

REVISED Evaluation Report

Appalachian Forest Heritage Area AmeriCorps: Enhancing Assets to Benefit Communities

Building Volunteer Management Capacity For Community Organizations

Appalachian Forest Heritage Area
Phyllis Baxter, Executive Director
Logan Smith, Deputy Director

External Evaluator
Maryann Durland, Ph.D
Durland Consulting

December 2020

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
Introduction	2
Program Background and Problem Definition	2
Overview of Prior Research.....	3
Program Theory of Change and Outcome of Interest	6
AFNHA AmeriCorps Volunteer Capacity Theory of Change	6
Evaluation Overview.....	8
Evaluation Scope and Purpose.....	8
Evaluation Background.....	8
Evaluation Research Questions.....	9
Evaluation Design.....	9
Data Collection	9
Data Analysis	12
Miscellaneous Data and Reporting Notes.....	14
Evaluation Findings.....	15
Conclusions.....	21
Recommendations	22
Future Evaluation Opportunities	23
Appendix A: Volunteer Management Capacity Survey	24
Appendix B: References.....	31
Appendix C: Evaluation Team	33
Dr. Maryann Durland Ph.D – Senior Evaluator, Study Analysis.....	33
AFNHA Staff.....	33

Executive Summary

Appalachian Forest National Heritage Area AmeriCorps (AFNHA): Enhancing Assets to Benefit Communities, a multi-focus intermediary program which provides direct member services related to environmental stewardship and community improvement goals, also provides volunteer management and capacity building for the organizations where members serve. The 2017-2020 AFNHA external impact evaluation aimed to assess the effectiveness of our volunteer management program interventions, primarily using a volunteer capacity survey completed by site supervisors of program sites, and by representatives of comparison sites of similar size and purpose but who did not have AmeriCorps members assigned.

Results from the survey and member performance data found AmeriCorps members were useful in managing volunteers for their sites, but their impact on the long-term capacity of the sites was less clear. Results were indicative, but not statistically significant. Large agency conservation sites with AmeriCorps members providing volunteer management showed somewhat more frequent use of volunteer management practices among large AFNHA organizations than the comparison group in 2017-18, but less so in 2018-19. Small non-profit community sites, who generally had lower capacity to start with, did not show stronger capacity than comparison sites. For the small program sites where AmeriCorps members had significant responsibility for volunteer management, they rated higher in 4 of the 6 practices studied than the comparison sites.

Introduction

Appalachian Forest National Heritage Area AmeriCorps (AFNHA): *Enhancing Assets to Benefit Communities* is a multi-focus intermediary program which provides direct member service related to environmental and cultural heritage stewardship. Appalachian Forest Heritage Area (AFHA) AmeriCorps has been serving in 16 West Virginia counties since 2007. Now designated as Appalachian Forest National Heritage Area (AFNHA), our AmeriCorps members serve in a variety of positions at partner sites, providing environmental stewardship through lands and assets improved, stewardship education and outreach, and community capacity building. Members serve directly with assigned sites, in a variety of locations across our counties. Members with conservation background serve with federal or state agencies or large non-profit organizations to conserve natural resources through ecosystem restoration and land improvement, habitat monitoring, and environmental education, awareness, and outreach. Members with cultural heritage background serve with small non-profits or local agencies including historical societies and museums, community groups, and arts organizations, to conserve cultural heritage assets including local history, arts, and community environment for rural communities including education to encourage stewardship of these resources. In addition, members also provide indirect service activities to improve volunteer management and build capacity for the organizations they serve.

Program Background and Problem Definition

Appalachian Forest National Heritage Area (AFNHA) AmeriCorps' *Enhancing Assets to Benefit Communities* multi-focus intermediary program that has been providing service through West Virginia since 2007. Members are full-time and generally placed individually with sub-sponsor organizations.

Members provide direct services related to environmental stewardship and community improvement. In these direct service activities, conservation members provide environmental stewardship services to protect and improve ecosystems in the central Appalachian forest of our area of West Virginia including hands-on improvements and monitoring for public forest lands, as well as improving community environments through public parks improvements. Members provide environmental education, outreach and raising stewardship awareness. AFNHA community heritage members serve struggling rural Appalachian communities throughout our rural service area. Members help communities move forward with community improvement goals, historic preservation of public historic buildings, enhancing and interpreting local cultural and heritage assets, and providing education to increase stewardship of community heritage.

In addition to their direct service activities, another role of AFNHA AmeriCorps members is to leverage community volunteers and build capacity for organizations and programs in small, rural communities. Members are providing service to improve volunteer management practices, build volunteer capacity, and improve organizational effectiveness. Volunteer Management is the common service activity across all our sites, with approximately 30% of

member service related to volunteer management, although the degree of emphasis varies from site to site. The purpose of this study is to assess the impact of these capacity building services by AmeriCorps members on the volunteer management practices of the organizations where they serve.

(Note: AFNHA was designated as a National Heritage Area in 2019. Prior to that time, the organizational name was Appalachian Forest Heritage Area (AFHA). Both names were used during the period covered by the evaluation. However, to avoid confusion, AFNHA will be used throughout the report.)

Overview of Prior Research

The importance of volunteering was underscored by a seminal 1998 study on volunteerism, (UPS 1998, p1) which stated “America is a nation of volunteers. And not-for-profit organizations have an unending need for the time and talents of volunteers. Organizations that are able to recruit and make effective use of volunteer resources are positioned to make the greatest contributions to those who need help.”

