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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate elements of state volunteer programs. Contents studied were budget, staff, range of functions, volunteer utilization, dollar benefits and leadership roles of government entities (legislature, governor, state agencies, advisory boards). The importance of a formal structure was illustrated in the literature review. A questionnaire was designed and sent to 25 states that funded centralized volunteer programs. At the completion of the study six survey instruments were returned as “non-deliverable.” The total was then 19. Twelve program managers completed and returned the survey instrument. Data gathered from the questionnaire was presented in descriptive and table format.

Results from the data indicated volunteer contributions were significant in state government; estimated value of services donated ranged from $370,000 to $300,000,000. Volunteer agencies in all states proved to be cost beneficial with all programs receiving a return on the dollar investment. Functions performed by state volunteer programs tended to be indirect in nature. Volunteer agencies supported 100 percent by state revenues had larger budgets and were less likely to experience decreases in funding. The results indicated it was important to have support from the legislature, governor, state agencies and advisory boards. Support from these government entities affected levels of funding. Due to a flaw in the research design, areas of volunteer utilization could not be analyzed.

In conclusion, the results of this study indicated that utilization of volunteers was cost beneficial. In order to achieve maximum utilization of human resources, it was important to have a formal structure to develop coordination, communication, and evaluation. Securing support from the governor was important, however, the volunteer office need not be directed by the executive branch. It was necessary that the program manager coordinate to secure support from the legislature, state agencies and advisory board; their support correlated with funding levels. Further replications of this study should use analytical statistics to gather data on volunteer utilization, and the question in the survey instrument would need to be reworded and readministered.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

"Volunteering in the United States is alive, healthy and growing." (Verity, Pace, 1983: 30). As discussed in the Voluntary Action Leadership, a Gallup Poll Survey found that 52 percent of American adults and almost an equal portion of teenagers volunteered in 1980-81. President Reagan, an advocate of volunteerism, organized a task force to encourage individuals and businesses to develop innovative ways to meet the needs of society. Volunteers should be viewed as a means of program enhancement and not as a solution to budget cuts. For example, a city commission faced with budget cuts would probably reduce funding of library programs before police services. The library is then faced with coping with a cutback in services and sometimes staff. Does the library eliminate a program such as a children’s storyteller or do they recruit a volunteer to maintain the service. Volunteer leaders, unions, and other professionals do not advocate replacing paid staff with volunteers. Management should not view volunteers in this way. The volunteer can enhance the paid storyteller by making artistic displays or even telling the story occasionally, but management cannot expect the volunteer to become the full time storyteller.

In summary, volunteers should not be seen as a solution to cope with budget cuts. However, it is desirable to utilize volunteers to add human qualities to the bureaucracy and enhance delivery of services.

Volunteering grows from leadership of creative, committed people who believe that it is possible to solve problems in ways that help others become independent and self-sufficient leaders. Montana could provide these elements in a state volunteer office for
utilization of citizens wishing to offer their time to state government. The intent of this study is to contribute to the body of knowledge available on volunteerism.

**Purpose of the Study**

There was little reference in the literature to the contents of state volunteer programs and almost no material on Montana volunteer programs. The purpose of this study is to investigate contents of existing state volunteer programs. The elements to be investigated are budget, staff size, functions performed, areas of volunteer utilization, dollar benefits, and support from government entities.

Based on this study, policy makers in organizations and governments could determine whether or not a volunteer program would be beneficial. The State of Montana may also utilize these results.

**General Areas Addressed**

This research project addressed areas of budget, staff, range of functions, volunteer utilization and leadership. The importance of a formal structure was also reviewed. It was the intent of the investigator to determine:

1. Did the programs directed by the governor have larger budgets and staffs than those directed by other entities?
2. Did revenue sources affect the amount of funding?
3. Did the central volunteer agency perform direct or indirect services?
4. Did the staff size affect the number of functions performed?
5. Did the number of paid employees relate to the number of volunteers donating time to state government?
6. Which jobs are best suited for volunteers.
7. Were dollar benefits or volunteer services sufficient to offset administrative costs?
8. Did degrees of support from government entities (legislator, governor, state agencies, advisory board) relate to the level of funding?

Organization of the Study

This study is organized into five chapters. The first chapter contained the introduction, purpose of the study, general areas addressed, limitation, delimitations and definition of terms.

Chapter II is the review of the literature. It addressed the development and nature of volunteerism. A brief overview of a 1981 Gallup Survey provided a demographic analysis of volunteers and indicates how people first became volunteers. Also, it indicates charitable giving in relationship to volunteerism. Chapter II stresses the importance of a formal structure to utilize volunteers, to provide leadership, management and evaluation. Areas of volunteer utilization and cost effectiveness of volunteer programs are also established in this chapter.

Chapter III defines various procedures used in completing this study. Steps include sources of data, construction of the survey instrument, administration of the survey instrument, and analysis of the data.

The results of the study are outlined in Chapter IV. The findings of the questionnaire are presented and analyzed.

The last chapter of this research project includes a summary of the study along with conclusions and recommendations.

Limitations

1. This study is limited to 25 states designated by the National Volunteer Action Center as having State Offices on Volunteerism.
2. The population represents 19 from the list; six questionnaire were returned as non-deliverable.

**Delimitations**

1. The scope of this study was limited to the utilization of volunteers at the state level.
2. The research instrument was limited to a self-produced free-choice questionnaire mailed to the population.
3. The questionnaire materials were limited to budget, staff size, functions performed, dollar benefits, and support of government entities.
4. The data is limited to subjective responses of state volunteer coordinators.
5. A second questionnaire and follow-up letter were sent to respondents that did not return the original instrument within the prescribed time limit.
6. Statistics are limited to a descriptive analysis.
7. Research was limited to the Montana State Library and the Montana State University Library.
8. No pre-test was administered due to a small population size.
9. Analytical statistics were not used due to a small population size.

**Definition of Terms**

*Volunteerism*: An umbrella term for all that is done by volunteers. The principle of supporting anything by volunteer action. (Noyes, Ellis, 1978:11)

*Volunteer*: A person who performs services without pay on a regular basis in an organized fashion.

*Director of Volunteers*: A salaried individual who takes responsibility for implementing, coordinating, and directing a volunteer program.
\textit{Staff}: Salaried and non-salaried individuals identified with and working in the state volunteer program.

\textit{State Agency}: An organization that operates under the auspices of state government.

\textit{Governing Body}: The organization to whom the state volunteer program is responsible.

\textit{Formal Structure}: Refers to a funded volunteer program that operates within state government. Its purpose is to plan and evaluate programs that utilize volunteers in state government.

\textit{Advisory Board}: A group of individuals outside the agency chosen from the community to advise those who are responsible for planning, implementing, and maintaining the volunteer program. They serve to meet the needs of the community, the volunteers, and the agency.

\textbf{Summary}

Volunteerism is not the answer to budget cuts. However, it can enhance programs that serve society. This concept lends itself to an investigation of volunteerism. By researching the concept of a formal structure to utilize volunteers in state government, it was the investigator's intention to contribute new information to add to the existing body of knowledge. This research is for review by policy makers in organizations and the public sector.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The literature reviewed covered a span of 16 years. Most material regarding volunteerism presented ideas for generating and utilizing volunteers. A large portion of the readings explained management of volunteers in different settings. The need for and development of a structured program were not well-documented; therefore, organizational theories were reviewed.

The volunteer organization depends on participation from many people. A structure assures that the organization can involve many different people, agencies, and leaders. A centralized structure provides leadership, planning, and coordination. A formal program can provide a means to gather ongoing documentation for program evaluation. Today a volunteer program must be based on sound management principles.

In the review of the literature, the history and nature of volunteerism were discussed. As the nature of volunteerism grew from the neighborly helping hand to a legislated, specific, regulated endeavor, it also changed from a social event to a political activity. So many volunteers worked across America in the 1980s that a statistical quantification was compiled. In order to create a system whereby there is optimum utilization of resources, a need for a formal structure was reviewed. In order to determine appropriate volunteer placement, areas of utilization were researched. The last item discussed in the review of literature was the cost-benefits of volunteer programs.
Volunteerism has evolved over the course of United States history. Some of its themes, such as lay involvement in American religions, have had long traditions while others such as membership in service clubs have arisen more recently.

