



19332
EVALUATION LOAN



College of William and Mary

WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA

Report on
Consultation to and Evaluation of
THE VOLUNTEER PROGRAM FOR THE PORTSMOUTH, VIRGINIA
JUVENILE AND DOMESTIC RELATIONS COURT

by the
National Information Center on Volunteerism (NICOV)
1221 University Avenue
Boulder, Colorado 80302

Report Prepared by
Ivan H. Scheier, Ph.D.
Director, and Chief Consultant to the Project

June 15, 1974

Manuscript Preparation: Ruth D. Miller

The Metropolitan Criminal Justice Center operates the Pilot City program in Chesapeake, Norfolk, Portsmouth, and Virginia Beach, Virginia. Established in September, 1971, the Center is a research and program planning and development component of the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, Virginia. The Center's Pilot City program is one of eight throughout the nation funded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the U. S. Department of Justice. The basic purpose of each Pilot City project is to assist local jurisdictions in the design and establishment of various programs, often highly innovative and experimental in nature, which will contribute over a period of years to the development of a model criminal justice system. Each Pilot City team is also responsible for assuring comprehensive evaluation of such programs, for assisting the development of improved criminal justice planning ability within the host jurisdictions, and for providing technical assistance to various local agencies when requested.

The Pilot City Program is funded under Grant No. 73-NI-03-0002 of the National Institute on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Financial support by NILE and CJ does not necessarily indicate the concurrence of the Institute in the statements or conclusions contained in this publication.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
I	History and Objectives of Program	1
II	Objectives of the Consultation-Evaluation	2
III	Capabilities of the Consultant	4
IV	Chronology of the Consultation	5
V	Data-Gathering Procedures and Instruments	7
VI	History and Current Status of the Portsmouth Program	8
VII	Issues and Challenges for the Future	19
A.	Preparing for Discontinuities	19
B.	The Volunteer Coordinator	22
C.	Diversification of People	23
D.	Diversification in Volunteer Service Offerings	25
E.	Communication	28
F.	Staff Involvement	31
VIII	Concluding Statement	33
Appendix A	Evaluative Forms and Formats Developed by the Center and Applied Locally for the Present Consultation-Evaluation	34
Appendix B	Rough Preliminary Analysis, Time Input-Output, March, 1974	43
Appendix C	Statement of Consultant's Capabilities	50

I: HISTORY AND OBJECTIVES OF PROGRAM

The Portsmouth Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court Volunteer Program began in April, 1973. Mrs. Winship Denton has been the full-time Volunteer Coordinator for this program since its inception, up to and including the present time.

As stated in the original grant application, the objectives of the volunteer program were as follows:

"The Volunteers in Probation will augment the juvenile services of the Portsmouth Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court by utilizing volunteers as friends, counselors, confidants and resource persons to assist children under the supervision of the Court.

Operating primarily through a full-time professional volunteer coordinator, the program will plan, implement and operate a variety of activities and projects and utilize a variety of proven and innovative techniques. The program will be firmly grounded in the developing theories and data concerning the utilization of volunteers and is intended to provide substantive, intensive and comprehensive services to its juvenile clients. At the same time, the program will be experimental in nature in both implementing and testing new ideas.

In order to achieve the above goals, emphasis will be placed upon:

- 1) screening of volunteer applicants;
- 2) scanning attitudes, interests and personalities in order to match offenders with the most appropriate volunteer;
- 3) development of systematic information on character types which are receptive and non-receptive to relationships with volunteers;
- 4) training and supervision of volunteers; and
- 5) training of probation staff in the use of volunteers."

II. OBJECTIVES OF THE CONSULTATION-EVALUATION

As stated in the original consultation plan, the evaluation component was to proceed as follows:

"Evaluation of the program will be conducted in the tenth and seventeenth months of the program. It is expected that upon program commencement, the National Information Center on Volunteers in Courts* will advise the Portsmouth coordinator as to the best forms and types of data to be kept and how to conduct the initial ten-month evaluation. The evaluation criteria will include such considerations as attitudes of volunteers, probationers and probation officers toward the program; recidivism; state commitment rates; employment; school progress; probation success or failure; and number of volunteer contacts including probationers, families and collateral.

A cost analysis of the program will also be undertaken. Some guidelines for this analysis have also been developed by the National Information Center on Volunteers in Courts and it is expected that these will be used as a basis for this evaluation.

During the seventeenth month of the program a consultant from the National Information Center will visit Portsmouth to conduct the final evaluation and prepare a report of the results and findings."

In conveying responsibility for this operation to the Center, the Contract between the City of Portsmouth, Virginia and the Center states as follows:

- "I. SCOPE OF SERVICES: The Contractor shall perform the following services in a satisfactory and proper manner, as determined by Portsmouth.
- a. Consult with and provide technical assistance to one volunteer coordinator who will visit the Center in Boulder, Colorado.

* The former name of the consulting organization, now changed to the National Information Center on Volunteerism.

III: CAPABILITIES OF THE CONSULTANT

The National Information Center on Volunteerism has been, for eight years, an information exchange, publication, consultation and evaluation organization in the field of criminal justice volunteer programs. During this period the Center has conducted approximately 75 volunteer program evaluations of the present type at the local, state, and regional levels.

General capabilities and services are described in Appendix C to this report.

Assistance will include introduction to on-going volunteer programs in the Denver area, introduction to reference and educational materials available through the Center, and training in data collection and in procedures which the volunteer coordinator should follow in performing the ten-month program evaluation.

- b. An onsite visit by one member of NICOV during the 17th month of the program to evaluate the total volunteer project, including a cost-effectiveness study and the preparation of a final evaluation report."

IV: CHRONOLOGY OF THE CONSULTATION

A. The Volunteen Coordinator, Ms. Winship Denton, visited the Center, as per contract, for a training tour on May 8-10, 1973. The principal learning sectors in this tour are described below:

May 8 - 8:30 am	Meet staff for introduction and review training tour schedule.
9:30 am	SCREENING OF VOLUNTEERS - Judy Berry, NICOV
1:30 pm	YOUTH SERVICES BUREAU - Melba Shepard, Director
3:00 pm	EVALUATION - Dian Callaghan, NICOV
May 9 - 8:30 am	STAFF ORIENTATION & DISCUSSION - Ivan Scheier, NICOV this may also include other staff
2:00 pm	TRAINING - Jim Jorgensen, Denver University
3:30 pm	ADAMS COUNTY PROBATION - Ron Herro, Volunteer Coordinator
May 10 - 9:30 am	BOULDER COUNTY PROBATION - Ron Ackerman, Volunteer Coordinator
12:00 pm	ATTENTION HOME LUNCHEON
1:30 pm	NICOV - this time will be spent with staff for any questions not answered, also may be spent in library or files.

B. The Center kept in touch with Ms. Denton thereafter, developing forms and formats for record-keeping and evaluation in the time input-output analysis and other evaluative areas. These forms are attached as Appendix A.

In March, 1974, the Center drew together the results of such record-keeping partly as a preliminary analysis and pilot run on time input-output procedures to that data.

This is enclosed with covering letter as Appendix B, entitled "Analysis of Portsmouth, Virginia Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court Volunteer Program," dated March 5, 1974.