Across the United States, 25.3% of residents volunteer, and 36.29% participate in groups or organizations. Even more, 62.5%, engage in “informal volunteering” such as doing favors for neighbors. (Volunteering, 2015) A study of national charities found that over 80% of charities with receipts over \$25,000 use volunteers 2010. (Urban, Charities p 4) This rate will be even higher for smaller organizations with little or no paid staff, such as are prevalent in rural West Virginia.

In a study of “Volunteer Management Practices during Challenging Economic Times” (Knepper, p1) the authors summarized “Nonprofit organizations rely upon volunteers to facilitate their missions of meeting critical community needs.” When non-profit organizations are stressed by federal funding cuts and reduced donor support, “nonprofits will increasingly be compelled to cope in new ways to achieve their missions.”

Management of volunteers is an ongoing challenge for most organizations. As explained in “Why is Volunteer Management Important?” (Idealist.org) “Without a volunteer management professional on staff – whether they be paid or volunteers themselves – volunteers often fall between the cracks of already busy organizations and are left to fend for themselves or forgotten altogether. In either case, the end result is a volunteer who doesn't feel valued or engaged. And that is a volunteer who will leave, taking with them the energy and time they could have contributed to the mission as well as, potentially, ill will towards the organization for how they were treated (think of it as negative PR).” The UPS study recognized that “managing volunteers effectively is a problem for many not-for-profit organizations. UPS recognizes that these organizations could accomplish even more if they could better recruit, manage and recognize the work of volunteers. These organizations often lack the resources to put systems in place that will allow them to get the most out of volunteers and retain them as committed workers.” (UPS 1998, p1) Their research documented this need in asking why volunteers

stopped helping at an organization. While some reasons were personal and not related to the organization, 40% cited a shortcoming of the organization volunteer management practices. “The organization is not well managed” is the most popular specific reason given for stopping work as a volunteer, mentioned by 65% of those who stopped volunteering for poor volunteer management reasons. The other most cited reasons were “The organization did not make good use of time” 57%, “the organization did not make good use of talents, skills or expertise” 45%, and “volunteer tasks were not clearly defined” 40%. 23% stopped volunteering because they “were not thanked and recognized for their efforts.” (UPS 1998, pp 14-15)

Volunteer management includes a complex range of activities, such as “recruiting, coordinating, leading, supporting, administering and organizing volunteers as well as strategic oversight and management of volunteer programs.” (Knepper p3) For the purposes of this study, the researchers defined volunteer management practices as including “regular supervision and communication with volunteers, liability coverage or insurance protection for volunteers, regular collection of information on volunteer numbers and hours, screening and matching of volunteers to assignments, written policies and job description for volunteers, recognition activities, annual measurement of impacts of volunteers, training and professional development opportunities for volunteers, and training for paid staff working with volunteers; and the utilization of a volunteer coordinator, including a paid staff person who can spend a substantial portion of their time on volunteer management duties.” (Knepper p 5) The Urban Institute Study on Volunteer Practices found that those practices that focused more directly on enriching the volunteer experience were more helpful for volunteer recruitment and retention, while organizational practices like tracking or policies provide other benefits such as generating resources. (Urban, Vol Practices, p 1) This study also discusses the need for practices outside of the more traditional “volunteer management practices” that “support volunteer involvement, cultivate an organizational climate that is welcoming to volunteers, give their volunteers an experience worth sharing, and enlist volunteers in recruiting other volunteers one-on-one.” (Urban, Vol Practices, p 12)

AFNHA AmeriCorps is taking a broad definition of “volunteer management practices” to include the traditional best practice recommendations, as well as additional support for volunteer involvement. In addition to recognized best practices, AFNHA members are trained with tools such as those from the Rural Volunteerism Initiative that are based on experiences with small, rural organizations. (ruralvolunteer.org) Members also learn from the real life experiences of the organizations in their communities and share their challenges and successes with other members of their AmeriCorps team. We consider this broad range of support to contribute to volunteer management for their organizations.

AmeriCorps members can be effective in volunteer management and increasing volunteer capacity. “The most popular capacity-building option among . . . charities . . . is the addition of a one-year, full-time volunteer with a living stipend (like an AmeriCorps member), with responsibility for volunteer recruitment and management.” (Urban, Charities p 5) “AmeriCorps

was designed to work from the bottom up, (with) groups meeting locally-determined needs in locally-determined ways. AmeriCorps Members help expand these groups' reach and impact", states the 2010 Transforming Communities through Service Report. They continue to say, "A very critical element of this approach is the design of projects that purposely engages the talents and abilities of community volunteers so they can also contribute to the overall success of these endeavors". This report quotes President Barack Obama on the signing of the Serve America Act "“Programs like these are a force multiplier; they leverage small numbers of members into thousands of volunteers.” (Transforming, 2010, p iv)

AmeriCorps programs are placing members (stipended volunteers) in communities across the United States in an effort to help organizations build capacity, especially through volunteer management. Volunteer Maryland (volunteer.maryland.gov) is an AmeriCorps program which places full-time AmeriCorps members as Volunteer Coordinators with community sites. In the 2012-2013 service year they reported:

- “96 percent of Service Sites reported that the organization does a better job of managing and supervising volunteers as a result of the Volunteer Maryland partnership.
- 92 percent of Service Sites reported that volunteers have enhanced the effectiveness of the organization as a result of the Volunteer Maryland partnership.
- 87 percent of Service Sites achieved some or all of their measurable objectives for volunteer impact.”