Early in American history, volunteerism was not an organized activity except for the militia. It consisted of primarily helping one’s neighbors with activities like barn-raising and mail delivery. Volunteerism was much more a means of coping with work that required many hands in a primarily rural setting rather than a social or political force. (Sloan, deAprix, Fernald, 1982:36)

Soon after American gained its independence, the nature of volunteerism underwent an evolution that gradually led to its modern form. The evolution began with the electorate’s involvement in political issues. Abolition, agrarianism, temperance, and women’s suffrage are among the issues that brought volunteers and activists into the political area. As American society became more urbanized and institutionalized, volunteerism expanded into a special activity that attempted to improve living conditions and build a more idealistic society. The Kennedy Administration marked the beginnings of legislative and administrative mandates for citizen participation. In 1964 the War on Poverty, whether by design or not, helped lend legitimacy to a new level of citizen involvement. During the Kennedy Administration the Peace Corps was formed (1961) and VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America) was created in 1966.

The evolution of volunteerism over the last 20 years has helped to legitimate the potential of people participation in government. Volunteerism has become a big business in the United States with thousands of options for individual involvement through organized programs, as well as informal activities.

In order to more accurately assess the potential of volunteerism in America, a coalition of volunteer organizations commissioned the Gallup Polls to conduct a survey on volunteerism. Allen states, "President Reagan has done more to publicize volunteering
than any other president since John Kennedy." The President's Task Force on Private Sector initiatives was the key vehicle through which Reagan's interest was expressed on volunteerism. (1983:23) The Task Force consisted of 44 members that represented a broad cross section of political opinion and leadership from academia, business, organized labor, government, foundations, religious, civil and non-profit groups. Created in 1982, the role of the Task Force was to act as a catalyst to encourage organizations, individuals, and communities to take leadership roles in developing new and innovative ways to meet the needs of society.

At the federal level, the State Office of Volunteerism Program was established in 1974 as an Action Demonstration Grant Program to promote volunteerism at the state level. Designed in cooperation with the 1973 National Governors' Conference, the program was intended to encourage and coordinate existing volunteer programs within state government.

Grants ranging between $40,000 and $60,000 were given to individual states to:
- establish volunteer coordination at the state level
- promote/coordinate volunteerism in the public/private sectors
- act as a liaison with federal action programs

At one time 34 states maintained state offices on volunteerism. The State of Montana had a Volunteer Bureau which was under the direction of Community Affairs. However, during a major reorganization in 1978, the Volunteer Bureau was disbanded. Currently the exact number of state offices varies from year to year. Many are staff operations of the governor, established by executive order, and subject to reversals of fortune from one administration to the next. In 1983, this investigator identified 19 state volunteer programs still in existence.

The nature of "volunteerism" encompasses a very broad scope. In its broadest sense, volunteerism includes any activity for which compensation is not received. For example,
an individual painted a neighbor's house, drove a friend to the doctor's, or babysat at church. To fill a more significant role in the delivery of state and local services, volunteerism must accept some form of regulation to insure continuity of these services. Retired Senior Volunteer Programs, Red Cross, and Cub Scouts are indicative of this regulated aspect in volunteerism. The following criteria, developed by Sloan et al. (1982) qualifies volunteer activity in state government:

- activity must provide a service or benefit to persons other than the individual performing it and his immediate family
- activity must not provide compensation, other than expenses incurred
- activity must be performed for an organized entity
- activity must be performed on a regular basis to assure the uninterrupted flow of service

In order to guarantee reliability in state government, volunteer activities will need a sufficient degree of organization and administration.

Experience from other state volunteer programs confirms that volunteers can enrich the lives of individuals and communities and that the state can encourage participation. (Millard, 1983:28)

Statistical Overview of Volunteerism

Number and Value of Volunteers

Approximately 84 million Americans (52 percent of the adult population) typically donate some of their time as volunteers. Of this 84 million, about 55 million (31 percent) donate more than 100 hours per year. The total amount of volunteer time in 1981 was estimated to be about 8.4 million hours with an estimated value of $64 million.

Demographic Analysis of Volunteers

The Gallup Survey indicated that 47 percent of the male population and 56 percent of the female population volunteered. Fifty-eight percent of the single people compared to 53 percent of the married people volunteered. Fifty-five percent of the people in full-time employment donated time while 65 percent of the individuals in part-time employment volunteered in 1981. People (75 percent) with a college degree are more likely to volunteer than those with educational levels of high school or less (31 percent). Fifty-nine percent of the households with four or more people volunteered compared to 41 percent of a household size of one.

Knowledge of Activity

The Gallup Survey indicated that most people became involved because they were asked. Relatively few (six percent) responded to ads in the media and one in four sought out the activity on their own. "Among adults who have volunteered in 1980-1981, the largest percentage (44 percent) first became involved in the volunteer activity because they were asked by someone if they would volunteer. Other sources of conformation or reasons for becoming involved in the volunteer activity are having a family member or a friend involved in the activity and through participation in a group or organization. One person in four sought out the activity on their own." (Allen, 1982:28)
The largest number (53 percent) of teenagers became involved because they were asked by someone; 42 percent volunteered because a family member or friend donated time.

The Gallup Survey illustrated that 25 percent of the adults and 21 percent of the teens sought out the activity on their own.

Charitable Contributions by Volunteers and Non-Volunteers

There appears to be a relation between charitable contributions and volunteer work. "Volunteers are more likely than non-volunteers to give monetary, charitable contributions. Ninety-one percent of all volunteers have made a charitable contribution, compared with 66 percent of non-volunteers. The group most likely to give a charitable donation in a particular area is the group who volunteers its time in that area. Among people who volunteered for a health organization in the past year, 65 percent also gave a charitable contribution to a health organization, whereas only 26 percent of non-volunteers gave a donation to a health organization." (Allen, 1982:26)

The Gallup Survey reveals that volunteerism in America is thriving. State officials could utilize these statistics to tap this human resource and enhance existing services. For example, the research indicates that people will become involved if asked. A formal structure could develop campaigns to recruit individuals for government work.

Also, as the survey indicated, volunteers are more likely to make charitable contributions, which could be beneficial to the programs.

Formal Structure

A structure is a planned, conscious effort to create a system that enables individuals, agencies, and leaders to participate in the organization. An example of a formal volunteer structure is the Montana State Library Volunteer Program. The library supports a full-time
paid manager, whose responsibility is to recruit, place, manage and evaluate volunteers. The volunteer program has a budget that funds one full-time employee, travel, supplies, and operation expenses. Supervisors within the library work through the volunteer coordinator to recruit and place volunteers; a formal structure will have the ability to organize, implement, and evaluate a volunteer program. In addition, an organized program will ensure that volunteer activities and opportunities are more visible to the public. As research indicates, people are willing to volunteer if only asked; a formal structure could target, facilitate, and conduct recruitment campaigns. As the Gallup Poll indicates the best recruitment method is asking. A program manager should establish personal contact with potential volunteers. For example, a personal speech to a group of retired teachers will draw more support than sending a letter or flyer.

In order for any structure to be successful, there must be leadership from committed people. Good program management will enable the organization to coordinate and communicate with appropriate entities. The volunteer structure should maintain its credibility through ongoing evaluations; e.g., the core of ongoing funding will be determined by the cost-benefits derived from the program.

**Leadership**

For an organization to succeed, there must be commitment from officials, support from an advisory board, and competent administrators to manage the program.