C. Ms. Denton attended a group consultation-training seminar at the Center

on January 8-11, 1974, entitled "Matching Volunteers to Clients." During the course of this, a private consultation with Center staff also occurred.

D. On February 7, 1974, the Center provided a written analysis of an "Evaluation Design for Volunteer Projects" submitted for the volunteer program by Charles W. Thomas, Ph.D., with periodic interaction thereafter on this matter with Dr. Thomas' group and Ms. Denton. Both C and D above were considered highly relevant to the continuing development of the project, particularly in regard to screening, matching and evaluation objectives of the Volunteer Program (see Section I). It is regretted that this research was later dropped.

E. The culmination of the consultation-evaluation process was a site visit by the Center's Chief Consultant May 9-11, 1974. The agenda, developed in conjunction with Ms. Denton, was as follows:

Thursday - May 9, 1974

Mrs. Davis, Chief Probation Officer	9 - 10:30 am
Mrs. Denton, Volunteer Coordinator	10:30 - 12:00 pm
Judge Piersall	1 - 2:30 pm
Staff Together	2:30 - 4:00 pm
Rob Draper, Job Program	4 - 5:00 pm

Friday - May 10, 1974

Maggie Baker, Matching & Other Research	9 - 10:30 am
Volunteer I	10:30 - 11:00 am
Volunteer II	11:00 - 11:30 am
Volunteer III (with probationer)	11:30 - 12:00 pm
Volunteer IV	12:00 - 12:30 pm

Lunch: Further discussion with Ms. Baker

Staff I - Joan Whitted	1:00 - 1:30 pm
Staff II - John Faircloth	1:30 - 2:00 pm
Staff III - Sharon Kurtz	2:00 - 2:30 pm
Staff IV - Mr. Jones	2:30 - 3:00 pm
Probationers (group of six)	3:00 - 4:00 pm
Office Managerial Staff Person	4:00 - 4:30 pm
Volunteer Office Assistants & Clerical Aids	4:30 - 5:00 pm

Saturday - May 11, 1974

Volunteer Group (8-10)	9:00 - 10:30 pm
Staff, Volunteers - preliminary evaluation from consultant for feedback (about 15-20 including Ms. Manervia Wilson of the sponsoring agency)	10:30 - 12:00 pm

V: DATA-GATHERING PROCEDURES AND INSTRUMENTS

In addition to normal interview and consultation procedures employed throughout the sub-contract, the seven instruments included in Appendix A were utilized for data-gathering during the on-site consultation, and during the preceeding ten months.

The first four (A, 1-4) are standard instruments for national comparative purposes. The "Scorecard", for example, has been administered 500 times nationally, and reflects the national Guidelines and Standards for Volunteer Programs established by the Center under LEAA sponsorship. Instrument A2, A3, and A4 are similarly used nationally.

Two instruments (A5, 6) were newly developed for this consultation in an effort to improve the validity of time-input analytical procedures (compare Appendix B). Instrument A7 was also used for the same purposes earlier in the present study. These instruments were developed by the Center and applied by the Portsmouth Coordinator and the Consultant.

As for the interviewing, we found generally that interviewees were candid, open, and informative in discussing volunteer issues, concerns and possibilities.

VI: HISTORY AND CURRENT STATUS OF THE PORTSMOUTH PROGRAM

- A. The original plan for the program was well thoughtout, well-reasoned, and was followed out well.
- B. The program has had the same full-time professional person as Coordinator since its beginning. She is a highly qualified professional and, moreover, showed evidence of continuously upgrading her knowledge and skills during her year of service.
- C. The Court now has definite high-probability plans for converting from outside-agency to within-agency funding for the programs, as part of the regular court budget.

All three of the above points are excellent auguries for the continuing and expanding success of the program, in the future.

- D. 1. The current workforce of volunteers is as follows:

4 awaiting assignment

3 clerical

32 assigned one-to-one

*1 VISTA (developing a job program)

*2 college interns

*2 nuns offering shelter care facilities

Asterisks mark volunteer positions which are not currently counted as part of the volunteer workforce but should be under the definition: "Anyone who offers any materials, services or facilities without cost to the Department." Thus, we recommend that recruitment and engagement of, for example, college interns, VISTA's, and UYA's be part of the Coordinators's area of responsibility in the future.

2. The program is doing particularly well in recruiting areas where many other programs are weak; notably the recruitment of blacks (18/39),

males (16/39), and younger people.

More attention is suggested to developing senior citizens, college interns and federal volunteers (e.g. VISTA, ACE, SCORE) as volunteer resources.

3. The consultant interviewed or spoke with 10-12 of the program's volunteers during on-site visitation. Making all allowances for the fact that this sample may have included many of the outstanding volunteers, it did represent a good sample: from one-quarter to one-third of all volunteers in the program.

Accustomed as he is to meeting the excellent people who volunteer all over the nation and some parts of the world, the consultant was nevertheless extremely impressed with the quality of the Portsmouth, Virginia volunteers. They are solid, decent, concerned and capable people.

In addition to direct impressions, the quality of Portsmouth volunteers is reflected in the tenor of their responses to Form A2, "Volunteer Reactions to the Volunteer Programs." On this form they provided many excellent specific suggestions incorporated throughout this report. The general tenor of responses is more pertinent at this point; they were client-centered and predominantly positive in attitudes to the staff and the program. This is just as it should be with high-quality volunteers.

4. As for number of volunteers, national standards recommend reaching no more than 50-75 in the first year of a new program. Attaining about 40 in its first year, the Portsmouth program is about at the national standard, or a trifle on the conservative side.

5. The present level of volunteers approximates a 1/10 ratio of volunteers to clients, and a 3/1 ratio of volunteers to paid staff. National standard expectations suggest a ceiling in this regard of 1/2 and 15/1 respectively, which would amount to a ceiling of approximately 200 volunteers.

The suggested phasing is as follows:

May, 1973 (baseline):	0
May, 1974 (present) :	40
May, 1975:	75-85
May, 1976:	120-130
May, 1977:	200 (ceiling)

The estimated eventual ceiling presumes no substantial increase in number of clients or staff in the agency.

6. The remainder of this report will offer suggestions as to how this ceiling may be achieved. However, at no time should quality and human relevance of programming be sacrificed to obsession with sheer increase in "body count." We are confident the above numerical targets can be achieved without that sacrifice.

- E. 1. The program Scorecard (Appendix A1) reflects how a program compares generally nationally in effectiveness of administration, recruiting, screening, training, etc. of volunteers.

This instrument ranges from 0 - 100. The national average for established volunteer programs is at a score of 55 - 60. Portsmouth received a score of 62 near the beginning of its program in July, 1973. Ten months later, in May, 1974, the Scorecard rating of the Portsmouth program, on general quality of program administration, had risen to 74. By national standards that is distinctly above average and should be considered very good to excellent. In addition, we see in these scores a steady improvement since the program's inception.

F. Program Administration by Subject-Area

1. The consultation has inspected the complete set of control and administrative forms used in the Portsmouth volunteer program. They are good except for the "Volunteer Contact Report," discussed elsewhere, which

is already in process of modification.

2. Recruiting

- a) The new recruiting brochure "Help Him Reach" is very good.
- b) The need for "diversification of people" in recruiting is discussed later in this report.