CalSERVES Volunteer Infrastructure program places members in community organizations across California to systematically increase their capacity to recruit, train, support, and utilize volunteers in order to be more effective. In this program's quasi-experimental impact evaluation, sites with VIP members were compared to comparison sites of like organizations, with propensity score matching between the two groups. Data was collected by a Volunteer Capacity Assessment pre-post survey completed by all sites at least two times with a six month interval. The study concluded that “CalSERVES VIP program appears to positively affect the partner sites' organizational capacity to host volunteers” compared to the control organizations. (CalSERVES 2012)

Methodology of using an assessment survey and matched control groups can be adapted from the CalSERVES study for use in evaluating the AFHA program. While AFNHA AmeriCorps members provide volunteer management service for only about 1/3 of their service time, rather than as their primary role in the Volunteer Maryland or CalSERVES program, we will assess evaluation of these member impacts to see if they still show improvement in the volunteer management capacity and effectiveness of the organizations they serve, showing improvement of capacity due to AFNHA AmeriCorps member assistance, and showing stronger capacity than for the control organizations without AmeriCorps assistance. Additionally, we will aim to compare to a matched set of control organizations.

Increased volunteer capacity can lead to more effective organizations, reporting better results and outcomes. “(Many) organizations lack the capacity or the expertise to measure volunteer impact. . . . The most common measurement of volunteer involvement was the number of hours worked and the monetary value of those hours. Reporting only the numbers of volunteers and hours engaged does not say anything about volunteer impact on the organization’s mission or its clients.” (United Way King Co p 6) One study that did look at the results of volunteering on organizations, determined that “Of the charities surveyed, more than 60% reported significant benefits, and more than 90% reported moderate benefits, in the following categories: Increases in the quality of services or programs you provide; Cost savings to your organization; increased public support for your programs, or improved community relations; Services or levels of service you otherwise could not provide.” (Urban, Charities p 14) In addition, many reported benefits of “access to specialized skills possessed by volunteers.” This study also found that smaller charities received higher levels of benefits from volunteers.

AFNHA AmeriCorps volunteer management support is intended to build volunteer capacity resulting in better outcomes and increased effectiveness for the rural community organizations which our members serve. The AFNHA AmeriCorps program creates real and lasting differences to our communities and sites. Rigorous evaluation of volunteer practices data will inform our decisions going forward as to how AFNHA AmeriCorps members can be most effectively deployed to support volunteers and the organizations they serve.

Program Theory of Change and Outcome of Interest

AFNHA AmeriCorps Volunteer Capacity Theory of Change

Need: AFNHA area rural communities are economically depressed and lack resources and capacity to effect meaningful change. Rural community and environmental organizations have inadequate professional staff to accomplish development goals and are often dependent on volunteer assistance to deliver program services. Yet they lack staff and capacity to effectively manage volunteers to accomplish needed projects.

This need for volunteers for non-profit organizations is as important in rural West Virginia as it is nationally. In our area, small communities and organizations often have little or no staff, and rely heavily on volunteers to accomplish their mission. While the 2014 formal volunteer rate in West Virginia was lower than national average at 20.8%, those who participate in organizations was almost even at 34.4%, and informal volunteering was significantly higher at 74.4% (Volunteering, 2015). Some factors that seem correlated with lower levels of volunteerism, such as higher poverty and lower educational levels might help explain the lower volunteering rates in West Virginia. Yet some factors that correlate with higher volunteering, such as commitment to the community and large numbers of non-profit organizations (Volunteering Issue Brief, 2010), are prevalent in West Virginia. These factors, added to the high rate of informal volunteering, could indicate that West Virginians offer the potential for significantly more volunteer activity than is currently being utilized.

Volunteerism is essential for mission delivery for many small non-profit organizations. Management of volunteers is an ongoing challenge, as it takes time and effort to recruit, manage, and coordinate volunteer service. AmeriCorps members can be effective in providing this volunteer management and building volunteer capacity for their organizations. Increased volunteer capacity can lead to more effective organizations, giving better results and outcomes.

Interventions: Full-time AFNHA AmeriCorps members provide volunteer support and capacity building for a portion of their time for the sites where they are assigned for direct service. These include programs of large environmental and land management agencies and organizations, and small community organizations including museums, historical and cultural sites, and community improvement groups. While members provide valuable direct service for about 2/3 of their time implementing environmental and community projects, they also show significant impact by improving volunteer capacity to increase effectiveness of their organization to accomplish program goals, accounting for about 1/3 of member time. Members are trained in volunteer management by the program, with curriculum including stages of volunteer program development and steps of volunteer management developed from “Volunteering Reinvented: Human Capital Solutions for the Nonprofit Sector” (Corporation for National and Community Service, 2007), and a variety of other research and experiential sources. Members implement volunteer management best practices that support at least one of these eight functions for effectively managing volunteers. Our training and interventions are based on these recommended functions and they provide the outline for the survey questions:

1. Market Research and Community Needs Assessments
2. Strategic Planning to Maximize Volunteer Impact
3. Recruiting and Marketing to Prospective Volunteers
4. Interviewing, Screening, and Selecting Volunteers
5. Orienting and Training Volunteers
6. Ongoing Supervision and Management
7. Recognition and Volunteer Development
8. Measuring Outcomes and Evaluating the Process

Members use that training to develop volunteer programs, improve volunteer management practices, recruit and manage volunteers, and help assess & build volunteer capacity for the organizations. Activities needed by sites vary depending on the organizational capacity and the development level of their volunteer program. For some sites members help with assessment and program policy development, while others focus on recruitment, selection and training of volunteers. For sites that focus on one-day projects and events, members help organize volunteer tasks, recruit volunteers, and manage them during the activity. For some sites with ongoing volunteers, members provide support for these volunteers to help their volunteer service be more effective. Members may have a role in thanking and tracking volunteers. AFNHA AmeriCorps members and the volunteers they manage conduct activities that support

planning, design, and implementation of projects identified by each conservation or community organization as contributing toward that organization's mission.