The success of state offices on volunteerism depends on leadership. Leadership starts first with the executive. As Schindler reports:

*Initial approval and support of the Governor for a State Office on Volunteerism are vital. There is simply no alternative leadership to the Governor's for expeditious establishment of the State Office on Volunteerism. Continued support of the Governor must be demonstrated and is as important as the initial approval and support. The location of the State Office on Volunteerism must facilitate and coordinate volunteerism throughout the state and among state agencies. Placement within a particular state department encourages the view of the State Office of Volunteerism as an office of volunteer services for that department.*
the ability to coordinate among state departments is almost inevitably diminished. (1977:22)

Millard indicated that the permanency and stability of volunteer programs can be achieved through legislation.

Volunteer programs should be created by a legislative mandate and not an executive order. Programs established by executive order are subjected to sharp reversals of fortune from one administration to the next. Many of the stronger volunteer programs were established by legislation, which provides added stability and clarity of purpose. (1983:19)

Another factor in leadership is that of the advisory board. “Administration is not and cannot be a one-man show. No enterprise can be performed by one person, unless it is the most simple of endeavors.” (Trecker, 1970:27) An advisory board is a group of people chosen from outside the agency to advise those who are responsible for planning, implementing, and maintaining the program. The following are functions of an advisory board:

- provide communication between the program and the community
- assist in making studies
- assist in the continuous review of content and organization
- provide evaluation of the program to insure that it is updated and meets the needs of the community
- assist in providing direct and indirect financial support
- assist in long-term planning (Ramaeker, 1976:43)

Advisory boards are just that, advisory. They have no legislative or administrative authority. They counsel, suggest, and recommend items that will benefit the program. Boards must participate in leadership roles; they are the voice of the community’s goals and aspirations.

In order to develop and maintain a volunteer program, qualified personnel should be hired. The volunteer administrator should wear many hats: the administrative hat, the hat of publications, the training hat, and the consultant hat. “Good personnel administration
helps individuals to use their capacities to fulfill and to attain maximum satisfaction.” (Naylor, 1967:174)

Leadership involves a supportive governor, competent managers, and an active advisory board. A legislative mandate can promote program stability.

Some researchers state that leadership determines, not only the climate, but actual success or failure of many enterprises or organizations. They have determined that of every 100 new business establishments started, almost half of them fail and go out of business within two years. By the end of five years, only one-third of the original 100 are still in business, and they maintain most of the failures can be attributed to ineffective leadership. (Wilson, 1976:60)

Program Management

Volunteer programs should be based on sound management principles. They need to justify their existence. The volunteer bureau will need to determine that both volunteers and state agencies are getting what they need. This can be done by coordination, communication, and motivation. “Coordination principally concerns the relationships between tasks or activities which must fit both by form and time into an integrated accomplishment of some overall goal or purpose.” (Litterer, 1965:215)

Communication is an essential element of coordination. “For a democratic system to function, there will be a need to establish a communication system between the fragmented and polarized sections of the community, which possess different values, orientations, expectations, and outlooks toward volunteerism.” (Schindler & Lippitt, 1975:16)

A formal structure can ensure that coordination and communication happen. By developing an organized format, the volunteer agency will be able to motivate and monitor the utilization of volunteers in state government. The central volunteer agency will be involved from planning to implementation to evaluation; for the responsibility of the agency is to answer questions, to stimulate new ideas, to work with people at all levels within the agency, to provide an ongoing stimulus for volunteer development to occur without a
The placement and utilization of human resources is another purpose for coordination and communication. “For any collaborative relationship to be productive, clarity of common goals and values must be achieved.” (Naylor, 1967:55) In the long run clearly defining the nature of the volunteer-staff partnership can prevent a lot of aggravation. Staff attitudes can get in the way of commitment. Past experiences or expectations on the part of both staff and volunteers can cause problems. It is the responsibility of a formal structure to coordinate with volunteers, employers, and employees of agencies to discuss perceptions. Volunteers and/or staff often lack a complete understanding of the overall purpose, major responsibilities, and assigned tasks involved in the program’s goals. The central volunteer agency has the responsibility for monitoring volunteer development in order to be aware of danger signals of managerial or organizational ill health which may be imperceptibly arising within an agency. Unless the situation is monitored, the volunteer program can find itself in a situation where turn-about is impossible.

**Program Evaluation**

Human service organizations are learning from the private sector; e.g., to be accountable by gathering data to indicate cost-effectiveness. Documentation will be an important process for the volunteer program; it will be necessary to record the number of volunteers, hours donated, and administrative costs. Developing goals and objectives and measuring outcomes will also be necessary. In order for the agency to be accountable, ongoing evaluation will need to happen.

Evaluation is intimately connected with an attitude that change is not only possible, but desirable, if it will move us closer to a chosen goal. A good systematic evaluation system is in this sense the hallmark of an open, growing, changing system/program/organization. (Smith, 1972:2)

In summary, a formal structure is important to the success of a volunteer program by providing tools to coordinate, communicate, motivate, and evaluate program goals in order to achieve maximum utilization of resources.
Areas of Utilization

"Volunteers prefer, as research indicates, to help other people directly, as their

time and interests permit. Conversely, government has many assignments requiring regular

work hours and special training that would not appeal to volunteers because they involve

administrative, clerical, or other support activities that are needed, but are divorced from

the direct provision of services." (Sloan et al., 1982:2) It will be important that state agen-

cies needing volunteers be aware of appropriate volunteer placement. A formal structure

will have personnel that can review and evaluate volunteer utilization.

Volunteers can be used to enhance delivery of services. "If we can accept the concept

that all persons have value as human beings, then we can see volunteers as a human re-

source, a human reservoir of time, talent, and skills waiting to be tapped to help meet

identified human needs." (Hardy & Cull, 1973:108) The development of the manual,

Aftercare, by the Montana Department of Institutions in 1973, indicated that most recipi-

ents of human services have many needs that could be met by volunteers; e.g., recognition,

respect, acceptance, and the need to be loved. Addressing those needs takes time and

energy which may or may not be available from the professional. The following is an exam-

ple of how a volunteer can enhance a human service program.

Even with a caseload of 35, a professional counselor does not have sufficient

time to provide adequate service to all children on his caseload. Given a 40-hour

week and the amount of paperwork and other non-counseling functions, this

would leave something less than one hour per week for child casework services.

One hour per week per child is not adequate for rehabilitation. It is with those

services that the companion volunteer can play a major role. (Aftercare, 1973:1)

In addition, the agency must protect the clients it serves. The reputation of the

agency must be considered; an unhappy volunteer can promote unsatisfactory public

relations toward the agency. Morale of paid staff declines when an inappropriate volunteer

placement occurs. Therefore, it is necessary to build into the volunteer selection process

procedures for ensuring suitability, appropriateness, and quality control. Screening out
those clearly unsuited for certain jobs and redirecting them to appropriate placements is essential.

Clients must be included in volunteer programs in our agencies. They must have input into the planning of the program, so client needs will be met and services extended and enriched by the volunteer involvement. The way to determine if this is in fact happening is to also involve the client in evaluating the program at strategic intervals. Some more adventuresome agencies are also discovering that clients have another service. Client-volunteers are now proving to be extremely successful in mental health settings, welfare programs, day care centers, Head-start programs, juvenile offender programs, etc. The empathy, sensitivity, and caring these people bring to others is tremendous and the self-esteem it generates in them is vital to their becoming full partners in society. (Wilson, 1976:122)

Cost-Effectiveness

A formal structure must strive to justify its existence. Allocation of funds depends on quantifiable data that indicates benefits outweigh costs.

The interest in quantifying the value of volunteer work has never been greater. Funding sources demand to know the return for their investments in volunteer programs. When preparing a projection of worth of volunteer contributions never conclude that volunteers save the agency X amount of dollars. It is unlikely that anyone ever was committed to paying for these services in the first place. Furthermore, talk of budget savings again raises the spectre of volunteers replacing staff. It is best to conclude that volunteers add services worth X amount of dollars. Most attempts at establishing a monetary value of volunteering do a great disservice by vastly underestimating the equivalency worth of a volunteer work. The equivalency model proposes that the true value of volunteering be fixed at the fair market value or purchase price of parallel paid services, or the actual worth of the contribution, not the volunteer’s earning power. (Karn, 1983:1-4)

In this way the contributions of some citizens who have a high rate of earning power, such as attorneys or physicians, will be rated on a different scale from that of a person who delivers meals to an elderly homebound individual.