3. Training

Volunteer training is a feature in which the Portsmouth program has shown special excellence. This was evident from the following sources:

- a) On-site interviews of volunteers and staff.
- b) Feedback during the preceding year on Forms A1, A2, and A3 (Appendix A), from both volunteers and staff.
- c) Feedback from volunteers (N = 10) on a form administered by the Coordinator. For example: On a general rating of the training, four volunteers rated the training excellent, six rated it good, and none rated it only fair or poor.

Asked if they thought the training better prepared them to be volunteer counselors, all volunteers said yes. To the question, was this training necessary, there was also a unanimous "yes".

Questions which directly invited critique received virtually no response.

- d) The Volunteer Program (Orientation) Handbook is excellent. Future editions might use a looseleaf ring binder format, to permit easier updating and note-taking, provided such a format is not too expensive.
- e) A significant suggestion made during the site visit, was that volunteer pre-service training be opened up more generally to the public, for general public relations and education, with no necessary obligation to become a volunteer at the end of it. (Something on the

model of a recent effort in Norfolk.) This is a particularly engaging suggestion in view of the excellence of the Portsmouth training. A counter-consideration is that such training, opened broadly to the public, might attract unsuitable applicants for volunteer service.

f) All the above refers mainly to volunteer pre-service training. In-service training models are more in process of jelling and while viewed as satisfactory by volunteers and staff, are not viewed quite as enthusiastically. One suggestion, later in this report, is that in-service training phase in more to regular group supervision meetings conducted by the staff person to whom volunteers are assigned. Indeed, staff supervision and responsibility for volunteers is the best form of in-service training. This brings us essentially to the area of volunteer-staff relations discussed passim in this report.

4. Evaluation

The attention to systematic ongoing evaluation given, with staff cooperation, by the present coordinator, was exemplary over the past year.

It is suggested that the new coordinator continue this process, with streamlining as appropriate and as necessary.

Hopefully the present report will help demonstrate that it is worth the time of all concerned in providing feedback and direction to the program.

5. Volunteer Motivation and Incentive

As noted elsewhere, this appears to be good. Volunteer dropout is relatively low and usually for good reason when it does occur.

6. Staff-Volunteer Relations

In this program, as with most others nationally, staff-volunteer relations are the chief area of challenge in improving the program.

This becomes a major theme in the remainder of this report, particularly in the section on communication and in the section on diversification of volunteer people and jobs (in order to better fit them to staff needs).

The following points are offered here by way of introduction to this theme.

- a) Such strains or lack of involvement as do exist are not primarily coming from volunteers (interviews and Form A3). While some of them do see relations to staff as a problem, there was virtually no direct hostility towards or criticism of staff expressed by volunteers, and a considerable amount of respect and sensitivity. Most volunteers stated they were being given adequate supervision by staff.
- b) Among staff, too, it is more a question of feeling that other matters have higher priority, rather than directly expressed hostility to volunteers.
- c) On interview, both the Chief Probation Officer and the Volunteer Coordinator expressed their belief that staff commitment to and understanding of volunteers had, in general, improved at least slightly over the first year of the program's existence.
- d) These opinions are heavily weighted in this report. However, they are not confirmed as decisive in analysis of data from Questionnaire Form A2: "Staff Reactions to Volunteer Program."

This form was administered to staff once near the beginning of the program in September, 1973, and again nine to ten months later in May, 1974.

The results of these administrations were extremely valuable in the input they provided on themes and content for this report. However, comparative analysis between first and second administrations did not show significant changes in staff attitudes to, acceptance and understanding of volunteers over the ten-month period.

On admittedly indirect but consistent evidence, particularly from questions 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, we find such patterns as a slight decrease in the expressed need for more volunteers, no particularly new or more insightful suggestions as to how volunteers could be more productively used, and generally no increase in staff feeling of direct and primary responsibility for the effective involvement of volunteers.

While staff attitudes were adequate for the beginning of a program in September, they appeared to be little or no more adequate ten months later. While staff suggestions were valuable and sometimes quite insightful on both questionnaires, they were not particularly more valuable or insightful on the second administration after ten months staff experience with the program.

Finally, and perhaps of most concern, on question 10, staff felt overwhelmingly on both questionnaire administrations that they already have the skills necessary to supervise a volunteer properly.

However, given the assumption that such matters as communication, volunteer relations and supervision are largely a staff responsibility, not the coordinator's, the present lack of perfection in these respects tends to differ with staff self-confidence in regard to their volunteer supervision skills. It is also to be recalled that volunteers, while not criticizing staff supervision, tend to rate it as "adequate" or "satisfactory" more often than "excellent."

7. Volunteer and Staff Time Involvement and Ratios

An earlier analysis of where volunteer and staff time goes, and how these interrelated, was based on first administration of Forms A2, A3, and A7, and is reported in Appendix B.

This study was considered inadequate in many respects: too diffuse, and too dependent on the long-term memory of respondees. Accordingly,

Forms A2, A3, and A7 were re-administered later in the program, along with newly-designed Forms A5 and A6, which allow the respondee to concentrate her/his memory on a relatively de-limited recent time period, after which monthly projections can then be made and compared with directly-made monthly estimates on the other forms.

The results below are a relatively approximate and judgmental consensus estimate from all the above sources of data. They should be taken as the best available present estimates in an area which needs further methodological development.

a) Staff Time Involvement with Volunteers Exclusive of Volunteers Coordinator's Time:

- 1) Varies extremely widely among staff, individually, from 0 to 15 or 20 hours per month per staff member.
- 2) Total for all staff exclusive of the volunteer coordinator is about 65-70 hours per month.
- 3) This is divided percentage-wise about as follows:
 - (i) Direct contact with volunteer --- 50%.
 - (ii) Direct contact with Volunteer Coordinator --- 25%.
 - (iii) Matching or other work with the volunteer's child --- 10-15%.
 - (iv) Attending volunteer training or other volunteer meetings --- 10%.
 - (v) Other --- 0-5%.

Note that staff count work with the volunteer's client as work supervising the volunteer, an assumption which might be considered somewhat marginal in some approaches to time input-output analysis.

The high percentage of time spent with the Coordinator is symptomatic of the earlier stages in volunteer programming, pending staff's assumption of more direct planning and supervisory

responsibility for volunteers.

b) Volunteer Time Involvement

1) Fairly consistently among volunteers, is approximately 16-18 hours per month per volunteer or 650-700 hours total collectively for all volunteers.* This is at least average or above average by national standards.

2) Percentage-wise, volunteer time involvement breaks down approximately as follows:

- (i) Directly with the client --- 50%.
- (ii) Planning work with client --- 15%.
- (iii) Preparing reports and/or with staff --- 15%.
- (iv) Training or other volunteer meetings --- 10%.
- (v) With the Volunteer Coordinator --- 5-10%.
- (vi) Other --- 0-5%.

Note that planning (ii above) probably includes time with staff; thus total time with staff may be higher than 15%.

Also note that these percentage allocations in paragraph 1 and 2 above may vary substantially among individual volunteers and staff.

c) Staff/Volunteer Time Ratios

Staff are investing approximately 65-70 hours per month on volunteers, directly or indirectly, for which they are receiving about 650-700 total hours of volunteer service, directly or indirectly related to the welfare of the Court's children.

