definition of Volunteer: No.

Study Performed by: MSU's Institute for Public Policy and Social Research.

Study Performed for: (used by) Nonprofit Michigan Project.

Timeframe: Surveys conducted between February 18 and April 7, 1997.

Published date: May 1997.

Points of Light Foundation. *Managing Volunteers in Today's Environment: Will the Best of Intentions Be Enough? A Report on Volunteerism Among the Nation's Voluntary Health Agencies*. 1996. Points of Light Foundation: Washington, D.C..

The Points of Light Foundation, working jointly with the American Cancer Society and the National Health Council, published this report on Voluntary Health Agencies (VHAs) in 1996. The foundation mailed a survey to the CEOs of 50 national VHAs from which they received 29 responses. Each VHA was also asked to nominate three affiliate groups who were in turn sent surveys of their own. The foundation received responses from 27 affiliate groups. The survey assessed the major issues facing VHAs and their relative priority; the missions, structures, processes and volunteer programs of organizations; opportunities and obstacles to effective volunteer involvement; the types of data collected by VHAs; and the demographics of the volunteers. Additionally, the foundation asked that affiliates highlight any best practices, that could serve as examples for other organizations.

The responses to these surveys offer insight into the priorities of volunteer-based organizations as well as areas where existing practices fall short of what is desired. The survey's conclusions are:

- Volunteer satisfaction was the highest priority for VHAs with 93% ranking it very or extremely important.
- However, only 54% of organizations had a system in place for measuring volunteer satisfaction.
- Other high-priority issues include time constraints of volunteers (79%), providing leadership opportunities for volunteers (71%), incorporating advanced technology (68%), diversity (63%), and finding well-trained volunteers for specialized assignments (61%).
- Volunteers spent most of their time dealing with fundraising (27-33% on average) and governance (16-22% on average).
- Only an average of 12-16% of volunteer time was spent in direct service to users.
- Volunteers are disproportionately female (64%) and college-educated (72% compared to a national average of 16%).
- Data collection was sparse with VHAs most consistently tracking their number of volunteers and the amount of volunteer-raised funding.

Methodology:	Survey of 29 targeted Volunteer Health Agencies and 27 affiliate organizations.
Definition of Volunteer:	No.
Study Performed by:	Points of Light Foundation.
Study Performed for:	Points of Light Foundation, American Cancer Society, and National Health Council.
Timeframe:	1996.
Published date:	1996.

The Prudential. *The Prudential Spirit of Community Survey: A Survey of Adults on Community Involvement.* 1995.

Prudential sponsored a national survey of adults, 21 years of age or older, conducted by The Wirthlin Group. A total of 520 adults were interviewed about community involvement by telephone in May 1995. The results were then weighted to compensate for any demographic disproportions.

The survey found:

- Most adults (71%) rated their communities as favorable places to live.
- 67% of adults thought it was very important for people to be involved in their communities.
- 64% favored individual initiative over government programs as a means of solving community problems.
- Among all adults, 58% said they were currently giving some time to community service activity. Of this group, 12% were highly involved, 29% were moderately involved, and 59% were less actively involved.
- The most popular reason for volunteering was that it "feels good" (rated very important by 70%).
- 65% consider lack of time to be a very important reason for not volunteering.
- More people (40%) were interested in educational and charitable activities than other types of volunteerism.
- With 70% saying they were not interested, political activities were the least popular volunteer opportunities.

Methodology: Weighted survey of 520 adults over the age of 21. The margin of error is 3-4% at the 95% confidence interval.

Definition of Volunteer: No.

Study Performed by: The Wirthlin Group.

Study Performed for: The Prudential.

Timeframe: May 1995.

Published date: August 1995.

United Parcel Service, *Managing Volunteers*, 1998.

United Parcel Service sponsored a random-number telephone survey of 1,030 Americans about volunteering. Bruskin/Goldring Research conducted the survey, and Fleishman-Hillard Research prepared the questions and report. Additionally, the study focused on certain market areas, and conducted 200 more interviews each in the metropolitan areas of: Atlanta, Chicago-Gary-Kenosha, Dallas-Fort Worth, New York-Northern New Jersey-Connecticut, Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City, San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose, and Washington, D.C.-Baltimore. The larger group of 1,000 had a sampling error of plus or minus three percent, while the smaller groups of 200 each had sampling errors of plus or minus 7 percent. For each group, there was a 95% confidence level.

The key findings from this report are numerous. Nationally, the survey concluded:

- 32% of Americans served one to five hours per month, 24% served six or more hours, 23% never served, and 20% were not volunteering at the time of the survey.
- 53% said they considered volunteering more important than it was five years ago; 34% said it was equally as important.
- 38% of the population would like to do more volunteer work.
- Only 20% of Americans reported recently increasing the amount of time they spend as a volunteer.
- 26% of volunteers have left a volunteer position because of poor volunteer management.
- People were more likely to volunteer if they found an organization was well-managed (52%) and would make good use of their time (58%).
- 26% of employed persons were aware of a community service project sponsored by their employer that used company employees in the past year.

In addition to the national findings, the survey results from the Dallas area are also of use. Specific results from the Dallas area showed slight differences from the national figures. These included:

- A greater number of people who had served as volunteers (79% compared to 76% nationally).
- A smaller number of people who had stopped previous volunteering at the time of the survey (13% compared to 20% nationally).
- More people who had recently increased their level of volunteerism (26% compared to 20% nationally).
- More people who said they would be more likely to volunteer if an organization made good use of their time (70% compared to 58% nationally), was well-managed (60% compared to 52%), or more clearly defined volunteer tasks (49% compared to 41%).

Methodology: A random-number telephone survey of 1,030 Americans with an additional 200 interviews each for seven selected metropolitan areas.

Definition of Volunteer: No.

Study Performed by: Bruskin/Goldring Research.

Study Performed for: United Parcel Service.

Timeframe: February 13-15, 1998.

Published date: 1998.

Utah Commission on Volunteers. *Volunteering in Utah*. 1997.