Outcomes: To the extent that members manage and support volunteers in these activities, improve volunteer management, and help to improve organizational volunteer policies and practice, then those members are providing volunteer capacity building service. In general, implementing these activities is theorized to result in improved capacity for the organization to recruit and use volunteers and increased effectiveness for the organization in program delivery. This leads to stronger organizations with increased efficiency, effectiveness, and program reach in delivering their mission objectives.

Evaluation Overview

Evaluation Scope and Purpose

The purpose of the 2017-20 external impact evaluation study was to assess the effectiveness of the volunteer management capacity building services provided by AFNHA AmeriCorps members for their site. Since our program is multi-focused and direct service activities vary from site to site, the part-time capacity building services were selected as the focus for the evaluation as these activities were more consistently provided across all of our service organizations.

In addition to meeting the external impact evaluation requirements for a program receiving over \$500,000 in federal funds annually, the results this evaluation have been used to assess the consistency and effectiveness with which our AmeriCorps members are implementing volunteer management assistance across our service organizations and provide us with information for continuous improvement.

Evaluation Background

The 2017-20 impact evaluation built upon a pilot survey of volunteer management capacity conducted by an external evaluator for AFNHA organizations hosting the 26 members serving 2015-16 (September to August) during the last 3-year grant cycle and a group of comparable organizations that had had no AmeriCorps member. Overall, the previous study found some differences between program organizations with volunteer management support provided by AFNHA AmeriCorps members and comparison organizations without AmeriCorps member assistance. Significant differences were found in six areas related to volunteer capacity of the organization. One set of questions related to improvement in volunteer capacity over time, and though not statistically significant, results were positive and indicative of potential effectiveness of AFNHA AmeriCorps member activities.

This 2017-20 cycle built on that first effort with a more extensive survey over multiple years. The first report from that data, submitted in 2019, compared all program sites as a group with all comparison sites, over the full range of questions. This REVISED report contains the results of Phase II data analyses conducted based on the Volunteer Management Capacity Survey data

collected for 2017-18 and 2018-19. The new analyses were undertaken to see if utilization of survey data only for practices most applicable to AmeriCorps member service, and analyzing by large or small site types, would provide any new, more accurate insights to the effectiveness of member engagement in volunteer management that could be used for continuous program improvement.

Evaluation Research Questions

The 2017-2020 external impact evaluation was originally designed to answer the following two research questions.

1. To what extent do community organizations with volunteer management support by AFNHA AmeriCorps members show *differences* in volunteer capacity compared with organizations that have not had assistance from AmeriCorps members?
2. To what extent do community organizations with volunteer management support by AFNHA AmeriCorps members show *improvements* in volunteer capacity over time?

The re-analysis of the survey data presented in this report ONLY focused on the first question due to small sample sizes and inconsistency in organization participation across multiple years. Therefore, there was insufficient high quality data available to adequately answer the second question.

Evaluation Design

The evaluation for the 2017-2020 grant cycle was an external impact evaluation using a quasi-experimental design.

The AFNHA evaluation design built upon the quasi-experimental impact evaluation conducted by CalSERVES AmeriCorps Volunteer Infrastructure Program¹, which found significantly stronger volunteer capacity in organizations served by AmeriCorps VIP members than in comparison organizations without such service.

Data Collection

The primary sources of data used in the evaluation was the Volunteer Management Capacity Survey. The Volunteer Capacity Survey was designed using questions developed for the CalSERVES study and adapted for use to fit AFNHA parameters and focus. The survey consisted of 45 questions focused on volunteer management practices which are intended to build volunteer capacity resulting in better outcomes and increased effectiveness for the organizations. There were multiple sets of questions on the survey including demographic and matching information (use of and types of service members (stipend volunteers), use of volunteers (non-stipend volunteers), and hours service members and volunteers served.)

¹ *AmeriCorps VIP Volunteer Capacity Study*, JBS International, Inc, Nov 2012 , www.nationalservice.gov/organizations/default/files/evidenceexchange/FR_CaliforniaVolunteers_CalSERVES-NCOE_AmeriCorpsVIP.pdf)

Volunteer management practices questions were grouped according to the AmeriCorps recommended functions for effectively managing volunteers, with multiple questions asked for each function.

The Survey was administered by the external evaluator using a digital survey in the fall in 2017-19 and 2018-19 to both AFNHA organizations and comparison organizations. All AFNHA organizations (ranging from 24 to 33 depending on year) and approximately 25 total comparison groups were invited via email to participate in the survey.

The evaluation sample included organizations hosting AFNHA AmeriCorps members to provide volunteer assistance and a comparison group of organizations similar in type to the AFNHA organizations that had not had assistance from AmeriCorps members. Comparison Organizations are matched with program organizations, as closely as possible to the following characteristics:

1. Type of organization (government agency, non-profit, etc)
2. Mission-focus of organization
3. Size of organization site (generally based on staff size)

The list of organizations for the comparison groups was constructed from references from AFNHA organizations, online searches, and general knowledge. The organizations were selected to be as similar to the ones with AmeriCorps members as possible. The list expanded or contracted as we updated emails and utilized other data verification and cleaning processes.