This is a 1:10 time input-output ratio, which is almost exactly the national average as known from research elsewhere.

It should, however, be targeted to increase to a more favorable

* This estimate weights most heavily the recent intensive time analysis questionnaire for volunteers (A6). It appears that average volunteer time per month has risen during the life of the program.

time benefit ratio of 1:15, over the next three years, as program administration procedures are perfected, as staff gains more experience in working effectively and collectively with volunteers, and as a relatively higher balance of staff-time-saving volunteer jobs are incorporated (see later in this report).

d) Cost Considerations

Assumptions:

Average hourly salary of staff --- \$7.00 (\$1120.00 monthly)

Average hourly value of volunteers --- \$3.00*

Time input-output ratio of staff to volunteer time --- 1:10

1) Cost ratio

1 staff hour x \$7.00 yields 10 volunteer hours x \$3.000.
Thus \$7./\$30., or for every dollar's worth of staff time invested, approximately \$4.30 work of volunteer time returned in service.

2) Total yearly worth of volunteer time at \$3. per

hour, 700 hours per month	\$25,200
---------------------------	----------

Total yearly staff investment in volunteers,

\$7. per hour, 70 hours per month	5,880
-----------------------------------	-------

Net gain	\$19,320
----------	----------

Minus Coordinator's salary	10,000
----------------------------	--------

Net gain yearly	\$ 9,000
-----------------	----------

3) Notes:

Even at the present beginning level of the program, the above figure is equivalent or nearly equivalent to the gain of one additional full-time staff member for the department.

* This is on the conservative side. Current cost analysis usage is tending toward \$4.00 - \$4.50 as the financial value of volunteer time per hour.

Even more optimistically, should the program reach targets set for a five-fold increase in volunteers within three years, still with only one full-time paid coordinator, plus an improved time input-output ratio of 1:15, the net gain could easily reach \$100,000 yearly. In general it is expected that net gain will improve as a program matures.

Finally, nothing in the above analysis is meant to detract from the human value of volunteers, which can be quite literally priceless.

8. Conclusion and Challenge

In general, this has been a prudently and professionally planned and operated program during its first year of existence.

An excellent foundation has been laid. The question now, and the challenge now, is to build a significant structure on this solid foundation, to grow not only numerically, but by moving out boldly with innovations which challenge the community and the Court.

The remainder of this report addresses this theme.

VII: ISSUES AND CHALLENGES FOR THE FUTURE

A. PREPARING FOR DISCONTINUITIES

Several significant discontinuities should be prepared for in the program.

1. The most significant discontinuity is that the present coordinator, Ms. Denton, will be leaving in August.

- a) The very best possible person must be retained as her replacement.
- b) Input from all staff, particularly including Ms. Denton, should be sought, as regards that person, both in terms of generally desirable characteristics, and in terms of specific applicants of high quality.
- c) The books "Using Volunteers in Court Settings" and "Guidelines and Standards" have fairly detailed sections on general job qualifications and duties for a volunteer coordinator. The consultant also has, on file, credentials for several persons currently seeking positions.
- d) One cannot expect to get all the characteristics desirable in a coordinator.

However, other things being equal, look for a person who:

- 1) Has been a volunteer coordinator.
- 2) Has been a probation officer or has similar experience in the criminal justice system.
- 3) Has been a volunteer (particularly in your own or a similar volunteer program).
- 4) Has direct knowledge of the Portsmouth area, or at least of Virginia.
- 5) Is somewhat expansionist-minded as regards volunteer pro-

grams. As noted elsewhere in this report, the stage has now been set for such a phase in the program.

- e) It is vital that the new coordinator overlap at least two weeks with Ms. Denton's tenure, either as a volunteer or paid person, so that she can familiarize and train the new person.
- f) It is highly desirable that provision be made for the new coordinator to receive other additional training early in his/her tenure, much as was done with Ms. Denton.
- g) The retaining of a new coordinator provides an opportunity for re-definition of role, appropriate to the expanding role of the volunteer program.

As with Ms. Denton, the new coordinator should have good direct communication links with the Director, Mrs. Davis.

In addition, she/he needs more authority in the staff structure. It is noted that in most successful volunteer programs, the coordinator or facilitator functions at a supervisory level in staff structure.

2. The current court re-organization and anticipated physical move is another discontinuity. The program must maintain momentum in spite of this.

- a) In the new physical quarters, the Volunteer Coordinator's office must be adjacent to and within the office suite for the rest of the department.
- b) The coordinator's office should be large enough for several desks (interns, volunteers dropping in, volunteer assistants, etc.) or else it should include two smaller offices.

Volunteers consistently expressed the need for some place to meet in or "roost" at the Court, and the coordinator will also need an assistant or two (intern, volunteer assistant) in the expanded program.

3. Special new projects coming into the Court, whatever their desirability otherwise, can pose problems of disruption in both paid staff and volunteer programming. An example is the contemplated Behavior Modification Project.

Any new special project of this type should henceforth be reviewed and adapted according to how volunteers may participate in this project, and serve in it.

4. Major state and federal elections, such as the one upcoming in November, 1974, tend to attract good volunteers away from human service volunteer programs.

The Portsmouth volunteer program should take account of this in its recruiting targets, in additional attention to motivation of its volunteers, and in securing commitments from them, as possible, through and beyond the election period.

B. THE VOLUNTEER COORDINATOR

We have already noted the need for continuity of excellence in the hiring of a new coordinator or facilitator of volunteer programs.

We have also stressed the importance of having the volunteer coordinator's office(s) located within whatever suite is assigned to the department.

Finally, we have suggested that the new coordinator receive pre-service training from the present coordinator as well as from competent outside sources.

In addition, the new coordinator should begin recruiting more volunteer administrative assistance in administering the expansion of the program. An appropriate precedent has already been set here in the involvement of Mr. Draper, a federal volunteer, for the development of the Job Program. Others should be recruited and involved similarly: federal volunteers, college interns, and senior citizens.

To achieve the three-year growth targets suggested previously (approximately 200 volunteers in a diversified program), about 100 hours a week should be devoted to the volunteer administration portion of the program. This could be one full-time professional paid coordinator, as now, plus about 40 hours of administrative assistance from volunteers as described above, and about 20 hours secretarial time.

C. DIVERSIFICATION OF PEOPLE

There are indeed a limited number of people of any particular type who will volunteer to work in a court setting, in a community such as Portsmouth.

Therefore, by diversifying the range of people it attempts to attract, the program can more readily achieve significant numerical increases in community involvement, to the target of 200 volunteers within three years (see previous section).

Diversification of people attracted also provides all the benefits of involving a wider range of Portsmouth citizens in the concerns of the court and its children.

The following suggestions are offered:

1. Continue the program's excellent record in involving the black community.
2. Begin innovating to involve well-screened clients or ex-clients as volunteers. Probably they should serve first of all teamed in service with supportive community volunteers.
3. Try to provide the budgetary reimbursement of work-related expenses, which is usually necessary for involving low-income people as volunteers.
4. Make a special effort to involve senior citizens through RSVP, the local volunteer bureau or center, senior citizen clubs, etc. These people often make excellent administrative-clerical volunteers, and there appears to be considerable demand for this kind of service in the Court.
5. Local college interns. More could be gotten from this excellent resource, e.g., black students from Norfolk State College, and graduate students, e.g., in counseling. The present coordinator is already working on the latter.
6. Other kinds of "interns", e.g., Job Corps, Business College, the military, and released time programs in industry.