Brigham Young University conducted a stratified random sample survey of 432 Utah residents in January 1997 on behalf of the Utah Commission on Volunteers. The survey explored both giving and serving behaviors and examined the age, gender, and marital status of volunteers; influences and motivations to volunteer; and awareness and information sources about volunteering opportunities. There was a special emphasis on the role of volunteer centers and how they aided Utah residents in finding opportunities to volunteer.

This survey found:

- 79% of Utahns age 16 and over volunteered.
- Since 1994, volunteerism had increased by 8% among Utahns aged 19 and over.
- Men volunteered more hours per month than women; 30% of men (the majority) volunteered 6-10 hours per month while 26% of women (also the majority) volunteered 1-5 hours a month.
- 37% of married Utahns volunteered 11 or more hours per month while the same percentage of single Utahns volunteered 1-5 hours.
- 33% of 51-65 year olds volunteered at least 15 hours a month while 42% of 16-18 year-olds gave one to five hours per month.
- The most popular reasons for volunteering were to improve the community (28%) and enjoying the "good feeling [they] get" (24%).
- Utahns were most motivated to volunteer by family members (rated 4.0 on a five point scale), religious leaders (rated 3.66), and friends (3.61).
- The most common sources of volunteering information were religious institutions (rated 3.7 on a five point scale), schools (rated 3.32), and nonprofit organizations (rated 3.2).
- 74% of Utahns didn't know if their community had a volunteer center, and 71% said they would turn to volunteer centers for information about volunteering once they were informed of their presence and purpose.

Methodology: Stratified random sample of 432 Utah residents, 95% confidence level and 5% margin of error (population of Utah is 2,233,169).

Definition of Volunteer: No.

Study Performed by: Brigham Young University.

Study Performed for: Utah Commission on Volunteers.

Timeframe: Survey done in January 1997, had previously been done in September 1994.

Published date: 1997.

Observations and Recommendations

The Texas Commission on Volunteerism and Community Service, in applying for evaluation funding from The Corporation for National Service, said:

> The key purpose of the utilization evaluation will be to develop a baseline
> of volunteerism in order to begin to measure the impact and effectiveness
> of various initiatives the Commission may undertake in the future and to
> target services more effectively.

The Environmental Scan was undertaken for the expressed purpose of assisting the Commission in developing a baseline of volunteerism in Texas. The scan provides insight into the type of data that is currently available about volunteer action in the state, and the type of data and information requested by key players in the volunteerism community. Furthermore, the interview process provided respondents with an opportunity to assess the work of the Commission. A separate literature review examined several of the current surveys undertaken to assess the level of volunteerism nationwide and in certain states. Information that focused on Texas has been presented as well.

To conduct the Environmental Scan, the RGK Center interviewed a representative cross-section of state and regional "coordinating" groups and organizations. Over the course of the summer of 2001, more than 134 telephone calls and countless email communications resulted in contact with 64 different groups and organizations, generating 49 usable sets of information. The findings reflect the perceptions of need and the data collection practices of local and regional volunteer service providers as understood by and shared through a representative sampling of regional and state-level coordinating groups. This representative study has been prepared to assist the Commission in determining next steps in its evaluative process. This study is not presented as either an exhaustive or definitive analysis of all volunteer service providers or volunteer utilization groups. The researchers apologize to groups and organizations that may have wished to participate in this study but were not contacted.

Observation #1 – Data Collection Practices and Needs

A few groups at a state level collect data pertaining to volunteer utilization. Those who do have spent time refining their process and have achieved significant program development outcomes as a result of this effort. The work of the Texas Department of Parks and Wildlife and the Texas Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation are both exemplary in this regard. Both have interesting stories to tell regarding their efforts. Both have identified significant policy and program priorities through their analysis and careful assessment. The Texas Association of Hospital Auxiliaries also collects member data and aggregates the number of volunteers and service hours on a state level. However, they appear to have experienced more difficulty in telling their story to either the public or the health-care community.

Several other nonprofits collect and aggregate some data about volunteerism on a state level. The data generally reflected numbers of volunteers and not service hours or service functions. In

most cases, however, this data was difficult to secure and not readily available on the state level. The general perception of respondents that volunteerism data was readily available and easily accessible on the state level was not accurate. Groups such as the United Ways of Texas and coordinating groups that represent various service entities, such as the state network of directors of volunteers in agencies or nonprofit management assistance networks, collect member organizational data but not volunteer utilization data.

Operating at a regional level and providing service to local nonprofits, public agencies, corporations, and membership groups, volunteer centers experience considerable difficulty collecting data. The intermediary nature of their service confounds the problem. Many volunteer centers operate as referral agencies and information resources. Although phone calls and email transactions referring volunteers for service opportunities can be charted, it is difficult to know which actions result in actual service placement. Likewise, agencies to whom volunteer centers refer volunteers have not demonstrated a high degree of willingness to share their data for aggregation purposes.

Volunteer centers did share interesting programmatic ideas and experiences. The Volunteer Center of Dallas County, for example, is now operating as the administrative and legal hub for two additional centers and has laid the foundation to expand further. Several centers described interesting public/private ventures. Many expressed the desire to share their experiences and learn from each other.

In spite of the problems collecting data, respondents did express considerable interest in securing "hard numbers" about volunteering in Texas. Respondents want data for public relations and funding purposes. They want to be able to tell the story of volunteerism with numbers as well as anecdotes. One participant specifically requested an annual report on state service in Texas.

In summary, it appears that when data is available about volunteer utilization in Texas it is most generally maintained on the local, programmatic, or organizational level. To secure a comprehensive picture of actual volunteer service in Texas would require development of a database or outreach system reaching the local level. The Arkansas Department of Human Services Division of Volunteerism, in cooperation with the University of Arkansas at Little Rock, does collect this form of data. The most recently published results of *The Economic Impact of Arkansas Volunteers* (1999) is reviewed in the literature section of this report. This report reflects one approach to collecting data about actual volunteer action.