The external evaluator was responsible for survey development, survey administration, data cleaning and storage, statistical analyses, report findings, conclusions, and the draft and final reports. Program staff helped with identification of survey questions, identification of program and comparison organizations, providing program performance measure data, and input on report draft.

Overview of Survey Respondents

A total of 39 organizations completed a survey at least once during the two years of the study: 25 AFNHA program organizations and 14 comparison organizations. Program organizations with AFNHA assigned members studied in the volunteer capacity survey evaluation included:

- 7 environmental stewardship conservation organizations, most of which were distinct program organizations within a larger federal agency or were field offices of large national non-profits. These were large, conservation organizations included in the evaluation.
- 18 community heritage organizations which were mostly small non-profit organizations with only one or a few staff, or all volunteer run. These included museums, historical and cultural groups, and community improvement organizations. These were the small, community organizations included in the evaluation.

Comparison organizations were selected to be similar to program organizations, but without having had significant AmeriCorps service. Similarities were confirmed as measured on several demographic variables including organizational type, site description which asked about the specific organizational structure of a site such as a branch or a larger organization, or a non-profit. Comparisons were also selected based on program emphasis and on the number of full and part-time paid staff and how many hours they worked on average.

Comparison organizations, which did not have significant AmeriCorps or national service members, included:

- 5 large conservation comparison organizations, selected as equivalent organizations in West Virginia or adjoining states
- 9 small community comparison organizations selected from similar organizations in West Virginia, of similar size and mission to the AFNHA site communities.

Table 1 provides a summary of the organizations completing the Volunteer Management Capacity Survey each year.

Table 1. Summary of Survey Respondents by Group, Size, and Year

Group	Number of Responses					
	All		Small		Large	
	17-18	18-19	17-18	18-19	17-18	18-19
AFNHA	22	17	16	9	6	6
Comparison	10	8	8	3	2	4

Approximately half as many comparison organizations responded to the survey each year as program organizations.

In 2017-18, the number of organizations completing the survey were as follows:

- 22 AFNHA organizations and 10 comparison organizations for a total of 32 respondents
- 16 small AFNHA organizations and 8 small comparison organizations for a total of 24 small respondents
- 6 large AFNHA organizations and 2 large comparison organizations for a total of 8 large respondents

In 2018-19, the number of organizations completing the survey were as follows:

- 17 AFNHA organizations and 8 comparison organizations for a total of 25 respondents
- 9 small AFNHA organizations and 3 comparison organizations for a total of 12 small respondents

- 6 large AFNHA organizations and 4 comparison organizations for a total of 10 large respondents

Data Analysis

The analysis of collected Volunteer Capacity Survey data was conducted in two phases.

- Phase I was conducted on all survey data collected over three years and summarized in an initial evaluation report completed in December 2019 and submitted to Volunteer West Virginia.
- Phase II was conducted on only the survey data most aligned with member service activities and is summarized in this revised report.

The following is a description of the analyses completed during each phase. **Phase I**

The first phase of data analysis included analyses of all 45 survey question responses for both AFNHA organizations and comparison group organizations across three years – partial pilot data (2016-17) and data from the next 3-year grant cycle (2017-18 and 2018-19.) The analyses of results included descriptive statistics, including frequency and percent for each questions and subpart, and inferential statistics where appropriate. T-tests were performed between the control and comparison organizations, and ANOVAs when categories of organizations were identified across the control and comparison organizations, for example, museums. Four measures and tests were used to determine the significance of differences, if found. Because we used a population, the response rate was important. We calculated other measures as appropriate.

- a. sample size
- b. effect size “Effect size is a simple way of quantifying the difference between two groups. It has importance over the use of tests of statistical significance alone. It emphasizes the size of the difference and is not based on sample size.”² In addition, there are ways to interpret effect size so that comparisons are clearer and easily visualized.
- c. significance level = $P(\text{Type I error})$ = probability of finding an effect that is not there (.05)
- d. power = $1 - P(\text{Type II error})$ = probability of finding an effect that is there. “Power analysis is normally conducted before the data collection. The main purpose underlying power analysis is to determine the smallest sample size that will detect the effect of a given test at the desired level of significance.”³ (70 as sample = .8358)

² <https://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00002182.htm>

³ <http://www.statisticssolutions.com/statistical-power-analysis/>

All calculations were meant to determine if there were differences, beyond significance testing, between the AFNHA organizations and the comparison organizations, as illustrated in the hypotheses table with possible actions.

Phase II

An in depth follow up review of the original evaluation report and its findings, the Volunteer Capacity Survey questions, three years of raw data, and the results of statistical tests run during the initial analysis were undertaken in October-November 2020. The review revealed four key limitations of the data collection and Phase I analyses which distorted the reported results.

1. Many of the survey questions about volunteer management capacity did not align with the service activities members were tasked to do at their host organizations. Therefore, those questions were not valid measures for assessing member effectiveness.
2. Both the AFNHA and comparison group sample sizes were very small (between n=2 and n=16) plus many organizations did not completed the survey for all three years – therefore the planned look at capacity building over time was not possible.
3. The analyses of the responses for the AFNHA and comparison organizations did not differentiate by organization size – small and large organizations were aggregated within each group. However, for example, the capacity and practices used by small community based organizations with no paid staff is quite different than a large governmental organization such as the WV Department of Forestry with multiple staff associated with the volunteer program.
4. The role of AmeriCorps members in volunteer management at AFNHA organizations was not factored into the analysis. At some organizations, members had primary responsibility for volunteer management, at others they assisted staff, and at a few their role was negligible.