The equivalency model affords a measure of precision in fixing the worth of the volunteer product, which cannot be obtained by using the average wage paid in the agency or the local or national median wage. (Karn, 1983:4)
To formulate the equivalency rate for a particular volunteer job, an accurate assessment of the duties performed and the minimums required are compiled. Volunteer duties are matched with the agency's classification system.

Not only must an hourly wage be assigned, but fringe benefits must be considered. Further, a state employee is also paid for many holidays, annual leave, and sick leave. Since volunteers report only actual hours worked, an equivalent rate of pay should take into account the real cost to the state for every hour actually worked by the parallel classification. (Karn, 1983:4)

The prime recipients of any cost analysis are those people who have the final decision-making power and authority over staff and service (county commissioners, judges, governors, heads of corrections). In doing any cost analysis, one must first know what information is needed by decision-makers. The goal of the analysis is to present your volunteer services as an alternative that can maximize the difference between social benefits and social costs. (Hodgkins, 1983:28)

The true value assessment process will show that the volunteer contribution has a significantly higher monetary value than will the frequently used standard approaches.

The Montana State Library is one state agency that has an active volunteer program. In 1981, a paid coordinator was hired to manage volunteers for the Library for the Blind & Physically Handicapped, which is a division of the State Library. The program has grown to 32 volunteers who donate time on a consistent basis.

For the year 1983 (January to December), 5779 volunteer hours were donated, for an estimated fair market value of $40,556. People contributed their time as outreach workers, clerks, technicians, and sound editors. In addition, volunteers performed jobs as narrators, monitors, and home workers. Also, students participated in the volunteer program to gain work experience for future employment.

When determining the fair market value, the coordinator reviewed the tasks performed by volunteers and paralleled them with like tasks as described in the Montana State Classification Manual (henceforth identified as MSCM). All grades were assigned and hourly wages were tallied at the Step I level.
Appendix A, The State of Montana Pay Matrix, was used to determine hourly wages. The following procedures were used in summarizing volunteer positions at the Library:

- description of volunteer activity
- MSCM classification, grade, and summary
- annual hours of each classification
- annual contribution of each classification

Appendices B through E are the detailed analyses of each volunteer job description. Table 1 is an overview of the volunteer contributions on which to calculate the fair market value of the program.

The Volunteer Program at the Montana State Library has used the equivalency model to determine the monetary value of volunteers. For the year 1983 volunteers added $40,019 to the Library. The cost for funding the Coordinator's position was $17,015; the total budget allocated for the Volunteer Program was approximately $24,000, which funded travel, purchase of Montana's books, and equipment.

**Summary**

Chapter II presented the history and nature of volunteerism, from the early barn-raising days to the present nationwide involvement. "There can be little doubt that there has been a renewal of citizen involvement, whether in efforts to shelter the homeless and feed the underemployed or in the campaign for a nuclear freeze." (Allen, 1983:24)

The overview of volunteerism was quantified in a 1981 Gallup Poll Survey. The survey presented the demographics of volunteers and gave insights into how they became involved.

The review of literature stressed the need for a formal structure to develop and maintain a successful volunteer program. Important components of a formal structure included leadership, management, and evaluation.
Table 1. Volunteer Contributions to the Montana State Library.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volunteer Title</th>
<th>MSCM Class</th>
<th>State Grade</th>
<th>Hourly Wage 20% Benefit</th>
<th>Weekly Hours</th>
<th>Annual Hours</th>
<th>Annual Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clerical (6)</td>
<td>Library Clerk I</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$5.58</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>$7,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Selectors/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptionists (6)</td>
<td>Library Clerk II</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$6.72</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>$17,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrators (3)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$9.32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>$2,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitors (1)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$9.32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>$969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach Workers (1)</td>
<td>Social Worker Aide I</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$5.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>$310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Pioneers (5)</td>
<td>Radio TV/Technician I</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$8.61</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>$11,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screening Committee (4)</td>
<td>Editorial Assistant</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$7.94</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Workers (3)</td>
<td>Library Clerk II</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$6.72</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>$538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students (2)</td>
<td>Library Clerk I</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$5.58</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>$536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5779</td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,556</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figures have been rounded off.
Studying areas of volunteer utilization revealed that volunteers prefer to work directly with people, and can enhance existing services by adding a human touch to service delivery.

Estimating the monetary value of volunteer labor was explained and illustrated by reference to the Montana State Library Volunteer Program.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

The review of the literature indicated that volunteerism in America is thriving, with 50 percent of the population contributing time. The literature illustrated the importance of a formal structure to provide leadership, program management, and evaluation. In order to achieve appropriate placement of volunteers, areas of utilization were reviewed. Concepts were studied to determine the cost-effectiveness of volunteer programs and a case study was presented. Based on the review of the literature, a questionnaire was administered to determine if programs directed by the office of the governor had larger budgets and staffs. In addition, in order to understand the role of a state volunteer program, the survey instrument asked respondents to identify functions performed by their office. Appropriate placement was surveyed by asking respondents to rank order jobs performed by volunteers. Program benefits were established by estimating the dollar value of volunteer services in state government. Levels of support from the legislature, governor, state agencies and advisory board were rated to determine if levels of support corresponded with size of budgets.

This study was undertaken to contribute data to the existing body of knowledge on volunteerism. Based on this study, policy makers, organizations and governments could determine whether or not a formal volunteer structure would be beneficial.

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the procedures followed in completing this study. The following areas were examined:

- Sources of the data
- Construction of the Survey Instrument
Administration of the Survey Instrument

Analysis of the Data

Sources of Data

A list provided by the National Center for Citizen Involvement identified 25 states that funded state volunteer programs. Data for the construction of the questionnaire was obtained from literature reviewed at the Montana State Library and the Montana State University Library.

Construction of the Instrument

The review of the literature provided background for the construction of the survey instrument. The questionnaire was designed by the researcher. One intent of the investigator was to ask questions that would identify the program's location in state government, budget, and staff size. A question asked respondents to rate functions performed. By doing this, the investigator could determine the relationship of the volunteer agency to state government. The literature stressed that appropriate volunteer placement is an important aspect that managers should consider. A question asked respondents to prioritize volunteer jobs. However, due to a flaw in the design of this question, two sets of data were received. Therefore, areas of volunteer utilization were not identified. Another question asked respondents to rate support from government entities. It was the intent of the investigator to determine if support and funding were related. The survey instrument asked state programs to tally volunteer hours and estimated dollar values. In this way, figures could be calculated to determine if the program was cost beneficial. The initial questionnaire was reviewed by the chairman of the researcher's committee. The survey instrument was approved August 8, 1983.
Administration of the Survey Instrument

On August 15, 1983, the questionnaire (Appendix F) and explanatory cover letter (Appendix G) were sent to 25 states. By the end of August 1983, 8 completed and 4 non-deliverable surveys were returned. By September 1, 1983, 3 more states responded. However, 2 states sent only annual reports and did not complete the survey instrument, and the other state returned an incomplete questionnaire.

On September 15, 1983, the researcher composed a follow-up letter (Appendix H) and sent the questionnaire to the 3 states that returned inadequate information, and to 7 programs that had not yet responded. After the follow-up letter had been sent, 4 volunteer offices completed the questionnaire and 2 states were returned as non-deliverable; a note on one envelope stated that the program was no longer in existence.

A total of 12 states returned a completed survey instrument. The states were: Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Rhode Island and Virginia.

Six of the 25 survey instruments were returned as non-deliverable. The states that were eliminated from the study were: Kentucky, Louisiana, California, Massachusetts, New Mexico, and New Jersey.

Analysis of the Data

This study was conducted to identify elements of an organized volunteer program within state government. Elements investigated were: budget, staff, functions performed, dollar benefits, and government bodies. Replies to each section were scored according to responses of the volunteer coordinators. Due to the small population size analytical statistics were not used. Survey results were presented in table and descriptive format.
Summary

This chapter defined the procedures used by the research for this study. Sources of data were defined by a list obtained from a national volunteer office in Washington, D.C. The organization identified the states that funded state volunteer programs.