Observation #2 – Information and Training

A significant number of respondents participating in this study voiced a strong desire for a centralized information hub in volunteerism. Participants requested information about volunteer recruitment, general volunteer management practices, best practices information, and resources to support their work on an ongoing basis. It should also be noted that many respondents sought information about AmeriCorps funding as well as general volunteerism information. Interestingly, the type of data requested by the scan participants parallels closely the findings of the TxServe Symposium held by TxCVCS and the Charles A. Dana Center in 1996. The

TxServe Symposium convened 170 service-sector participants from 43 cities in the state of Texas to design a web resource to support volunteerism in Texas. The participants requested information in four basic areas: tools for learning the business of volunteer management; information for professional development (training information); grantsmanship and fund development resources; and information about model programs and best practices.

In discussing their need for information, many respondents were actually identifying a need for access to information that does exist but is not generally available or widely known. The literature review section summarizes findings from seven recent reports that speak to some of the questions raised by respondents. In addition, Appendix C provides a limited bibliography of resources germane to the focus of the Environmental Scan. This listing is brief in comparison to the literature that serves the field of volunteerism. The problem is, however, that this material is not readily available nor is it easily accessible.

As noted in Question 4, the Commission is best known for the Governor's Volunteer Leadership Conference. Some respondents believe the conference provides some of the best volunteerism training in the State. Others respect the conference but recommended that attention be given to the focus, direction, and overall management of the conference. Furthermore, several respondents recommended that training be regionalized so that more people could benefit from this important resource.

Consistent with the focus on training and information was the attention given to networking activities the Commission has sponsored. Specifically, state agency respondents drew attention to the State Agency Task Force. Most respondents expressed an interest in seeing the group reconvene. These same persons were clear in requesting closer attention be given to the management and composition of the group. Likewise several volunteer center respondents expressed an interest in networking opportunities that they suggested the Commission might sponsor. These persons saw networking meetings as a way to share best practices as well as a way to expand the reach of the Commission.

The interplay between training, information and networking is fairly obvious. What is less clear is the role the Commission desires to play in this arena. The Commission may wish to evaluate the GVLC closely and explore ways to make the conference and other networking events more central to its mission and focus. Likewise the Commission may want to explore ways in which it might partner, not only with volunteer centers and other field-based groups, but also with area colleges and universities to support and encourage a training agenda that helps to meet the needs of the field. In addition, this may be a time to revisit the Commission's web presence and determine what information may be appropriate for electronic dissemination.

As the Commission examines the arena of information and training, careful attention should be given to the existing household surveys that describe the serving and giving behaviors of Americans. The literature review section summarizes surveys that have been conducted in Michigan, Utah, and the United States. In addition the literature cites data reflecting volunteerism behaviors in Dallas and Houston. A Texas-specific household survey would provide additional information and data in volunteerism, however, it would be interesting to ascertain the impact of state level data as distinct from national information. Likewise, it would

be important to compare the impact of a household survey of reported service such as that performed for the state of Utah, with the impact of the type of survey performed by Arkansas which documents service actually performed.

Observation #3: Advocacy and Public Policy

Although the number of respondents addressing public policy and advocacy concerns was distinctly smaller than the number of persons requesting information and training in the field, the respondents who did raise this issue were generally experienced practitioners responsible for volunteer utilization in large organizations or directors responsible for maintaining financially viable nonprofit organizations or both.   It should also be noted that these persons shared the concern for data in the field as described in Observation #1. They saw data along with information and knowledge as powerful advocacy tools to draw attention to citizen service.

Critical advocacy issues include insurance and liability coverage for volunteers, improved wages for volunteer leaders, and funding support for nonprofit agencies, particularly volunteer centers. State agencies currently negotiate insurance coverage on an agency-by-agency basis. The perception is that a more cost-effective coverage could be negotiated collectively. They see the Commission as an active participant in this process, convening the appropriate players and championing the project. Furthermore, advances in liability and insurance coverage negotiated for state agencies may well be expanded to serve nonprofit organizations and public/private ventures. In addition, the issue of automobile insurance and liability coverage for volunteers who drive state vehicles was important to these respondents. They argued for policy development as well as coverage options.

Several state agencies would appreciate assistance with job classifications and pay scale issues for directors of volunteer services and community engagement initiatives in both state and regional offices. Without a champion for hiring qualified leadership into positions that adequately compensate managers, the state-level directors experience high turnover among staff and are often forced to accept inappropriate state employee transfers into open positions. Both situations keep programs from reaching their full potential and cost taxpayers money.

Nonprofit leaders expressed considerable concern about the ongoing need to find funds, particularly to maintain the basic operations of volunteer centers across the state. While the case can be made that volunteerism is in the public interest, making such a case would require coordinated attention and central leadership. Likewise, many volunteer centers perceived that they could function effectively to support the work of the Commission at the local level, but again, funding would be essential to underwrite such a coordinated effort.

Awards programs represent another way to draw attention to volunteerism and advocate for the field. Although not a great many people mentioned this facet of Commission operations, those who did where fairly clear in their opinions and concerns. Those most vocal about the current awards structure wanted to see a much broader and more inclusive recognition program. Any changes made in this area will need the support of the Governor's Office as well as those who have worked to support and refine the current structure. The Commission may want to explore

the way in which other states recognize volunteers. At one point Iowa was a leader in local-level recognition programs that involved both the governor of the state as well as local legislators.

Although public policy advocacy per se is beyond the scope of this report, it is clear that positioning the Commission as an advocate for volunteer and national service could well play a role in determining phase two of this evaluation effort. The selection of a research focus, as well as the marketing plan envisioned to promote the findings of the report, could position the Commission as a visible, knowledgeable advocate for service. While observation one and two reflected on data collection and information resources, it should be noted that some of the most interesting findings from this environmental scan were the stories shared with the researchers. Knowing, for example, that the state parks in Texas could not open if it were not for volunteers, creates a powerful image drawing attention to the power and significance of volunteerism statewide.   While facts and figures may outline the service picture, it is carefully selected stories which bring the picture to life.