In light of these limitations, it was decided to undertake a second round of analyses focused on answering the research question: To what extent do community organizations with volunteer management support by AFNHA AmeriCorps members show *differences* in volunteer capacity compared with organizations that have not had assistance from AmeriCorps members?

In Phase II of the analysis on which this report is based, six volunteer management practice survey questions were identified as being **directly related** to member service activities. The questions that were not included covered activities members would be unable to directly influence such as organizational risk management, funding sources, board administration, etc.

Collected data for the six key practices were then analyzed in order to provide a more accurate understanding of the impact of AFNHA member service on host organizations as compared to comparable size organizations that had no member.

Means for reported frequencies for each of the six practices were calculated five ways:

1. All AFNHA organization and all comparison organizations
2. All small organizations: AFNHA and comparisons
3. Small organizations where members played a reported role in volunteer management: AFNHA and comparisons
4. All large organizations: AFNHA and comparisons
5. Large organizations where members played a reported role in volunteer management: AFNHA and comparisons

Miscellaneous Data and Reporting Notes

- Every attempt was made to ensure the accuracy of the data provided in tables and the narratives accompanying them. However, despite our best efforts, there may still be a few small inadvertent typos or calculation errors for which we apologize in advance.
- All calculated means in tables were rounded to the nearest full number or tenth for ease in interpretation. We believe trends are more visible to the reader using the shorter numeric form.
- Tables were designed to present data as consistently and clearly as possible. Narrative describing the contents of each table are also provided.

Evaluation Findings

Survey respondents were asked to rate the frequency with which their organization engaged in six volunteer management practices using a 5-point Likert scale (5=Consistently, 4=Usually, 3=Sometimes, 2=Rarely, 1=Never.) Each practice was selected from a longer list of items to reflect the specific activities in which AFNHA members were most likely involved at the majority of their host site organizations. The purpose was to determine whether organizations that had AFNHA members more frequently engaged in the six practices than comparable organizations that were not involved in the program.

Table 2 provides a summary of all AFNHA and comparison organization responses concerning volunteer management practice frequency.

Table 2. Volunteer Management Practices: AFNHA vs. Comparison Organizations

Volunteer Management Practice	All Organizations							
	2017-18				2018-19			
	AFNHA Organizations		Comparison Organizations		AFNHA Organizations		Comparison Organizations	
	Number	Mean	Number	Mean	Number	Mean	Number	Mean
Site actively recruits volunteers.	22	2.9	10	3.2	17	3.2	8	4.8
Volunteers are provided with specific training for their position.	22	3.4	10	3.4	17	3.5	8	3.5
Site has regular supervision and communication with volunteers.	22	3.8	10	3.8	17	3.6	8	3.9
Volunteer projects are well planned, and adequate resources provided to support the volunteer.	22	3.3	10	3.5	17	3.6	8	4.3
Volunteers are publicly recognized for their service.	22	3.3	10	3.3	17	3.6	8	4.0
Site collects and tracks volunteer hours and numbers of volunteers.	22	3.5	10	3.2	17	3.5	8	4.6

Among all organizations responding to the survey in 2017-18, the following differences between AFNHA and comparison organizations among the six volunteer management practices were noted.

- Volunteer hour and number tracking were undertaken more frequently by AFNHA organizations than comparison organizations.
- Volunteer training, supervision and communication, and recognition frequency were comparable for both AFNHA and comparison organizations.
- Comparison organizations reported they more frequently engaged in two of the six volunteer management practices than AFNHA organizations (recruitment and project planning) based on mean responses.

Among all organizations responding to the survey in 2018-19, the following differences among the six volunteer management practices were noted.

- No practice was undertaken more frequently by AFNHA than comparison organizations.
- Volunteer training was comparable for both AFNHA and comparison organizations.
- Comparison organizations reported they more frequently engaged in five of the six volunteer management practices than AFNHA organizations (recruitment, supervision/communication, project planning, recognition, and data tracking) based on mean responses.

Looking at both years, only one practice in the first of the two years was found to be done more frequently at AFNHA organizations than comparison organizations. Four practices were comparable between both groups over the two years. Comparison organizations more frequently engaged in seven of the practices over two years. Therefore, it appears having an AFNHA member was not a strong indicator of improved capacity as measured by frequency of volunteer management practice use.

However, since the context and capacity of the small community-based organizations, some with no paid staff is very different from that of large governmental organizations, an additional analysis was done breaking out the responses by size of organization. The following sections provide the results of the analysis based on organization size - large and small.

Large Organizations

The survey data for all large AFNHA and comparison organizations was analyzed and mean frequencies for the six practices calculated. Table 5 provides a summary of the results.

Table 3. Volunteer Management Practices: Large AFNHA vs. Comparison Organizations

Volunteer Management Practice	Large Organizations							
	2017-18				2018-19			
	AFNHA Organizations		Comparison Organizations		AFNHA Organizations		Comparison Organizations	
	Number	Mean	Number	Mean	Number	Mean	Number	Mean
Site actively recruits volunteers.	6	3.8	2	3.0	7	3.3	4	3.3
Volunteers are provided with specific training for their position.	6	4.5	2	3.5	7	3.8	4	3.8
Site has regular supervision and communication with volunteers.	6	4.7	2	3.5	7	3.8	4	3.5
Volunteer projects are well planned and adequate resources provided to support the volunteer.	6	4.2	2	3.5	7	4.0	4	4.0
Volunteers are publicly recognized for their service.	6	3.2	2	3.0	7	3.5	4	3.8

Volunteer Management Practice	Large Organizations							
	2017-18				2018-19			
	AFNHA Organizations		Comparison Organizations		AFNHA Organizations		Comparison Organizations	
	Number	Mean	Number	Mean	Number	Mean	Number	Mean
Site collects and tracks volunteer hours and numbers of volunteers.	6	4.7	2	3.5	7	4.3	4	4.8

Among large organizations responding to the survey in 2017-18, the following differences between AFNHA and comparison organizations among the six volunteer management practices were noted.