In constructing the survey instrument, the investigator reviewed the literature dating back 16 years. From the information obtained, the researcher designed the questionnaire that contained the following components: size of budget and staff, functions performed, dollar value of volunteer services, and support of government bodies.

A two month period was required to complete the administration of the survey instrument. It was sent to 25 states. At the completion of the survey, only 19 state volunteer programs were in operation. Six instruments were returned designated as non-deliverable.

Descriptive statistics accompanied by tables were used to present the analysis of the data.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The function of this chapter was to report the findings of the survey administered to 25 states. At the completion of the survey six questionnaires were returned. These were removed from the total, leaving 19 states. The number completed was 12 (63 percent). Eighty-four percent of the state offices were created in the 1970s. Six (50 percent) of those volunteer programs were directed by the governor’s offices. Budgets ranged from $45,000-$450,000; staff sizes ranged from 1-15. Volunteer contributions were cost beneficial with estimated values ranging from $370,000-$300,000,000. The state legislatures, governors, state agencies, and advisory boards were rated supportive by over 50 percent of the respondents.

The purpose of this study has been to investigate the contents of state volunteer programs; elements analyzed were budget, staff, functions performed, government entities, and dollar benefits of volunteer utilization.

Presentation of Data

In each of the volunteer agencies surveyed, a program coordinator completed the questionnaire. Data was presented in descriptive and table format. The following questions were answered:

QUESTION: To whom is your program directly responsible?

Of the 12 states responding, six (50 percent) were responsible to the office of the governor, four (34 percent) were responsible to a state agency, and one (8 percent) was governed by a private agency.
QUESTION: How are you funded?

Funding bases for the programs were provided by various revenue sources. There were seven (58 percent) that received all of their funding from the state general fund. Colorado was the only state that relied entirely on federal funds. The volunteer program in Colorado also had the smallest budget. The remaining four states had funding bases that included federal, local, private, and state dollars.

QUESTION: What was the size of your FY 1983 budget? What was the size of your FY 1982 budget?

Budgets for State Volunteer Programs ranged from $45,000 to $450,000. The state that maintained the largest budget was North Carolina which was funded with state revenues. The volunteer programs with budgets below $50,000 were Colorado and Rhode Island. The funding base for Colorado was federal dollars. The state legislature funded the Rhode Island program with general fund dollars. The Volunteer Program in Rhode Island was created in 1980. Their 1983 budget increased 13 percent over 1982 funding. Only two of the 12 programs had a decrease in their funding; these were the Colorado Volunteer Program, which experienced a 17 percent decrease, and North Carolina with a five percent decrease from 1982 to 1983. Five (42 percent) had budgets of $150,000-$450,000; one (8 percent) maintained $100,000 on account; three (25 percent) had annual budgets of $80,000-$85,000; three (25 percent) were funded in 1983 below $75,000.

QUESTION: What is the number of paid staff in your office?

There were 11 (92 percent) of the volunteer programs that maintained more than one on staff. Missouri was the only state that employed one person. The two volunteer offices that had the most personnel were North Carolina with 15 employees and Virginia with a staff of seven. The programs that received funding over $100,000 also employed more than four people. One exception to this was Missouri with a budget of $150,000 with a staff of one volunteer coordinator.
QUESTION: Do you have a governing body that advises your office; If yes, please describe.

There were nine states (75 percent) that had advisory boards. Three states (25 percent): Hawaii, Oklahoma, Missouri, reported no board of advisors. The composition of the advisory boards ranged from legislators, business people, and media personnel to volunteers. The states of Connecticut, Iowa, Minnesota, and Rhode Island had advisory boards that were appointed by the Governor. However, only two of these programs were directly responsible to the Governor's Office. The Volunteer Program in Rhode Island had a commission of five state representatives, three state senators, and seven citizens that advised the program. Appointments were made by the Speaker of the House and the Governor. Table 2, page 29, compared the data on the above questions.

QUESTION: Rate the following functions that your office performs.

Respondents rated functions performed as “often,” “sometimes,” or “never.” The survey indicated that the following were responsibilities performed “often” by at least 50 percent of the study states. State volunteer program functions rated “sometimes” or “never” were not discussed in descriptive format by the researcher. Table 3, page 30, classified these results.

Provide Communication

Of the total responses, ten (83 percent) indicated that this was an important task of their office.

Information Dissemination/Public Awareness

This function was performed “often” by ten (83 percent) of the total respondents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>To Whom Responsible</th>
<th>Year Created</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>FY1983 Budget</th>
<th>FY1982 Budget</th>
<th>% Increase/Decrease</th>
<th>Staff Size</th>
<th>Advisory Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Department of Human Services</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>state/federal</td>
<td>$144,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>+14%</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>50,139</td>
<td>60,125</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>state/private</td>
<td>69,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>+15%</td>
<td>2 full</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>73,000</td>
<td>71,000</td>
<td>+3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>federal/local</td>
<td>82,200</td>
<td>82,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>federal/state/local</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>74,000</td>
<td>+8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Department of Administration</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>154,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>+3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>454,573</td>
<td>477,608</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>+6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Legislature</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>+13%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>+11%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Program Functions Performed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruit Volunteers</td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
<td>4 (33%)</td>
<td>5 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Volunteers</td>
<td>2 (16%)</td>
<td>5 (42%)</td>
<td>5 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure Funding</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>8 (67%)</td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write Grants</td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
<td>7 (58%)</td>
<td>2 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Training</td>
<td>7 (58%)</td>
<td>4 (33%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Communication</td>
<td>10 (83%)</td>
<td>2 (17%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Coordination</td>
<td>6 (50%)</td>
<td>6 (50%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify Volunteer Manager</td>
<td>2 (17%)</td>
<td>6 (50%)</td>
<td>4 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with State Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminate Information/Public Awareness</td>
<td>10 (83%)</td>
<td>2 (17%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/Operate Model Programs</td>
<td>6 (50%)</td>
<td>5 (42%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Resources</td>
<td>10 (83%)</td>
<td>2 (17%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resource Sharing

Resource sharing was a responsibility that ten (83 percent) of the volunteer programs rated as a task “often” performed.

Training

Another responsibility performed “often” was training. Seven state volunteer programs (58 percent) provided volunteer management training to agencies of state government.

Coordination

The responsibility for coordination within state government was rated “often” by six (50 percent) of the volunteer offices.

Design/Operation of Model Volunteer Programs

There were six (50 percent) volunteer coordinators who indicated they designed and operated model volunteer programs.
In conclusion, the functions performed “often” were communication, information dissemination, resource sharing, training, coordinating, and designing model programs.

QUESTION: Please rate the following job areas on a scale of 1-5 (with 1 being effective and 5 being the least effective) according to the degree which volunteers are effective in state government.

The 19 states were asked to rate volunteer effectiveness in the following areas: clerical, working in institutions, social services, professional, or other. The intent of the researcher’s question was to rate the job areas in relation to each other. Five states prioritized the job areas in this manner; seven states rate each category on an individual basis; therefore, the researcher presented the data in two formats.

Prioritized Ratings

Five states rated the job areas in relation to each other. Table 4 provided an overview of these ratings.

Table 4. Prioritized Ratings: Areas of Volunteer Effectiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>(1) Most</th>
<th>(2) Moderate</th>
<th>(3) Average</th>
<th>(4) Less</th>
<th>(5) Least</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clerical duties were least effective. Two program managers (40 percent) rated this category a “4” and three (60 percent) scored it a “5.”

Utilization of volunteers in institutions was viewed at a rating of “2” by one (20 percent). Three respondents (60 percent) indicated it was a “3,” and one (20 percent) rated it with a “4.”
Social Services was an area that three (60 percent) scored the most effective ("1"). The remaining two states (40 percent) indicated that it was a service that volunteers performed effectively and rated it a "2."