Particularly as regards paragraphs 5 and 6 above, it is noted that

the recruitment and engagement of these people should be as much a part of the coordinator's responsibility as is the same function for regular community volunteers. A special caution: the interns' affiliation with another organization, e.g., a college, should not deter their primary obligation to perform a service of direct value to the Court.

7. Occasional-service on-call skilled volunteers, e.g., psychologists, optometrists, job counselors, cosmetologists, and the like. This volunteer sector does not always build easily or without frustration and setbacks, but it can be built, and is worth the effort.

Further suggestions received on recruiting during the consultation were the increased use of present volunteers as recruiters, including perhaps a recruiting committee of volunteers.

D. DIVERSIFICATION IN VOLUNTEER SERVICE OFFERINGS

The volunteer program now has "all of its eggs in one basket," or most of them. This is the one-to-one program, and no criticism is suggested for that choice. It is a basic mode of volunteer involvement, with a considerable amount of research backing nationally, on its effectiveness with offenders.

In the years ahead, however, the time is ripe for diversification in volunteer service opportunities, and there are several good reasons for this:

1. By no means all potential volunteers are inclined towards a suitable for one-to-one assignment. Diversification will provide a wider range of "lures" appropriate to a wider range of natural aptitudes, skills and motivations among community people.
2. Diversification will help tailor the program to the range of individual needs of children.
3. It will do the same in regard to the needs of staff for volunteer assistance.

To the numerical growth targets suggested in Section VI, we would therefore add the following approximate diversification targets.

	No. of volunteers	No. of major types of programs
May, 1974	40	1
May, 1975	75-85	3-4
May, 1976	120-130	5-6
May, 1977	200	7-10

4. The current evaluation suggests what some of these new volunteer service opportunities might be. The suggestions below are a composite of on-site interviews of staff, volunteers, and clients, plus the yield during the year from administration of Forms A2 and A3 (Appendix A) administered to volunteers and staff.

In approximate order of consensus priority, these suggestions are presented below:

- a) Job Program*
- b) Tutoring
- c) Temporary shelter homes, or longer term ones (similar to Virginia Beach)
- d) More office assistants, administrative-clerical
- e) Transportation
- f) Social history assistance, in preparation
- g) Special projects for groups, e.g., working on a boat, field trips, coach athletic teams, provide uniforms, arts and crafts
- h) Run groups or assist staff with them
- i) Roster of occasional-service special or professional skills volunteers
- j) Monitoring technical supervision cases (perhaps several per volunteer)
- k) Work with families and parents, groups or classes

* Notes:

1. The job program has already been developed and is nearly ready to launch. It appears to be an excellent choice as the next major mode of community involvement.
2. It is not necessary that these new dimensions of possible volunteer service appeal to all staff. For example, assistance with social histories seems to be quite attractive to one probation officer, and perhaps two or three others, while at least one or two other P.O.'s definitely prefer to do social histories themselves. That is perfectly all right; the new volunteer job can be developed only for those P.O.'s who are interested, very preferably strongly interested, enough so to input materially in the definition of the job and initial volunteer training for it.
3. Some of the above jobs tend to be time-savers for staff, rather than time-reinvestment or actual time-takers, as one-to-one volunteer

positions may be. Examples are jobs d, e, f, and j above. That, too, is desirable. The range of volunteer jobs offered should be a balanced mix of these three types, as regards staff time input.

4. There is also some emphasis on occasional-service as well as continuous-service jobs on the list (e.g., jobs c, e, g, and i). This, too, can be a good re-adjustment in balance. Occasional-service or even one-shot service volunteer contributions do indeed tend to require more organizational and time investment per unit of volunteer output. But they can still be very significant kinds of contributions; everything depends on their real relevance, as defined, to the needs of children and staff.

5. There is precedent for each of the 11 volunteer job suggestions, as productive programs, elsewhere nationally.

6. The above list should not be taken as a "final" set of priorities for opening up additional volunteer job opportunities. Needs change; experience and sophistication with volunteers grows. The list will change accordingly, and volunteers, staff, and clients should be continuously de-briefed on their suggestions and observations, towards alteration or expansion of the list.

Approximately twice a year a relatively intensive participative process should be mounted in this regard by the Need Overlap Analysis in the Helping (NOAH) process.

The new coordinator should become familiar with this NOAH process.

E. COMMUNICATION

Volunteer programs intrinsically pose special challenges for communication in an agency. This is largely because volunteers are part-time people, rarely in the office, and they do not ordinarily like "bureaucratic" reporting processes.

Secondly, paid staff must have very close and clear communication with the volunteer coordinator, perhaps even more so than they have with other paid staff members.

The following suggestions are made:

1. Between Coordinator and Staff:

- a) The coordinator's office to be located within the suite of offices assigned to other staff.
- b) Continue to perfect and streamline the process whereby staff request volunteers from the volunteer coordinator. As much as possible, this process can be individualized to the preferences of individual staff members.

In general, however, it seems that staff does not like longer or more complex written referral forms. Shorter checklists should be developed.*

Also, the coordinator should continue to take the initiative in visiting staff to discuss their needs for volunteers, and to advise them of promising new volunteers or volunteer jobs which may be of use to them.

- c) The coordinator must continue to have regular access to staff in group meetings in regard to volunteers, or as a significant portion of agenda at any regular staff meeting.

* As for client receptivity to volunteers, the checklist on page 89 of the "Guidelines and Standards" book should be placed on each staff person's desk, supplemented by the NICOV Frontier 12 report, and adapted to local use.

2. Staff-Volunteer Communication

a) In general, staff should take more initiative in contacting volunteers, rather than simply waiting for the more silent volunteers to contact them. This has an important volunteer morale function, as well as an information function.

As of now, the results of Forms A5 and A6 (Appendix A) indicate that approximately three out of four contacts are initiated by volunteers. As a rough rule of thumb, the balance should be about half and half.

The tendency of some volunteers to contact the coordinator rather than the staff person to whom they are assigned, is partly a function of this lack of staff initiative. It is not a desirable communication situation, except occasionally and in unusual circumstances.

b) Volunteers seem to have widely differing individual preferences as to reporting: in person, by telephone, via cursive unstructured written reports, etc. Insofar as this individuality can be negotiated with the staff supervisor, as also suitable to them, it should be allowed and encouraged.

In general, however, the former checklist reporting form is not considered optimal at this time, either by staff or by volunteers. A shorter, more structured reporting form is needed.

c) The potential of telephone reporting should be further exploited in phone calls initiated by staff (if not forthcoming from volunteers). Any data retrievable from any written report form is just as easily recorded as a structured interview over the phone, with the extras of morale (staff cares enough to call) and extra information too, as sensitive staff explore significant areas they may pick up, normally missing on a formal report form.

d) Group supervision of volunteers by staff has all the advantages of telephone interviewing and more. Staff can not only pick up tones of voice, they can pick up facial expressions and body language, trends and interactions between their volunteer supervisees.

Meeting all one's volunteers, say once a month, is a logistical time-saver for staff, which also plugs in senior volunteers as supporters of newer volunteers.