- All six volunteer management practices were done more frequently by AFNHA organizations than comparison organizations based on mean responses

Among large organizations responding to the survey in 2018-19, the following differences among the six volunteer management practices were noted.

- Volunteer supervision and communication was undertaken slightly more frequently by AFNHA organizations than comparison organizations.
- Volunteer recruitment, training, and project planning mean frequencies were comparable for both large AFNHA and comparison organizations.
- Comparison organizations reported they more frequently engaged in for two of the six volunteer management practices than AFNHA organizations (recognition and data tracking) based on mean responses.

In summary, the results for volunteer management practice frequency at large AFNHA organizations compared to the large non-AFNHA organizations did not show consistency across the two years of data. In the first year, AFNHA organizations more frequently engaged in all six practices but in the second year only in one practice. Therefore, it is difficult to make definitive conclusions about the effectiveness of the AFNHA model for capacity building, especially due to small sample sizes.

To take a deeper look at the potential differences in volunteer management practices among large organizations where members were specifically identified as having the primary role for volunteer management and/or assisted staff, a secondary analysis of the six practices was undertaken. Table 6 below provides a summary of the mean frequencies with which large organizations engaged in the six practices comparing AFNHA organizations clearly using members to build their capacity versus the comparison organizations.

Table 4. Volunteer Management Practices: Large AFNHA vs. Comparison Organization Size by Member Role

Volunteer Management Practice	Large Organizations							
	2017-18				2018-19			
	AFNHA Organizations*		Comparison Organizations		AFNHA Organizations*		Comparison Organizations	
	Number	Mean	Number	Mean	Number	Mean	Number	Mean
Site actively recruits volunteers.	6	3.8	2	3.0	6	3.3	4	3.3
Volunteers are provided with specific training for their position.	6	4.5	2	3.5	6	3.8	4	3.8
Site has regular supervision and communication with volunteers.	6	4.7	2	3.5	6	3.8	4	3.5
Volunteer projects are well planned and adequate resources provided to support the volunteer.	6	4.2	2	3.5	6	4.0	4	4.0
Volunteers are publicly recognized for their service.	6	3.2	2	3.0	6	3.5	4	3.8
Site collects and tracks volunteer hours and numbers of volunteers.	6	4.7	2	3.5	6	4.3	4	4.8

* Only includes AFNHA host organizations where members were reported to be either directly responsible for or assisted staff with volunteers.

Among large organizations responding to the survey in 2017-18 that clearly used members to build their volunteer management capacity versus comparison organizations, the following differences among the six volunteer management practices were noted.

- Large AFNHA organizations using members to manage volunteers more frequently engaged in all six practices compared to comparison organizations. Based on mean responses

Among large organizations responding to the survey in 2018-19 that used members to build their volunteer management capacity versus comparison organizations, the differences noted were less clear.

- Large AFNHA organizations using members to manage volunteers more frequently engaged in supervision and communication than comparison organization.
- Volunteer recruitment, training and project planning frequency were comparable for both large AFNHA and comparison organizations.
- Large comparison organizations reported they more frequently engaged in volunteer recruitment than large AFNHA organizations based on mean responses for two practices: recognition and volunteer tracking.

The secondary analysis revealed somewhat more frequent use of volunteer management practices among large AFNHA organizations than the comparison group in 2017-18, but less so in 2018-19.

Small Organizations

The survey data for all small AFNHA and comparison organizations was analyzed and mean frequencies for the six practices calculated. Table 3 provides a summary of the results.

Table 5. Volunteer Management Practices: Small AFNHA vs. Comparison Organizations

Volunteer Management Practice	Small Organizations							
	2017-18				2018-19			
	AFNHA Organizations		Comparison Organizations		AFNHA Organizations		Comparison Organizations	
	Number	Mean	Number	Mean	Number	Mean	Number	Mean
Site actively recruits volunteers.	16	2.6	8	3.3	9	3.4	3	4.0
Volunteers are provided with specific training for their position.	16	3.0	8	3.3	9	4.0	3	3.3
Site has regular supervision and communication with volunteers.	16	3.4	8	3.9	9	4.0	3	4.3
Volunteer projects are well planned, and adequate resources provided to support the volunteer.	16	3.0	8	3.5	9	4.0	3	4.3
Volunteers are publicly recognized for their service.	16	3.4	8	3.4	9	4.1	3	4.7
Site collects and tracks volunteer hours and numbers of volunteers.	16	3.1	8	3.0	9	4.0	3	4.3

Among small organizations responding to the survey in 2017-18, the following differences between AFNHA and comparison organizations among the six volunteer management practices were noted.

- Volunteer hour and number tracking were undertaken slightly more frequently by AFNHA organizations than comparison organizations.
- Volunteer recognition frequency was comparable for both AFNHA and comparison organizations.
- Comparison organizations reported they more frequently engaged in four of the six volunteer management practices than AFNHA organizations (recruitment, training, supervision/communication, and project planning) based on mean responses.