Observation #4: Focusing the Work of the Commission

Although knowledge about the specific functions and services of the Texas Commission for Volunteerism and Community Service varied among those interviewed, respondents were concerned about perceived instability at the office as evidenced by the turnover among staff and leadership. As noted previously in the report, participants believe that the Commission "has not lived up to its potential." With the introduction of a new director, which coincides with this evaluation project, the Commission again has the opportunity to "re-invent" itself. As the Commission ponders phase two of this evaluation project, it will be important to place this project within the larger context of the plans and objectives of the Commission and its programmatic focus. Regardless of the direction selected, the Commission will need to allocate sufficient staff time and energy to position itself to take advantage of the study and its outcomes. This will include web site preparation to report findings, reports at the GVLC, and sharing findings through networking exchanges and publications, as well as responding to questions from the public.

As one respondent noted, "I think the Commission with its own Board has to go through the struggle of what's the best role that it can play in Texas." In preparation for selecting a direction for phase two of this project, there are several questions which need to be answered. The response to these questions will help the Commission more clearly articulate its direction and they will assist the Commission in the selection of an appropriate direction for the continuation of this project.

- What is the primary focus of the work of the Commission?   How is this focus evidenced in the allocation of staff time and Commission products? What type of study or analysis would assist the Commission in achieving its goals?

- Who does the Commission most need to influence to achieve its stated or desired goals or direction? What type of document or report would be most useful to influence this/these constituent(s)?

- How does the Commission want to position itself within Texas state government? Is there an area of expertise that the Commission needs to develop to achieve this position? Is there a way that phase two of this evaluation project will facilitate this positioning?

- To whom is the Commission accountable? What, if anything, does the Commission need to do to be more accountable?

- What questions are staff members asked on a regular basis via the phone, via the internet, or in face-to-face encounters? What type of information would assist the staff in responding to these questions?

The options in phase two of the evaluation project are many. There is not a single correct option. As the Commissioners proceed with this decision making process it is important to remember that the field of volunteerism and national community service is an emerging field of study and a fertile ground for research. Providing policy makers with accurate and up-to-date information, whether it is an analysis of service provided within a specific sector or service area, a household survey, or in-depth research on insurance and liability issues as it effects volunteer service, will facilitate more informed decision making. The promotion of the findings will encourage citizen action and together the findings can work to help position the Commission as it seeks to reach its full potential.

Appendix A

Organizations and Individuals Contacted

Volunteer Centers	Contact	Contacts Attempted[1]	Remarks
Volunteer Center of Abilene, Inc.	Kermit Klaener	1	Completed interview
United Way Volunteer Action Center, Amarillo	Donna Soria	2	Completed interview
Volunteer Resource Center, United Way of Brazoria County (Angleton)	Diana Galvan	1	Unable to complete interview due to Hurricane Allison
Volunteer Center, United Way / Capital Area (Austin)	Kathy Crowley Mando Rayo	4	Completed interview Provided additional material
Volunteer Center of the Coastal Bend	Gilna Nance	2	Completed interview Provided additional material
Volunteer Center of Dallas County Volunteer Center of Collin County Volunteer Center of Tarrant County	Julie Thomas	2	Completed interview
Georgetown Information and Volunteer Exchange	Jane Minton	3	Completed interview
Volunteer Houston Volunteer Bay Area	Carrie Moffitt	2	Completed interview
Killeen Volunteers	Joyce Hodson	2	Unable to contact
Nonprofit Management & Volunteer Center, Laredo		2	Unable to contact
Volunteer Center of Lubbock, Inc. (Texas Association of Volunteer Centers)	Louise Cummins	1	Completed interview Provided additional material
Volunteer McKinney	Jeannine Sellmeyer	2	Provided written response to survey Provided additional material
Round Rock Volunteer Center	Pat Patterson	1	Completed interview Provided additional material
Volunteer Center at United Way of San Antonio & Bexar Co.		2	Unable to contact

---

[1] Each Volunteer Center also received the survey via US mail.

Volunteer Centers	Contact	Contacts Attempted[1]	Remarks
Texarkana Volunteer Center	Kathy Graves	2	Completed interview
Volunteer Center Waco	Dottie Wienecke	2	Provided written response to survey
Youth Volunteer Center, Camp Fire Waco	Sherri Street	1	Completed interview Provided additional material

17 Volunteer Centers   **32**   **13 completed interviews**
7 provided additional materials

Nonprofits, Service Organizations, and Membership Groups	Contact	Contacts Attempted	Remarks
American Association of Museum Volunteers	Sarah Christian	4	Unable to contact
American Cancer Society	"Rene" Linelle Blais	3	Briefly exchanged information
American Red Cross	Bruce Summers Mabel Pierce Glenn Ross	4	Exchanged information Provided additional material Provided written response to survey
Association of Junior Leagues International	Diane Moran Stephanie Madden	2	Briefly exchanged information
Baptist Mission Corps	Sam Pearis	4	Provided written response to survey
Big Brothers / Big Sisters of America	Keoki Hansen	2	Exchanged information
Camp Fire Boys and Girls	Erin Williams	2	Briefly exchanged information
Catholic Diocese of Austin	"Gloria"	2	Briefly exchanged information No data
Communities in Schools, Dallas	"Kathleen"	1	Briefly exchanged information
DOVIA, The Texas Network	Kathy McCleskey	2	Completed interview Provided additional material

Nonprofits, Service Organizations, and Membership Groups	Contact	Contacts Attempted	Remarks
Presbyterian Hospital of Dallas (Texas Association, Directors of Volunteer Services)	Ann Gabel	1	Completed interview Provided additional material
Sierra Club	Emily McFarland	3	Briefly exchanged information
Texas Association, Directors of Volunteer Services (Presbyterian Hospital of Dallas)	Ann Gabel	2	Completed interview Provided additional material
Texas Association of Hospital Auxiliaries	Gigi DuBois	3	Completed interview Provided additional material
Texas Association of Partners in Education	Judy Farmer	3	Completed interview Provided additional material
Texas Association of Volunteer Centers (Volunteer Center of Lubbock, Inc.)	Louise Cummins	1	Exchanged information via VC of Lubbock
Texas Library Association	Haven Toosman	2	Briefly exchanged information No data
Texas Nonprofit Management Assistance Network, Inc.	Rose Mary Fry	3	Completed interview Provided additional material
Texas Parent Teacher Association	"Diane"	4	Briefly exchanged information
United Way of Metropolitan Dallas	Danielle Mazzeo	1	Unable to complete interview
United Ways of Texas	Karen Johnson Mike Terry	2	Completed interview Provided additional material Added questions to survey, see Appendix