It is strongly recommended that this be implemented, as also in large measure a substitute for present modes of volunteer in-service training.

F. STAFF INVOLVEMENT

As noted throughout this paper, staff involvement is a primary consideration governing the growth and welfare of the volunteer program. Some suggestions:

1. Selectivity. Some staff members are far more actively receptive to volunteers, willing to work for and with them, than are others. The coordinator should concentrate on working with the former, letting other staff members discover for themselves the benefits to be gained from volunteers.
2. On the other hand, no staff person anywhere dislikes volunteers. What they dislike is certain kinds of volunteers doing certain kinds of things. Therefore, diversification of people and job opportunities tailored as closely as possible to staff needs via the NOAH process, will eventually break through to "resistive" staff.

The coordinator is reminded that if some staff-originated volunteer job suggestions sound "Mickey Mouse" to her/him, they are not so if a volunteer can be found who clearly understands what is involved and considers it significant.

3. Better communication between staff and the coordinator.
4. Better communication between staff and volunteers.

Both have been discussed previously.

5. Also as discussed previously, more authority afforded the role of the volunteer coordinator backed by a continuing clear message from top management: "volunteer involvement is high (top) priority here."
6. Continued and increasing concentration on volunteer program processes and jobs which are time-saving for staff.
7. There should be instituted as soon as possible a clear and concrete system of recognition, reward, and work credit for staff evaluated as working significantly well with volunteers.

8. Similarly, receptivity to and experience with volunteers should be a significant consideration in the hiring of any new staff.

Points 7 and 8 are elaborated in the Center's Frontier 11 publication which is incorporated by reference here.

9. More active, positive, high-priority staff commitment to volunteers is devoutly to be desired. However, it does not happen in a day. We are talking about a three- to four-year process, during which steadily increasing commitment reaps steadily increasing rewards for staff.

VIII: CONCLUDING STATEMENT

It is hoped that this report will be shared as widely as possible among the staff and volunteers of the Portsmouth Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court. The new coordinator particularly should study it.

After this, it should be the occasion for dialogue and discussion as to which of its recommendations are to be accepted and implemented, as recommended or in adapted form.

It is further suggested that an outside consultant be retained for a return visit to the program in about one year, to consider with staff and volunteers the progress made during the year, in terms of program objectives, and to reconsider recommendations for the next year and the years ahead.

Finally, the consultant wishes to express his appreciation for the many courtesies afforded him during his visit, and for the opportunity to participate in the planning of a program of promise for the future.

VOLUNTEER PROGRAM

SCORECARD

Want to see how you're doing? Below are some representative questions to help you take the temperature of your program. Of course, not all questions are equally relevant to all courts, and you might even want to make up some of your own scoreboard questions.

Place two checks on each line if you're sure it's true for you.....
Place one check on each line if you're uncertain or if it's only partly true....
Leave the line blank if it's not true for your program.....
Suitable substitutions are easily made for volunteer programs outside the criminal justice system.

1. Spent at least three months planning our program, before it started, carefully consulting all relevant people.....
 2. During this time we looked into at least 3 national publications on the subject..
-

3. We have written volunteer job descriptions, at least 2 paragraphs long.....
 4. Deliberately go out after the kind of people who can fill our volunteer jobs.....
 5. At least half of our volunteers are personally and consistently involved working directly with probationers.....
 6. Definite plans or efforts to involve new types of people as volunteers: minority, younger, older, poor, etc.....
 7. Before accepting volunteers we use and study a volunteer background registration form.....
 8. Each volunteer is interviewed at least once before acceptance.....
 9. Each volunteer is interviewed at least twice by different people.....
 10. At least half of the clients we think could benefit from volunteers, have them..
-

11. Require at least five hours volunteer orientation before assignment.....
 12. Judge and/or regular staff are closely involved in volunteer orientation.....
 13. We have in-service training meetings monthly or more often.....
 14. Films and/or tapes, and/or slide shows, and/or role plays used for at least 25% of the total training time.....
 15. Each new volunteer receives and keeps a written orientation manual.....
 16. Systematic effort to orient staff to working with volunteers.....
-

17. We have at least two main alternative work roles for volunteers.....
18. We deliberately seek maximum compatibility of volunteer and probationer by asking and assessing both volunteer and probationer.....
19. In addition to intuition, we employ specific compatibility criteria such as home location, interests, sex, age, etc.....
20. Volunteers sign or explicitly assent to a work contract of specific time commitment over a maximum period of at least eight months.....

21. During past year, we have been forced to terminate at least one volunteer.....

22. We have a regular position of Volunteer Coordinator or Director.....

23. He or she feels he has enough time to do the job adequately.....

24. Volunteer Coordinator is suitably paid.....

25. Our Volunteer Coordinator has attended at least three days of training institute-conferences, also has read at least 150 pages in this specific area, in the past year.....

26. Our Volunteer Coordinator has his office near other staff and is regularly invited to attend staff meetings.....

27. Not more than 40 volunteers for each direct supervisor of volunteers.....

28. Each volunteer has an I.D. card or lapel pin or other suitable court identification.....

29. Certificates and/or volunteer recognition meeting at least once a year.....

30. Regular or supervisory staff are also recognized for their leadership role in volunteer programs.....

31. Volunteers have a desk or other designated place to roose at court.....

32. Provision for good experienced volunteers to move up in responsibility and status as volunteers, e.g. head volunteer, volunteer advisory board, etc.....

33. At least one of our ex-volunteers is now on regular paid staff.....

34. Of volunteers who complete training, at least two-thirds are with us at the end of a year (or their assigned hitch).....

35. At least a third of our new volunteers are brought in by present volunteers.....

36. Within five minutes, we can tell you (a) exactly how many volunteers we have, and also (b) for any individual volunteer, current address, job and assigned probationer if any.....

37. Volunteers are required to report at least once a month by phone or by report form and we enforce this.....

38. At least twice a year we systematically ask regular staff what they think of volunteer programs.....

39. Ditto, both volunteers and probationers, what they think.....

40. Generally, volunteers are actively involved (e.g. advisory board) in decisions regarding their own volunteer program.....

41. We have a regular statistical-evaluative component supervised by a professional in the area.....

42. We prepare a regular, carefully considered budget for the volunteer program.....

43. We keep good account books and formal records on the program.....

44. At least one-half of our volunteer program funding is from local sources (including below).....

45. At least one-half funding is incorporated in regular state or local probation-parole budget.....

A. Staff Reactions To Volunteer Program (Please use back of paper if there is not enough space on the front side.)

This questionnaire is for the purpose of evaluating the volunteer program. Please be frank in responding to the questions.

1. How long have you had any sort of contact with the volunteer program?
2. How much time during an average week are you in any sort of contact with volunteers?
3. How do you see your main role in relation to volunteers? (Direct supervisor of casework handled by volunteers, of volunteer office assistants, etc.) Please specify.
4. Could the agency use more volunteers now? Fewer volunteers? About the same number?
5. How could volunteers do their present jobs better?
6. What jobs could volunteers usefully perform that they do not now, if any?
7. Could any jobs volunteers now perform probably be done better or more efficiently using paid staff?
8. What are some of the things you see as particularly helpful in the volunteer program?
9. What are some of the things which could be improved?