The realm of professional work was deemed effective by two states (40 percent) and scored it as an "1." One state coordinator (20 percent) rated this area as a "2," and two respondents (40 percent) rated it a "3."

Two of the five programs (40 percent) rated the category of "other." The jobs in this category ranged from health services to civil defense and aeronautics. The one state that rated "other" with a "2" indicated that volunteers performed effectively in the field of health services. The other respondent marked "4" and stipulated that volunteers were least effective in jobs of civil defense and aeronautics.

According to the data, social services was one of the more effective areas in which to place volunteers; clerical work was one of the least effective fields in which to utilize volunteers.

**Individualized Ratings**

Seven states rated each job area on an individual basis. Four respondents (58 percent) stated that clerical duties were effective and scored it as a "1." One manager (14 percent) assigned it a "2," one manager (14 percent) rated it a "3," and one respondent (14 percent) scored it as least effective ("5").

Utilization of volunteers in institutions was rated most effective ("1") by five (78 percent) of the state coordinators. One respondent (14 percent) indicated that institution work was effective and marked it a "2." A "4" rating was assigned by one (14 percent) of respondents.

Social services rated as most effective ("1") by five (78 percent) of volunteer coordinators. One person (14 percent) rated social services as a "2" and the other (14 percent) rated it as a "4."
Professional work performed by volunteers was assigned an “1” by five states (78 percent). The number “2” was marked by one respondent (14 percent) and the number “3” represented the scoring of one manager (14 percent).

The respondents in this group made no reference to “other.”

The analysis of the data indicated Institutional, Social Services, and Professional work were the effective areas in which to place volunteers. Five states (78 percent) ranked these areas with an “1.”

Clerical work also proved to be an appropriate area in which to utilize volunteers because four of seven states (58 percent) scored clerical duties as effective (“1”). Only one state respondent (14 percent) indicated clerical work as least effective (“5”).

Table 5 compared the response of the seven states that ranked each area on an individual basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>(1) Most</th>
<th>(2) Moderate</th>
<th>(3) Average</th>
<th>(4) Less</th>
<th>(5) Least</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>4 (58%)</td>
<td>1 (14%)</td>
<td>1 (14%)</td>
<td>1 (14%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>5 (78%)</td>
<td>1 (14%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (14%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>5 (78%)</td>
<td>1 (14%)</td>
<td>1 (14%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>5 (78%)</td>
<td>1 (14%)</td>
<td>1 (14%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher was unable to determine areas of volunteer effectiveness because this question had a flaw in the wording and produced invalid data; in order to obtain prioritized responses, the question would need to be reconstructed.

QUESTION: How many volunteers presently work in your state government?

The research found that volunteers contributed large portions of time to the public sector. North Carolina documented 1,102,243 people had donated time in one year’s period. Of the 12 states responding, four (33 percent) indicated that 25,000 or more
people had volunteered in their state. Four (33 percent) of the state volunteer programs had no figures to report regarding volunteers within state government.

**QUESTION: What are the total estimated hours per year that volunteers donated to your state?**

The survey results indicated that volunteers donated time that represented millions of hours. North Carolina indicated that volunteer time amounted to 59,469,127 hours. Other states that reported hours totaling over one million were Hawaii, Connecticut, Minnesota, and Virginia.

**QUESTION: What is the estimated dollar amount in benefits that volunteers contributed to your state?**

The researcher did not know what dollar value was assigned to volunteer time. Hawaii was the only state that average volunteer time at $3.35 an hour. In other words, volunteers in Hawaii donated $4,971,041 worth of services. Minnesota indicated that volunteers made actual cash contributions of $2,545,385. There was no calculation made on the worth of hours donated. However, a base wage of $3.35, applied to Minnesota's 1,299,109 annual hours, shows a value of $4,352,015. Therefore, the total of cash donations and volunteer time added $6,897,400 to the State of Minnesota. Volunteers in North Carolina contributed an estimated value of $300,000,000. In all but one state (Idaho), volunteer time amounted to millions of dollars. Table 6, page 35, outlined the numbers of volunteers donating time, yearly hours, and the estimated values.

**QUESTION: Please rate the following government bodies in relation to the goals of your program.**

The respondents were asked to indicate levels of support by the state legislature, governor, state agencies, and advisory boards. The degrees of support were: supportive, neutral, and non-supportive. Table 7, page 35, outlined the responses.
Table 6. Volunteer Contributions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of Volunteers$^*$</th>
<th>Annual Hours Donated$^*$</th>
<th>Average per Volunteer</th>
<th>Estimated Value of Hours Donated$^*$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>N/R*</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>200,200</td>
<td>1,500,900</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>100,300</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>37,200</td>
<td>1,300,100</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>1,100,200</td>
<td>59,500,100</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>$300,800,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>30,800</td>
<td>2,100,000</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>$7,000,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* N/R: not reported.  † Figures have been rounded off.

Table 7. Program Support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government Body</th>
<th>Supportive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Non-Supportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State legislature</td>
<td>7 (59%)</td>
<td>4 (33%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>11 (92%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State agencies</td>
<td>9 (75%)</td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory boards</td>
<td>8 (89%)</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 12 states responding, seven (59 percent) reported that the state legislature was supportive, four (33 percent) were neutral, and one (8 percent) was non-supportive.

Eleven states rated their governor as supportive, one state indicated that the governor maintained a neutral position.

State agencies were rated as supportive in nine states and neutral in three states.

There were only nine states with advisory boards. Eight (75 percent) indicated that their boards were supportive, and one (25 percent) felt that the advisory board was neutral.
Summary

One problem in the survey involved areas of volunteer utilization. Improper wording produced two sets of data (prioritized and individualized); it was the intent of the research to prioritize areas of volunteer effectiveness. In order to prioritize areas of effectiveness, the question would need to be reconstructed and administered to the population.

Chapter IV presented the data analysis. It was the intent of this chapter to report the results gleaned from a survey administered to 19 states. Elements analyzed were budgets, staffs, functions, volunteer utilization, dollar benefits, and support levels of government entities. The findings were organized into descriptive and table formats.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine the elements and responsibilities of volunteer offices in state government. The components investigated were budget, staff, functions performed, dollar benefits and government bodies. There was little reference in the literature to the contents of state volunteer programs and almost no material on Montana volunteer programs. The review of the literature indicated the need for leadership, program management, and a formal structure to utilize volunteers. The literature also defined the "fair market formula" to determine the cost effectiveness of volunteer activities.

The data for this study was obtained from the questionnaire delivered to 25 states with funded state volunteer agencies. Six envelopes were returned marked "undeliverable" and removed from the total of 25 offices; the number was then 19. From this number 12 surveys were returned which was 63 percent of the population.

The results of this study were organized into areas that concerned the agency, the legislature, and both the agency and legislature. The conclusions addressed: budget/staff size, range of functions, dollar benefits, and formal structure.

Conclusions

Budget/Staff Size: Agency Concern

It was expected that volunteer programs directed by the executive branch would have larger budgets and staffs. Six of the volunteer programs were responsible to the governor; three of those programs had budgets from $45,000 to $80,000 and three had budgets from $80,000 to $450,000. Six programs were responsible to other agencies; one program had a
budget between $45,000 to $80,000 and five programs had $80,000 to $450,000 budgets. Five programs under the auspices of the executive branch had a range of 1-7 staff and one program had a range of 8-15 staff. All six programs responsible to other agencies had a range of 1-7 staff. The research concluded state volunteer programs directed by the office of the governor did not have larger budgets, but did maintain larger staffs.

Revenue sources were an element that should be reviewed at the agency level. It was the intent of the research to determine if revenue sources affect the amount of funding. Five programs were funded at levels of $100,000 or greater. Four of those programs had 100 percent funding from one source. The researcher concluded one funding source provided a larger budget than a combination of sources. State programs with one source of funding received the money from state or federal revenues. Eight states had one source of funding; seven programs had state support, and one program had federal funding. One state-funded program, North Carolina, experienced a five percent decrease in the 1983 budget.