21 Nonprofit Groups   **51   9 completed interviews**
10 partial interviews
8 provided additional materials

Corporate and Businesses Groups	Contact	Contacts Attempted	Remarks
Bank One of America	Joan Klaus	3	Briefly exchanged information No Texas data
Corporate Community Relations Council of Houston	Charlotte Williams	1	Unable to contact
Corporate Volunteer Council of Austin	Darleen Motley	1	Unable to contact
Corporate Volunteer Council, San Antonio	Helen Butler	1	Unable to contact
Corporate Volunteer Services of Dallas	Laura Simmons	2	Completed interview Provided additional material
GE Elfun, Dallas - Fort Worth Chapter **National Headquarters**	Glen Kitto David Warshaw	1 2	Briefly exchanged information No useable data
HEB	Greg Flores	2	Unable to contact
JCPenney	Jeannette Seigel	1	Unable to contact
Shell Oil	Debbie Breazeale	1	Briefly exchanged information
Texas Accountants and Lawyers for the Arts	Jane Lowery	2	Briefly exchanged information
Texas Association of Businesses and Chambers of Commerce	Art Roberts	1	Briefly exchanged information No data

11 Corporate Groups   18   1 completed interview
                                                                 4 partial interviews
                                                                 2 provided additional materials

State Agencies	Contact	Contacts Attempted	Remarks
Communities in Schools, TDPRS	Jackie Seale Nellie Reyes	2	Unable to complete interview
Texas A&M Extension Service	Carroll Bonn	2	Provided written response to survey Provided additional material
Texas Commission for the Arts	Laura Wiegand	3	Unable to complete interview

State Agencies	Contact	Contacts Attempted	Remarks
Texas Department of Protective and Regulatory Services	Katie Young	3	Briefly exchanged information
Texas Historical Commission	Cynthia Beeman Pat Mercado-Allinger	4 1	Completed interviews
Texas Mental Health Mental Retardation	Jane Hilfer Paul Goebel	2	Completed interview Provided additional material
Texas Natural Resources Conservation Commission	Ted Hazen	2	Unable to complete interview
Texas Office of the Attorney General	Ann Costilow	2	Completed interview Provided additional material
Texas Parks and Wildlife Department	Kevin Good	2	Completed interview Provided additional material
Texas State Library	Wendy Clark	3	Briefly exchanged information
Texas State Bar Association	Julie Oliver	1	Unable to complete interview Received informational material

11 State Agencies   **27**   **5 completed interviews**
                                                              3 partial interviews
                                                              6 provided additional materials

National Service Organizations	Contact	Contacts Attempted	Remarks
Texas Commission on Volunteerism and Community Service	Rosa Moreno-Mahoney	2	Completed interview Provided additional material
Corporation for National Service, Texas Office	Jerry Thompson	2	Completed interview
Texas Center for Service Learning	John Spence	2	Completed interview Provided additional material
Retired Seniors Volunteer Program **Travis County**	Fred Lugo	2	Completed interview Provided additional material

4 National Service Organizations   **8**   **4 completed interviews**
                                                              3 provided additional materials

Appendix B

Resources Supplied by Respondents

American Cancer Society, "Volunteering for the American Cancer Society," Internal Web Document. Obtained from American Cancer Society via email on June 20, 2001.

American Red Cross, "Part VII—Human Resources (Volunteer Staff)," Definitions and Reporting Form. Obtained from American Red Cross via email June 21, 2001.

Association Works, "The Texas Nonprofit Management Assistance Network Marketing Study 2000." December 5, 2000. Obtained from Texas Nonprofit Management Assistance Network via US mail May 29, 2001.

Austin Partners in Education, "Annual Report 1999-2000." Obtained from Austin Independent School District via US mail June 21, 2001.

Austin Partners in Education, "Education is Everybody's Business: Partnership Press." Winter 2001. Obtained from Austin Independent School District via US mail May 29, 2001.

Beaumont ISD School Volunteer Program, "Annual Report 1998-1999." Obtained from Texas Association of Partners in Education via US mail June 21, 2001.

Big Brothers Big Sisters of America, "All Matched Volunteers," 1999. Obtained from Big Brothers Big Sisters of America via email June 21, 2001.

Big Brothers Big Sisters of America, "Volunteers Total by State," 1999. Obtained from Big Brothers Big Sisters of America via email June 21, 2001.

CCMS-TNMAN Tech Team 2000, "Technology and Texas Nonprofits: A report for the Texas Nonprofit Management Assistance Network." Includes slide show printout. Obtained from Texas Nonprofit Management Assistance Network via US mail May 29, 2001.

Dallas Independent School District, "32nd Annual Partner / Volunteer Recognition." May 10, 2001. Obtained from Texas Association of Partners in Education via US mail June 21, 2001.

J. Scott Buchanan and Associated, "Leveraging Nonprofit Management in Texas: An Assessment of the Texas Initiative Program (TIP)," Commissioned by the Meadows Foundation. Obtained from Texas Nonprofit Management Assistance Network via US mail May 29, 2001.

Lubbock Avalanche-Journal, "A Guide to Volunteering in Lubbock." Newspaper Insert. August 27, 2000. Obtained from Volunteer Center of Lubbock via US mail June 11, 2001.

The Network of Directors of Volunteers in Texas, "Survey 2000 Results of Managers of Volunteers." Obtained from Network of Directors of Volunteers in Texas in person in Spring 2001.