10. Considering the newness of this volunteer program, do you feel you have been given or acquired the skills to supervise a volunteer worker properly? Please comment.

11. Any other comments are welcomed.

B. Volunteer Reactions To Volunteer Program (Please use back of paper if there is not enough space on the front side.)

This questionnaire is to obtain your ideas on how to improve our volunteer program.

1. How long have you been in the volunteer program?
2. Please describe briefly your volunteer job (s).
3. Where does your volunteer time go in an average month?
_____ Hours with offender, or otherwise on the job.
_____ Hours consulting with regular staff.
_____ Hours in various volunteer meetings.
_____ Hours filling out reports, paperwork (Not a part of job itself)
_____ Total hours per average month.
4. What are the main reasons you joined as a volunteer?
5. What are some of the main satisfactions you are obtaining from your volunteer work now?
6. What are some of the main frustrations?
7. What do you see as some of the good things about the volunteer program as a whole?
8. What are some of the things you feel need improvement?
9. Please describe any suggestions you have on new jobs volunteers could fulfill.

10. Considering the newness of the program, do you feel the staff has given you adequate supervision or do you feel it needs improvement?

11. Do you feel you were given an adequate orientation before your participation began? If not, how could the orientation sessions be improved?

12. Do you feel the in-service monthly meetings are helpful? If not, how could they be made more beneficial?

13. Please feel free to make any additional comments.

PROGRAM MATURITY CHECKLIST

FILL-OUT ONE FOR EACH LOCAL PROGRAM

LOCAL PROGRAM name _____

address _____

DATE VISITED _____

NOCOV STAFF _____

WHO TALKED TO OR OTHER BASIS OF DATA _____

A. SCORECARD

1. Vol coord _____ 2. their supervisor _____ 3. difference _____
4. special areas of concern in scorecard _____
5. Does your observation-testing generally conform to theirs, on self-evaluation of scorecard? _____

B. OTHER

1. N VOL _____ 2. VOL/CLIENT RATIO _____ 3. VOL/LINE STAFF _____
4. Staff Admin Vol Program paid _____ 5. Staff Admin Vol Program unpaid _____
6. Breadth of Vol. Involvement

List Jobs, ___# Vol in each ()

_____ ()	_____ ()	_____ ()
_____ ()	_____ ()	_____ ()
_____ ()	_____ ()	_____ ()
_____ ()	_____ ()	_____ ()

7. Breadth of people involved, e.g. balance on age range, minorities income level, etc.

8. How long has program been consistently in operation _____

9. How many coordinators or Leaders since beginning _____
(coordinator turnover)

10. Knowledge of Latest development in the field, e.g.

- Matching
- minority involvement
- job development
- program evaluation
- etc.

As distinct from traditional approach

11. Does program appear to have high status with local management? Direct or indirect indices, e.g. Did they have time to see you, and if they did, did they appear to know the problem realistically well?

STAFF TIME INVOLVEMENT WITH VOLUNTEERS

We are trying to determine how much time staff have records of spending with volunteers, and how much time volunteers believe they spend consulting with staff. Your help in this is appreciated.

A. Please give the full names of any volunteers you may have talked to in person about work, yesterday.

Name of Volunteer	How Much Time
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

B. Yesterday how many volunteers, if any, did you talk to by phone. Put an asterisk next to the name if you initiated the phone call.

Name of Volunteer	How Much Time
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

C. What other activities directly related to volunteer work might you have engaged in yesterday?

Activity	How Much Time
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

D. Now, please fill in A, B, and C alone for day before yesterday.

Name of Volunteer	How Much Time
A. _____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

Name of Volunteer

How Much Time

B.

Activities

C.

E. Now, please do the same for two days ago, as best you can remember.

A.

B.

C.

F. What kinds of things do you usually discuss with volunteers? Would you please list five in approximate order of priority and time involvement.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

G. Any other comments you'd care to make would be appreciated. Thank you.

VOLUNTEER TIME: WHERE IT GOES

We're trying to determine where your time goes, in order to be sure it's invested the very best way to help you do your job. Please help by responding to the questions below.

- A. List the last four times you talked to the staff person directly supervising your work (not the volunteer coordinator).

Date When (As Close as you can)	By Phone	In Person	How Much Time
1. _____	_____	_____	_____
2. _____	_____	_____	_____
3. _____	_____	_____	_____
4. _____	_____	_____	_____

(Put an asterisk on the phone column if you initiated the call.)

- B. What are the five most usual things you talk about when you speak with your staff supervisor?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____

- C. How much time did you spend with your assigned client, total?

1. Last week (total) _____
2. All last month (4 weeks) (if you have been assigned that long) _____

- D. How much other time did you spend doing or planning things on behalf of your client, though not in direct contact with her/him?

1. Last week _____
2. All last month (4 weeks) (if you have been assigned that long) _____

E. How much other time do you denote to the volunteer program, not covered in any of the previous questions?

Last month, writing reports _____

Last month, training sessions _____

Last month, visit or call to the volunteer coordinator _____

Last month other (please list) _____

Any other comments you'd care to make would be most welcome. Thank you.

Name _____

Date _____

How long have you been with this volunteer program? _____

Name: _____

Daily Time Sheet
Volunteer Program

- a.) Please estimate how much time you have invested in the volunteer program today.
- b.) Please break the time down into the kinds of things the involvement included.

Name of Volunteer - Kind of Activity
(Training, Supervision, Etc.)

Approx. No. Of Hours

Volunteer Program Staff
(Planning, Matching, Staff Meeting, Etc.)

Other

Total Hours: _____

National Information Center On Volunteerism

Ivan H. Scheier Ph.D. Director

Judith L. Berry, Assoc. Director

717 Colorado Building
Boulder, Colorado 80302
Telephone 303 447-0492

Board of Directors
Tadini Bacigalupi, Jr.
Hon. Horace B. Holmes
James D. Jurgensen
Phyllis Lake
Ernest L. Shelley, Ph. D.

March 5, 1974

Winship Denton
783 48th Street
Apt. 1
Norfolk, Va. 23508

Dear Winship,

Enclosed please find, as per contract and promise, time input-output analysis. I did the original, it was checked out by our evaluation person, Bob Presson, and will be mailed to you in my absence.

The data were as enclosed in your letter of January 16. We are suggesting you go through one more cycle of data collection for March -- one week for staff, plus time reports from volunteers. Then send us this immediately at the end of March.

On other matters in your letter, my written comments on the matching proposal are in the mail to you, should have arrived by now.

As for visit dates, we often go into Saturday; it actually has advantages for seeing volunteers and clients, and a quiet wrap-up with you and other staff, with no phones ringing. So, if you don't mind working Saturday, I could still suggest: Thursday, May 9, Friday, May 10, Saturday, May 11.

In any event, I can't make it May 1-3.

Best Regards,

IVAN H. SCHEIER, Ph.D.
Director

/rdm

P.S. Please let us know what you think about the uncertain points in the input-output analysis, enclosed.

Encl. Time input-output analysis

ANALYSIS OF PORTSMOUTH, VIRGINIA JUVENILE
AND DOMESTIC RELATIONS DISTRICT COURT VOLUNTEER PROGRAM

TIME INPUT-OUTPUT ANALYSIS

Prepared by

IVAN H. SCHEIER, Ph.D.
ROBERT A. PRESSON, Evaluation Specialist
National Information Center on Volunteerism

Table 1 presents staff time in hours, reported as invested in the Volunteer Program.