In conclusion, revenue sources affected the amount of funding. State programs that received their funding from state revenues had larger budgets and smaller reductions in their budgets.

Support from government bodies is an issue that should be addressed at the agency level. Did degrees of support from government entities (legislature, governor, state agencies, advisory boards) correlate to level of funding?

Seven volunteer programs indicated the legislature was “supportive.” Six of these programs received an increase in their funds. Four states rated their legislatures “neutral”; two received an increase in 1983 budgets and one maintained present level of funding. Colorado, the federally funded program, had a 17 percent decrease in the 1983 budget.
Idaho, the one program that rated their legislature as "non-supportive," received no increases in 1983 funding.

Eleven states rated their governor "supportive"; eight of these programs received increases in funding; one maintained present level of funding and North Carolina received a five percent decrease in their 1983 budget. In two states where the legislature was rated "neutral" and the governor "supportive" there were increases in program benefits.

Nine state programs rated state agencies "supportive"; two programs indicated agencies "neutral" and one program rated state agencies as "non-supportive." Eight of the nine programs with "supportive" state agencies received increases in funding levels; the three volunteer organizations with "neutral" or "non-supportive" state agencies received no increases in 1983 funding.

Advisory boards were rated "supportive" by all states (9) that had boards.

In conclusion, support from government bodies related with funding levels. A "supportive" legislature increased funding levels; a "supportive" governor and a "neutral" legislature allowed for budget increases. State agency support also related with increases in program funding. No relation could be drawn between advisory boards and levels of support. When a volunteer program had support from all four government entities, budgets of $100,000 or greater were noted. Table 8 compared degrees of support and funding levels. In Table 8 "S" represented supportive, "N" neutral and "N.S." non-supportive.

**Range of Functions: Agency/Legislature Concern**

Were the functions performed by the state volunteer programs more direct or indirect? The functions identified from the research questionnaire performed "often" by 50 percent of the programs were: communication, information dissemination, resource sharing, training, coordination, model program design. These activities were not performed directly with volunteers but were support- and assistance-oriented. The functions that 33
Table 8. Support vs. Funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>FY 83 Budget</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
<th>Leg.</th>
<th>Gov.</th>
<th>State Agency</th>
<th>Advisory Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>$144,000</td>
<td>14+</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>50,139</td>
<td>17-</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N'</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>69,000</td>
<td>15+</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>73,000</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>No Bd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>82,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>8+</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>154,000</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>No Bd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>454,573</td>
<td>5-</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>6+</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>No Bd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>13+</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>11+</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

percent of the states "never" performed were: volunteer recruitment, volunteer placement, and identification of volunteer managers within state agencies. Therefore, the functions performed “often” were more indirect activities.

Did the number of staff in the volunteer office affect the number of functions performed? The researcher identified 11 functions that respondents were asked to rate “often,” “sometimes,” or “never.” The number of staff had no effect on the number of functions performed. The state programs that had 1.5 employees performed as many tasks as those that had 15 employees. Table 9 compared the total functions performed in relation to the total number of staff.

Was there a correlation between the size of staff and total number of volunteers participating in state government. Of the 12 respondent states, North Carolina (with over 1,000,000 volunteers) and Hawaii (with over 200,000 volunteers) had the largest number of people who donated time to state government programs. North Carolina had a staff of 15 and Hawaii had a staff of 3. Rhode Island had 4000 volunteers and Idaho had 5600 volunteers; Rhode Island had a staff of 1.5 and Idaho a staff of 3. No relation existed between size of staff and total number of volunteers.
Table 9. Functions Performed in Relation to Staff Size.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Functions</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Total Functions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>2 full</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dollar Benefits: Legislature Concern

The intent of the research was to determine if it would be cost beneficial to fund a state volunteer program; were the dollar benefits of the volunteer program greater than the administrative costs? In 1983 Connecticut had administrative costs of $69,000; benefits from volunteer services amounted to $10,000,000. This meant that for every dollar Connecticut invested, $145 was produced in volunteer benefits. North Carolina invested $454,573 in 1983 administrative costs and their return in volunteer services amounted to $306,780,412; a dollar return of $675. All state volunteer programs that reported values of volunteer services received dollar benefits greater than administrative costs.

In conclusion, the dollar benefits received from volunteer donations were greater than administrative costs. Table 10 compared dollar benefits. States that did not report volunteer donations were noted by “NR.”

Formal Structure: Legislature Concern

The data collected did not address the formal structure; however, the literature review stressed the importance of a formal structure. An organized program could provide leader-
Table 10. Dollar Benefits vs. Administrative Costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Annual Volunteer Donations</th>
<th>FY 83 Budget</th>
<th>Return on Dollar Invested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>$144,000</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>69,000</td>
<td>$145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>$4,971,041</td>
<td>73,000</td>
<td>$68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
<td>82,200</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>$6,897,400</td>
<td>154,000</td>
<td>$45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>$306,780,411</td>
<td>454,573</td>
<td>$675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>$6,954,660</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>$45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ship for volunteer utilization in state government. Good program management would enable a centralized volunteer agency to coordinate/communicate with state agencies, citizens, and policy-makers. Evaluation could be implemented in the formal structure that would enable data to be gathered to determine the effect of volunteer utilization in state government. In order to achieve optimal use of human resources, a formal structure could be beneficial.

The conclusions gathered from this survey concerned both the agency and the legislature. Based on this study, program managers and policy makers could review the need for a formal volunteer structure.

Recommendations

As a result of this investigation the following recommendations were made:

1. The literature stressed the importance of a formal structure to utilize volunteers. Therefore, it is recommended that a state should consider a volunteer agency to utilize volunteers within state government.
2. The data showed that states reported a dollar return on their programs. The services donated by volunteers were greater than the administrative costs. According to the data it would be cost beneficial to utilize volunteers in state government.

3. The data indicated that one funding source was better than a combination. Also it showed that programs funded with state revenues had smaller decreases and larger budgets. Thus, according to the data it is recommended that a volunteer program secure funds from state dollars.

4. The literature indicated that a state volunteer program should have the support of the governor and be directly responsible to that office. However, the data showed that volunteer agencies responsible to other state agencies were effective as determined by the budget. Programs directed by other state agencies had larger budgets, but smaller staffs. Therefore, the volunteer program need not be responsible to the governor, but should have support.

5. The data showed that support from the legislature, governor, state agencies, and advisory boards related to funding levels. Those programs that had support from all areas had larger budgets and received increases in funding. According to the data a state volunteer program should seek and maintain support from the government entities.

6. The data indicated that the functions performed by state volunteer programs tended to be indirect in nature; less than half of the volunteer agencies participated in recruitment and placement. However, the literature stated that most people became involved in volunteer activities because of being asked. The formal structure could be the mechanism that would enable personal contact with individuals and groups. A volunteer coordinator could made contacts within the community to recruit for state government.

   The function of placement should be reviewed as an appropriate responsibility of the state office. The literature stressed the importance of appropriate use of volunteers. The manager of the formal structure could study potential areas of placement to determine if
they are appropriate. For example, volunteers should not replace paid staff. Also, it will be important not to place them in jobs that paid staff does not want to do (i.e., janitorial, clerical).

It is recommended that the office perform the indirect functions of coordination, communication, and also consider recruitment and placement as important functions.

7. The literature stated that advisory boards were important to the operation of programs. The volunteer agency should select a group of committed individuals to counsel the activities of the program.

8. Results of further studies would be more useful if presented with analytical statistics.
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APPENDIX A
## STATE OF MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION

### Pay-Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pay-Matrix</th>
<th>State Personnel Division Systems Unit</th>
<th>Matrix Type = Hourly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1983–1984</strong></td>
<td>FY 84 04/27/83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Annual Hours = 2080</strong></td>
<td>Note: Does Not Include Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRD</td>
<td>Step 01</td>
<td>Step 02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.348</td>
<td>4.665</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outreach Workers

In this area there is only one volunteer, a woman, who works in Dillon, Montana. For the year 1983, she donated 52 hours.

a. Description of activities:
   Provides information and referral for library services
   Identifies potential users
   Provides technical assistance on use of recording equipment

b. MSCM class, grade & summary:
   Social Service Aide I, Grade 6
   Summary: "Under general supervision performs routine duties in support of social workers and their assigned caseload of clients (MSCM, 81:219012).

c. Annual hours: 52

d. Annual contribution: $310

Clerks

Nine volunteers work in this area which requires donating time at the Library for the Blind & Physically Handicapped. For purposes of estimating the fair market value, this category was divided into two areas; Library Clerk I and Library Clerk II.