Presbyterian Hospital of Dallas, "Presbyterian Hospital, Hours Report, January 2000 through December 2000." Internal Document. Received from Presbyterian Hospital of Dallas via US mail June 2001.

Retired Senior Volunteer Program of Travis County, Fact Sheet- Fiscal Year 2001. Obtained from RSVP, Travis County via email on July 19, 2001.

Retired Senior Volunteer Program of Travis County, Objectives Workplan for Programming for Impact/Outcome Based Activities. Obtained from RSVP, Travis County via email on July 19, 2001.

Retired Senior Volunteer Program of Travis County, "Project Profile – General Version, 10/01/00 – 3/30/01." Internal document. Obtained from RSVP, Travis County via fax on July 19, 2001.

Round Rock Volunteer Center, "Program Outcomes and Statistics for the Year of 2000." Obtained form Round Rock Volunteer Center via fax July 6, 2001.

Round Rock Volunteer Center, "Programs of the Round Rock Volunteer Center Output and Goals." Obtained from Round Rock Volunteer Center via fax June 25, 2001.

Round Rock Volunteer Center, "Round Rock Volunteer Center's Survey of Value of 2000 Volunteer Hours Round Rock Municipal Volunteer Program (MVP)." Obtained from Round Rock Volunteer Center via fax June 25, 2001.

Round Rock Volunteer Center, "2000 Non-profit Volunteer Hours." Obtained from Round Rock Volunteer Center via fax June 25, 2001.

Shell Oil Company, "Shell in the U.S.: 2000 Annual Review." Obtained from Shell Oil Company in person June 28, 2001.

Shell Oil Company, "Shell Youth Training Academy." Pamphlet. Obtained from Shell Oil Company in person June 28, 2001.

Spring Branch Independent School District Partners in Education, "A Celebration of Partnership, 1999-2000 Annual Report." Obtained from Texas Association of Partners in Education via US mail, June 21, 2001.

Texas A&M Agriculture Program, Texas Agricultural Extension Service, "Extension Outreach." Spring 2000. Newsletter. Obtained from Texas Agricultural Extension Service via US mail June 2001.

Texas Agricultural Extension Service, "Diverse Programs Serving Diverse Texans." Pamphlet. Obtained from Texas Agricultural Extension Service via US mail June 2001.

Texas Agricultural Extension Service, "Texas Community Futures Forum." Website.
http://futuresforum.tamu.edu. Obtained from Texas Agricultural Extension Service via US mail
July 2001.

Texas Agricultural Extension Service, "Texas 4-H & Youth Development: Building Tomorrow's
Leaders." Flyer. Obtained from Texas Agricultural Extension Service via US mail June 2001.

Texas Agricultural Extension Service, The Texas A&M University System, "Texas 4-H Events
and Activities: A World of Fun, A World of Knowledge." Pamphlet. Obtained from Texas
Agricultural Extension Service via US mail June 2001.

Texas Agricultural Extension Service, The Texas A&M University System, "Texas 4-H FOCUS
2002-2003: The Action Plan of the Texas 4-H and Youth Development Unit." April 2000.
Obtained from Texas Agricultural Extension Service via US mail June 2001.

Texas Association of Hospital Auxiliaries, Inc., "Summary Member Annual Reports 1998-
1999." Obtained from Texas Association of Hospital Auxiliaries, Inc. via fax June 17, 2001.

Texas Association of Hospital Auxiliaries, Inc., "Summary Member Annual Reports 2000-
2001." Obtained from Texas Association of Hospital Auxiliaries, Inc. via fax June 17, 2001.

Texas Association of Partners in Education, Newsletter, Spring 2001, Volume 9, Number 4.
Obtained from Texas Association of Partners in Education in person June 11, 2001.

Texas Center for Service-Learning, "Learn and Serve America Report." April 25, 2001.
Obtained from Texas Center for Service-Learning via email July 25, 2001.

Texas Center for Service-Learning, "Texas Students Making a Difference through Service-
Learning." Obtained from Texas Center for Service-Learning via email July 25, 2001.

Texas Commission on Volunteerism and Community Service, Full-Time and Part-Time Hours of
Texas AmeriCorps Programs. Compiled by Mary Wilson. Obtained from Texas Commission on
Volunteerism and Community Service via email July 5, 2001.

Texas Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation, "FY 1999 v FY 2000." Internal
Document. Obtained from Texas Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation via
email June 25, 2001.

Texas Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation, "Overview of the Volunteer
Services State Council of Texas." Internal Document. Obtained from Texas Department of
Mental Health and Mental Retardation via email June 25, 2001.

Texas Historical Commission, "Current Archeology in Texas." April 2001, Volume 3, Number
1. Newsletter. Obtained from Texas Historical Commission via Interagency mail July 17, 2001.

Texas Historical Commission, "TASN Report, First Six Months of FY 2000." Obtained from Texas Historical Commission via US mail August 6, 2001.

Texas Historical Commission, "TASN Report for the Period Sept. 2000 to Feb 15, 2001, 2nd Quarter." Obtained from Texas Historical Commission via US mail August 6, 2001.

Texas Historical Commission, "Texas Archeological Stewardship Network." Pamphlet. Obtained from Texas Historical Commission via Interagency mail July 17, 2001.

Texas Historical Commission, "Texas Archeological Stewardship Network Semi-Annual Report, for period Feb.1 through July 31, 2001." (Survey Instrument) Obtained from Texas Historical Commission via Interagency mail July 17, 2001.

Texas Historical Commission, Texas Archeological Stewardship Network, "The Stewards Handbook." May 2001. Obtained from Texas Historical Commission via Interagency mail July 17, 2001.

Texas Lawyers Care, a department of the State Bar of Texas, "Legal Services in Texas: A Referral Directory for Low Income Texans, 2001." Obtained from United Ways of Texas, June 2001.

Texas Nonprofit Management Assistance Network, "Annual Report 2000." Obtained from Texas Nonprofit Management Assistance Network via US mail May 29, 2001.