A. Analyzing staff time only, the summed totals are:

	Volunteer Training Supervision	Table 1A Planning, Matching Staff Meeting	Other	Total	
July 16-20	2.25	9.0	.5	11.75	weekly
Oct. 1-5	20.0	12.5	5.75	38.25	weekly
Nov. 26-30	12.75	20.75	5.25	38.75	weekly
	35.00	42.25	11.50		

In the earlier part of the program, relatively more staff time was spent on planning and less in supervision. As is reasonable, the proportion of staff time actually spent supervising volunteers, rises in the latter two periods of the program. However, the overall ratio, 35/38.75, could still be higher in favor of volunteer supervision.

The total amount of staff time invested weekly in the program, appears to be leveling off in the latter periods.

Table 2 indicates the distribution of volunteer time, where it is going.

The analysis is indeed reassuring for the program. The volunteers are indeed able to spend the vast majority of their time working with offenders, which is what we all want. The report-paperwork percent is satisfactorily low (7%). The time in volunteer meetings (15%) is understandable, since much of it may be valuably invested in training. The time with staff (8%) is low, but this may or may not be reassuring as indicated below.

Table 3 is reported or estimated volunteer time per month* in hours.

Before we get into the main analysis contingent on this Table, several side-

*All analysis henceforth assumes this is monthly, not weekly. If it is weekly advise us immediately.

lights are of interest sufficient to note.

1) The number of volunteers terminating during this 6-month period is not particularly large by national standards.

2) The preceding monthly averages of terminating volunteers, are lower than that of persevering volunteers, and, thus, a low monthly average may be a reasonably good signal of trouble ahead.

3) The average number of hours per month per volunteer, is about 6.5. This is quite good by national standards where 5.0 is considered satisfactory and quite acceptable.

The main analysis which follows, staff time input per volunteer time output, assumes that all staff and all active volunteers have been surveyed in this regard.

Table 4

	Staff monthly est. hrs.	Volunteer monthly est. hrs.	Input-Output Ratio
July 11.			
July 11.75 x 4=	45	29	1½ to 1
Oct. 38.25 x 4=	150	106	1½ to 1
Nov. 37.75 x 4=	150	131	1.1 to 1

The first column is an estimate of total time invested by staff in any way in the volunteer program, gotten by multiplying by four the weekly surveyed estimate for staff for that month (see Table 1A).

The second column is the monthly total for volunteers for that month, directly from Table 3.

The third column gives the approximate average number of hours staff must put in to get an hour of volunteer service in return. It would appear they're putting in slightly more than they are getting back.

However, this may be unfair in the sense that the volunteer time reported is mainly or solely time with the offender, while staff were reporting administrative, planning time as well.

If we make our ground rules a comparison of staff time devoted directly to the volunteer with volunteer time devoted directly to the volunteer, the comparison

looks like this; the staff figure now taken only from the first column of Table 1A.

Table 5

	Staff est. monthly	Volunteer Est. monthly	Input-Output Ratio
July 2.25 x 4=	10	29	1:3
Oct. 20.5 x 4=	80	106	1:1.3
Nov. 12.75 x 4=	50	131	1:2.7

The input-output ratio looks more favorable here and though not up to national expectations (1:10 or 1:15), is comparable to a similar intensive analysis we made of Worcester, Massachusetts two years ago.

Is it possible it could be even more favorable, perhaps because volunteers are under-reporting their time, or staff over-reporting theirs? Certainly, from the strictly volunteer viewpoint of estimates, it looks far better. On Table 2, volunteers say they spend 82 hours with offenders for every 11.5 hours with staff, an input-output ratio of 11.5/82 or better than 1:7. Moreover, if you take their total time from Table 2, they are saying they invest approximately 110 hours in their work for every 11.5 hours they spend with staff, an input-output ratio of 11.5/110 or almost 1:10. This is, as noted above, almost exactly on the nationally expected convergence from studies in Boulder, Colorado, Ottawa, Ontario, and San Diego, California.

Note, however, that none of the above takes into account the time of the Volunteer Coordinator.

TABLE 1

Court Staff*	July 16 - 20, 1973			Oct 1 - 5			Nov 26 - 30		
	I Volunteer training, supervision	II Vol. Prog. planning, matching, staff	III Other	I	II	III	I	II	III
A \$4.41	0	1.25	0	3	0	0	2.75	.5	0
B \$4.22	1.0	1.75	0	2.5	0	1.75	0	3.5	0
C \$4.22	.25	.75	.5	1.5	.5	.5	10	.5	.5
D \$4.22	1.0	1.50	0	8.0	.5	2.0	4.5	6.0	3.0
E \$4.82	0	.25	0	.5	0	0	0	.5	0
F \$5.05	0	1.0	0				0	1.75	0
G \$4.41	0	0	0	0	.5	0	3.0	0	0
H \$5.05	0	0	0				0	0	0
I \$4.04	0	0	0				0	1.5	0
J \$4.62	0	0	0	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	0	0
K \$12.32	0	0	0	1.5	3.0	1.5	0	3.75	0
L \$5.77	0	2.50	0	1.5	6.5	0	0	2.15	1.75
Totals	2.25	9.0	.5	20.0	12.5	5.75	12.75	20.75	5.25

*Probation Staff and Judge - hourly rate
(Names omitted from distribution draft)

**Staff time in hours
(Blanks indicate that no sheet
was handed in)

A Compilation of Attitude Sheets Taken in September

<u>Vol.</u>	<u>Hours with offender</u>	<u>Hours with staff</u>	<u>In Volunteer meetings</u>	<u>Reports, Paperwork</u>
1	8	1	2	1½
2	6	1	2	2
3	12	½	1½	½
4	10	½	1	½
5	12	½	2	2
6	10	3	2	½
7	4	1	3	½
8	8	4	3	1
9	<u>12</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>¾</u>
Totals	82	11.5	19.5	9.25
Approx. %	68%	9%	15%	8%

Number of Contact Reports

Volunteers	July	August	September	October	November	December, 1973
	4*	2½	3	terminated		
				4*	8*	8*
		5*	5½	4 3/4	6	5½
			2½	7½	5	
Names		20½	11	10*	8*	10*
mitted				7	5	2*
from			5½	4 3/4	5*	5*
distribution	3¼	3¼	2	3*	5*	3*
draft	2	terminated				
				2*	terminated	
					13½	2
					6*	8*
					6	6*
					5½	5*
					½	4*
						8*
	8*	8*	8*	8*	8*	8*
		8	7½	11	8*	7
			1	8*	12	10*
	4½	14½	11	4½	6½	3½
			3	7	9	8*
		9	2	terminated		
	3½	9	0	5	4	4*
	2 3/4	4½	2 1/3	terminated		
					6	6*

Contact Reports Continued . . .

	July	August	September	October	November	December, 1973
						6½
	1	16½	10½	12*	out of town	6*
			8	7½	4½	7
Monthly Totals	29	100.5	84.75	106	131.5	132.5
Average Per Volunteer	3.6	9.1	5.3	6.6	6.0	6.0

* Estimates

END

7 tables/summary