Library Clerk I

a. Description of volunteer activity:
   Rewinds cassettes
   Prepares cassette and record books for mailing
   Some filing

b. MSCM class, grade and summary
   Library Clerk I, Grade 5
   Summary: "Under immediate (initially) to close supervision performs repetitive and easily learned library oriented clerical work . . . tasks require repetitive application of a few specific instructions; guidelines are clearly applicable and adherence to instructions is required" (MSCM, 1981:249005).

c. Annual hours: 1300

d. Annual contribution: $7254

Library Clerk II

a. Description of volunteer activity:
   Selects books for users of library
   Performs telephone duties
   Files book requests in user's file
   Performs minimal tasks on library computer
b. MSCM class, grade and summary

"Under general supervision performs library-oriented clerical work; assignments are related to a functional area of library activity, are covered by a variety of well-established procedures and instructions and require some discretion or choice in the application of pertinent guidelines to the situation at hand (MSCM, 1982: 249006).

c. Annual hours: 2600

d. Annual contribution: $17,472
APPENDIX C
Technicians

A group of retired Mountain Bell employees volunteer their time once a week. They are responsible for the repair and maintenance of the cassette and record players. This group has been volunteering since 1969.

a. Description of volunteer activity:
   Repairs cassette machines and record players
   Repairs broken cassettes
   Maintains recording equipment

b. MSCM class, grade & summary:
   Technician, Radio/TV II, Grade 11
   Summary: “Performs technical work of average difficulty in the installation, operation and maintenance of radio and television equipment (MSCM, 1975:003010)

c. Annual hours: 1300

d. Annual contribution: $11,193

Sound Editors

Four volunteers act as a screening committees and review audition tapes of all people desiring to be volunteer narrators. They developed a rating scale whereby they judge all voices for quality, fluency, error levels, and smoothness of the presentation.

a. Description of volunteer activity:
   Designs procedures for rating audition tapes
   Listens to each voice and accepts or rejects
   Provides constructive criticism for individual improvement

b. MSCM class, grade and summary:
   Editorial Assistant, Grade 10
   Summary: “Under general supervision, performs paraprofessional work assisting in the production of material for publication (MSCM, 1982:132004).

c. Annual hours: 13
   *Note: The volunteer auditions did not start until June 1983. Therefore, the screening committee has only reviewed 15 voices.

d. Annual contributions: $103
Narrators

The coordinator was unable to locate a category that paralleled the position of narrator. At the federal level, Library of Congress narrators were paid $125/hr. For purposes of this report, the writer arbitrarily chose a Grade 12 as a beginning professional grade. There were 3 narrators that started in June 1983.

a. Description of volunteer activity:
   Preread all materials before narration
   Narrates assigned Montana material
   Strives to produce quality (e.g., know and pronounce words correctly, read in a smooth fluent manner, and use correct inflections in voice)
   Participate in voice training seminars

b. MSCM classification, grade & summary:
   NA, Grade 12
   Summary: NA

c. Annual hours: 234

d. Annual contribution: $969

Monitors

In order to comply with Library of Congress Standards, all recordings must be monitored by a volunteer whose responsibility it is to maintain appropriate sound levels, direct narrator and assure that the text is being read print perfect. In this category, there was only one volunteer. For the year 1984, more monitors have been recruited. Monitors at the national level are paid $25 hour. The coordinator assigned a Grade 12 to this volunteer position.

a. Description of volunteer activity:
   Monitors sound levels
   Directs narration of the book
   Labels and stores master reel of book
   Maintains and cleans recorder

b. MSCM class, grade and summary
   Class: NA Grade 12
   Summary: NA

c. Annual hours: 104

d. Annual contribution: $310
Home Workers

In this category volunteers work out of their homes. They work on as-needed basis, and usually with special projects.

a. Description of volunteer activity:
   Record professional materials for individuals and organizations
   Type special projects

b. MSCM, class, grade & summary:
   Library Clerk II, Grade 7
   Summary: "Under general supervision performs library-oriented clerical work; assignments are related to a functional area of library activity, are covered by a variety of well-established procedures and instructions and requires some discretion or choice in the application of pertinent guidelines to the situation at hand (MSCM, 1982:249006).

c. Annual hours: 538

d. Annual contribution: $538

Students

The Library for the Blind & Physically Handicapped participates in a training program whereby students volunteer time in order to gain work experience. During the 1983 year, two students, one from Helena High School and one from Helena Industries worked at the library. This program was implemented in October 1983. Before the year ended, the one student from Helena Industries found gainful employment.

a. Description of volunteer activity:
   Rewind cassettes
   Repair damaged cassette books

b. MSCM class, grade & summary:
   Library Clerk I, Grade 5
   Summary: "Under general supervision performs library-oriented clerical work; assignments are related to a functional area of library activity, are covered by a variety of well-established procedures and instructions and require some discretion or choice in the application of pertinent guidelines to the situation at hand (MSCM, 1982:249006)."
STATE VOLUNTEER PROGRAM QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Name & Title ____________________________________________________________

2. State ________________________________________________________________

3. Title Of Your Program ________________________________________________

4. Address of Your Program ______________________________________________

5. To Whom Is Your Program Directly Responsible (title, department) __________

6. Year That Your Program was Created __________________________________

7. How Are You Funded __________________________________________________

8. What Is The Size Of Your FY 83 Budget? _________________________________

9. What Was The Size Of Your FY 82 Budget? _______________________________

10. What Is The Number Of Paid Staff In Your Office? _________________________

11. Do You Have A Governing Body That Advises Your Office? If Yes, Please Describe

12. Please Rate The Following Functions That Your Office Performs. Please Check The Appropriate Column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>often</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruit volunteers for state government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place volunteers in state agencies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist in securing funds by advocating volunteerism during legislative sessions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist in securing funds by writing grants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide training in volunteer management to state agencies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide communication on a regular basis to state agencies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coordinate with state agencies on a regular basis regarding volunteerism.

Identify individuals w/n agencies to manage department volunteers.

Provide Community awareness through information dissemination, e.g., PSA's, public speaking, advertising, media.

Design & operate model volunteer programs.

Act as resource center for state agencies.

---

Additional Comments

13. Please rate the following job areas from 1-5 (with 1 being the most effective and 5 being the least effective) according to the degree which volunteers are most effective in state government.

_______ clerical within agency

_______ work in institutions (e.g., prison, mental, institutions)

_______ social services (e.g., senior citizen programs, youth, AFDC)

_______ professional (e.g., advisory boards, public relations)

_______ other (please comment)

14. How many volunteers presently work in your state government?___________

15. What are the total estimated hours per year that volunteers donate to your state?____

16. What is the estimated dollar amount in benefits that volunteers contribute to your state?___________

17. Please rate the following government bodies in relationship to the goals of your program.

supportive neutral non-supportive

State Legislature

Governor

Agencies

Advisory Board
Dear Volunteer Coordinator:

I am conducting a research project regarding use of volunteers in state government. I am investigating roles that volunteer agencies play in other states.

Therefore, I would appreciate your input. Please fill out the enclosed questionnaire and return to me. Self-addressed envelopes have been enclosed for your convenience.

Sincerely,

Linda Brander
I am sending another questionnaire. I would appreciate your input into my research project, therefore, will you complete it and return as soon as possible. In Montana, we are interested in investigating the possibilities of a Volunteer Bureau and feel that your data would be most valuable.

Thank you for any assistance.

Sincerely,

Linda Brander
Volunteer Coordinator