Texas Office of the Attorney General, "Outreach Initiatives, Child Support Division." June 2001. Internal Document. Obtained from Texas Office of the Attorney General via email June 20, 2001.

Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, "Community Services Report," used to report volunteer program hours. Internal Document. Obtained from Texas Parks and Wildlife Department via US mail June 18, 2001.

Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, *Texas Parks and Wildlife Annual Report 2000*. Obtained from Texas Parks and Wildlife Department via US mail June 18, 2001.

Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, "Volunteer Hours – FY00 1st Quarter." Internal Document. Obtained from Texas Parks and Wildlife Department via US mail June 18, 2001.

United Way / Capital Area Volunteer Center, "United Way / Capital Area Community Service Programs, Annual Report, FY 1999-2000." Obtained from United Way / Capital Area Volunteer Center via email June 29, 2001.

United Way of Texas, "76th Legislative Session: Final Report." 1999. Obtained from United Ways of Texas June 6, 2001.

United Way of Texas, "Texas: Planning for the Future." Fourth Edition. 1998. Obtained from United Ways of Texas June 6, 2001.

United Way of Texas, "Texas Public Policy Handbook: A Guide to the Legislative Process." Fifth Edition. March 1999. Obtained from United Ways of Texas June 6, 2001.

United Way of Waco-McLennan County, "Volunteer Hours are Increasing." Press Release, June 27, 2001. Obtained from United Way of Waco Volunteer Center via fax June 28, 2001.

United Ways of Texas, "Strategic Directions Survey (of members and non-members), 2001-2004." June 2001. Internal Document. Obtained from United Ways of Texas via email July 24, 2001.

United Ways of Texas, "Strategic Directions Survey (results through August 23, 2001)." Internal Document. Obtained from United Ways of Texas via email August 23, 2001.

United Ways of Texas, "Texas Campaign Reporter." June 4, 2001. Obtained from United Ways of Texas in person June 4, 2001.

Volunteer Center of Dallas County, "Corporate Services: Caring, Incorporated." Pamphlet. Obtained from Volunteer Center of North Texas Corporate Services Program via US mail June 26, 2001.

Volunteer Center of Lubbock, "Get-Involved." February 2001, Volume III, Issue 2. Obtained from Volunteer Center of Lubbock via US mail June 11, 2001.

Volunteer Center of Lubbock, "Lubbock: Making Holiday Wishes Come True!" Pamphlet. Obtained from Volunteer Center of Lubbock via US mail June 11, 2001.

Volunteer Center of Lubbock, "1999 Annual Report." Obtained from Volunteer Center of Lubbock via US mail June 11, 2001.

Volunteer Center of Lubbock, "2001: Get Involved." Pamphlet. Obtained from Volunteer Center of Lubbock via US mail June 11, 2001.

Volunteer Center of Lubbock, "Youth Connection." Publication. Obtained from Volunteer Center of Lubbock via US mail June 11, 2001.

Volunteer Center of Lubbock, "Youth Volunteer Opportunities." Pamphlet. Obtained from Volunteer Center of Lubbock via US mail June 11, 2001.

Volunteer Center of North Texas, "The Beat." Spring 2001. Newsletter. Obtained from Volunteer Center of North Texas Corporate Services Program via US mail June 26, 2001.

Volunteer Center of North Texas Corporate Services, "When It Comes to Volunteering, We Mean Business." Obtained from Volunteer Center of Dallas County Corporate Services Program via US mail June 26, 2001.

Volunteer Center of the Coastal Bend, "1998 Statistical Report (Management Assistance Program)." Obtained from Volunteer Center of the Coastal Bend via US mail June 20, 2001.

Volunteer Center of the Coastal Bend, "1998 Statistical Report (Mobilization)." Obtained from Volunteer Center of the Coastal Bend via US mail June 20, 2001.

Volunteer McKinney, "VMC Survey Results and Analysis 1999 & 2000." Obtained from Volunteer McKinney via US mail June 2001.

Appendix C

Partial Bibliography of Additional Resources

Methods Research/Suggestions

California Association of Hospitals and Health Systems. *Benchmarking for Volunteer Departments.* Sacramento, CA, September 1999.   **Publ Report**

Canadian Centre for Philanthropy. "Scan of Research on Public Attitudes Towards the Voluntary Sector." By Husbands, Winston, A-J. McKechnie, and Fleur Leslie. February 2001.   **Intl Doc**

Energize, Inc. *Volunteer Energy Resource Catalog*. 2000-2001. **Catalog**

The Grantmaker Forum on Community and National Service. *The State of Service-Related Research: Opportunities to Build a Field.* Berkeley, CA, May 2000.   **Publ Report**

Independent Sector and United Nations Volunteers. *Measuring Volunteering: A Practical Toolkit*. Washington, DC and Bonn, Germany, 2001.   **Publ Report**

Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. Against the Grain: High-Quality Low-Cost Government for Texas, Vol. 2. By John Sharp. Austin, TX, January 1993.   **Texas State Document**

Voluntary Sector Initiative. "Telling the Story of Canada's Voluntary Sector." *Update*, May 2001, No. 2.   **Newsletter**

Qualitative Research

American Cancer Society, Points of Light and National Health Council. *Managing Volunteers in Today's Environment: Will the Best of Intentions Be Enough?* Washington, DC, 1996. **Publ Report**

American Red Cross. *Taking Volunteerism into the 21st Century*. Lorton, VA, 1990. (Brochure). **Brochure/Pamphlet**

The Dallas Foundation. *Dallas Survey on Corporate Giving: Building a Better Community.* Dallas, TX, June 1999. **Publ Report**

Department for Education and Employment. "From Strength to Strength: Rebuilding the community through voluntary action." Speech by the Rt. Hon. David Blunkett MP, Secretary of State for Education and Employment, February 7, 2001. **Speech**

Gerson, Michael J. "Do Do-Gooders Do Much Good? Most Volunteers Aren't Solving Care Problems." *US News and World Report*. 122:26-30+ April 28, 1997. **Article**

Points of Light. *Changing the Paradigm: The First Report.* Washington, DC. 1992. (Brochure). **Brochure/Pamphlet**

Points of Light. *Changing the Paradigm: The Second Report.* Washington, DC. 1993. (Brochure).   **Brochure/Pamphlet**

TxServe: Linking Texas' Volunteer Administrators for the Improvement of Community Service. 1996 Symposium Report. **Publ Report**

United Parcel Service. *Managing Volunteers.* 1998. **Publ Report**

UPS Community Crossroads. *Volunteer Impact Initiative.* Online. Available: http://www.community.ups.com/community/causes/us_relations/impact.html. Accessed: June 7, 2001. **Website**

UPS Foundation / United Way of America. *Volunteer Impact Initiative.* Alexandria, VA, 2000. **Publ Report**

UPS Foundation. *Strategies for the Effective Engagement of Volunteers, Second Edition.* June 2000. **Publ Report**

UPS. "Delivering Success: New Strategies for Effective Volunteerism – Executive Summary." **Article**

Winbush, Don. "Make No Small Plans." **Article**

General Comparative Research

Action. *Americans Volunteer 1974.* Washington, DC. 1975. (Pamphlet). **Brochure/Pamphlet**

Austin American Statesman. "New Index Shows US Progress in Caring." (November 30, 2000), p. A16. Online. Available: United Way Online : Lexis-Nexis, http://online.unitedway.org/site/vopenFile2.cfm?FIID=36218. Accessed: July 2, 2001.   **Lexis-Nexis**

Charity Village Research. Giving and volunteering in five countries. Online. Available: http://www.charityvillage.com/charityvillage/research/rstal19.html. Accessed May 31, 2001. **Website**

Gannon, Mark. Institute for Volunteering Research. Email, "Volunteering in the NHS," to Katy Fallon, May 30, 2001.   **Email**

Independent Sector. *1999 National Survey.* Online. Available: http://independentsector.org/GandV/default.htm. Accessed: February 13, 2001. **Website**

Independent Sector. *Giving and Volunteering 1992: Findings from a National Survey.* Washington, DC, 1992. **Authoring Agency as Publisher**

Independent Sector. *Giving and Volunteering 1992: Findings from a National Survey.* Washington, DC, 1992. **Authoring Agency as Publisher**

Independent Sector. *Giving and Volunteering in the United States, 1994, Volume II.* Washington, DC, 1995. **Authoring Agency as Publisher**

Independent Sector. *Giving and Volunteering in the United States: Findings from a National Survey 1999 Edition.* Washington, DC, 1999. **Publ Report**

Independent Sector. *Giving and Volunteering in the United States: Findings from a National Survey 1996 Edition.* Washington, DC, 1996. **Authoring Agency as Publisher**

Institute for Volunteering Research. *Age Discrimination and Volunteering.* London, UK, February 2000. **Publ Report**

Institute for Volunteering Research. *Issues in Volunteer Management: A Report of a Survey.* London, UK. **Publ Report**

Institute for Volunteering Research. *Public Sector Support for Volunteering: An Audit.* London, UK, November 1999. **Publ Report**

Institute for Volunteering Research. *The 1997 National Survey of Volunteering.* London, UK, **Publ Report**

Institute for Volunteering Research. *Valuing Volunteers in Europe.* London, UK, February 1999. **Publ Report**

Institute for Volunteering Research. *Volunteering in the NHS.* London, UK, January 1999. **Publ Report**

Institute for Volunteering Research. *What Young People Want from Volunteering.* London, UK, 1998. **Publ Report**

JC Penney and VOLUNTEER-The National Center. *A National Profile: Volunteering.* Arlington, VA. 1987. (Brochure). **Brochure/Pamphlet**

Kuti, Eva. *Individual Giving and Volunteering in Hungary.* Working Paper Series. Washington, DC: Nonprofit Sector Research Fund, Summer 1997. **Publ Report**

Points of Light Foundation. *Framework for Volunteer Center National Network.* **Document**

Tomlinson, Mark E., and Mark I. Wilson. *Helping Others: A Profile of Michigan Volunteers.* Briefing Paper 97-22. Michigan State University, May 1997. **Publ Report**

University of Arkansas at Little Rock and the Arkansas Division of Volunteerism. *The Economic Impact of Arkansas Volunteers 1998.* Publication 99-05. Little Rock, AR, July 1, 1999.   **Publ Report**

Utah Commission on Volunteers. *Volunteering in Utah 1997.* Orem, UT, 1997. **Publ Report**

Wirthlin Group. *The Prudential Spirit of Community Adult Survey.* August 1995. **Publ Report/PDF**

Appendix D
United Ways of Texas Survey Results

The researchers are grateful to the United Ways of Texas for including five questions about volunteer involvement in their June 2001 Strategic Directions survey to Texas United Ways. As of July 23, 2001, 19 United Ways had responded to the survey. The responses are summarized below.

- The respondents use a total of 30,322 volunteers. The number of volunteers varied from 12 to 25,000 depending upon the size and scope of the local organization.

- Eleven, or 61%, of responding organizations strongly agreed or agreed that they are satisfied with their local system of volunteer management. Those unsatisfied with their system of volunteer management said:
  - Their "use of volunteers could be greatly improved and of greater benefit to [their] own needs as well as those of agencies."
  - "Need more help and time dedicated to this area."
  - They are running on "auto-pilot" and "out of fresh ideas."
  - Their United Way does not have enough volunteers to run its campaign.

- Eleven, or 58%, of the respondents currently maintain records that document the number of volunteers they engage in their organization, while only 5, or 26%, maintain and report the hours of service contributed. Reasons for not maintaining and reporting data include:
  - Lack of staff, time, or money was referred to by four United Ways.
  - "Report to whom?" asked one United Way.
  - Others indicated that it is not a high priority or too difficult to monitor.
  - Some don't know how or don't have a system in place.

- Fourteen of 17 indicated that their United Ways would benefit from a statewide recognition system that would strengthen volunteer retention.