Among small organizations responding to the survey in 2018-19, the following differences among the six volunteer management practices were noted.

- Volunteer training was undertaken slightly more frequently by AFNHA organizations than comparison organizations.
- Comparison organizations reported they more frequently engaged in five of the six volunteer management practices than AFNHA organizations (recruitment,

supervision/communication, project planning, recognition, and data tracking) based on mean responses.

In summary, there was only a negligible positive difference in volunteer management practice frequency at small AFNHA organizations compared to the small non-AFNHA organizations.

Possible explanations for this finding include volunteer management at all 8 small comparison organizations were the responsibility of organization staff which likely implies a more consistent approach to volunteer use generally. Organizations invited to be part of the comparison group that had no staff or without strong practices may have self-selected out of responding to the survey. Also, it is also likely the small organizations that hosted AFNHA members were aware they had limited capacity for volunteer management which motivated them to apply for AmeriCorps support.

As the survey did not specifically ask AFNHA organizations to consider the effects of their member(s) while responding how often they engaged in various practices, it is difficult to know how which areas members made the most significant contributions. Also, because the survey did not ask about improvement, only current status.

To take a deeper look at the potential differences in volunteer management practices among small organizations where members were specifically identified as having the primary role for volunteer management and/or assisted staff, a secondary analysis of the six practices was undertaken. Table 4 below provides a summary of the mean frequencies with which small organizations engaged in the six practices comparing AFNHA organizations clearly using members to build their capacity versus the comparison organizations.

Table 6. Volunteer Management Practices: Small AFNHA vs. Comparison Organizations by Member Role

Volunteer Management Practice	Small Organizations							
	2017-18				2018-19			
	AFNHA Organizations*		Comparison Organizations		AFNHA Organizations*		Comparison Organizations	
	Number	Mean	Number	Mean	Number	Mean	Number	Mean
Site actively recruits volunteers.	10	3.1	8	3.3	9	3.4	3	4.0
Volunteers are provided with specific training for their position.	10	3.7	8	3.3	9	4.0	3	3.3
Site has regular supervision and communication with volunteers.	10	3.9	8	3.9	9	4.0	3	4.3
Volunteer projects are well planned and adequate resources provided to support the volunteer.	10	3.8	8	3.5	9	4.0	3	4.3
Volunteers are publicly recognized for their service.	10	3.6	8	3.4	9	4.1	3	4.7

Volunteer Management Practice	Small Organizations							
	2017-18				2018-19			
	AFNHA Organizations*		Comparison Organizations		AFNHA Organizations*		Comparison Organizations	
	Number	Mean	Number	Mean	Number	Mean	Number	Mean
Site collects and tracks volunteer hours and numbers of volunteers.	10	4.3	8	3.0	9	4.0	3	4.3

* Only includes AFNHA host organizations where members were reported to be either directly responsible for or assisted staff with volunteers.

Among small organizations responding to the survey in 2017-18 that clearly used members to build their volunteer management capacity versus comparison organizations, the following differences among the six volunteer management practices were noted.

- Small AFNHA organizations using members to manage volunteers more frequently engaged in four of the six practices compared to comparison organizations: volunteer training, project planning, recognition, and data collection.
- Volunteer supervision and communication frequency was comparable for both small AFNHA and comparison organizations.
- Small comparison organizations reported they more frequently engaged in volunteer recruitment than small AFNHA organizations based on mean responses.

Among small organizations responding to the survey in 2018-19 that used members to build their volunteer management capacity versus comparison organizations, the differences noted were less clear.

- Small AFNHA organizations using members to manage volunteers more frequently engaged in member training than comparison organization.
- Small comparison organizations reported they more frequently engaged in volunteer recruitment than small AFNHA organizations based on mean responses for the other five practices.

The secondary analysis revealed somewhat more frequent use of volunteer management practices among AFNHA organizations than the comparison group in 2017-18, but less so in 2018-19.

Conclusions

The effects of AFNHA members on increasing the capacity of host organizations as compared to organizations without an AFNHA member was unclear based on the collected data. In some analyses, AFNHA organizations reported more frequent engagement in selected practices; in another year, the same advantage was not noted.

Of the AFNHA program sites, 20 sites in 2017-18 and 19 in 2018-19 reported for performance measurement that members at their sites had implemented at least three volunteer management practices. Yet the survey data is not showing clear benefit of longer-

term use of these practices. In comparing this to the clear benefit found in the CalSERVES study for members focusing entirely on volunteer management, this may have implications for AFNHA program model expectations. These results indicate that while AFNHA member service can be useful in managing volunteers, the amount of time they spend on volunteer management compared to direct service is less helpful in achieving long-term capacity building for their organization.

There were also major limitations in the implementation of this study. One of the greatest explanatory factors for the small effects of AFNHA members at their host organizations compared to other organizations is likely the limitation of the data collection tool used. When the survey was administered, the instructions for both groups was the same to eliminate potential differences. There were no additional questions asked which would have allowed AFNHA organizations to indicate the greatest impact their member had on volunteer management practices. Since the survey did not specifically ask AFNHA organizations to consider the effects of their member(s) while responding to how often they engaged in various practices, it is difficult to know how which areas members made the most significant contributions. Also, the survey did not ask about improvement, only current status. There was no way for host organizations to indicate which practices the member had been assigned and had actively participated in. Any assumption that hosting a member improves volunteer program practices across the board did not bear out.

Another time, a survey of host organizations could be more useful if respondents were asked to indicate which practice(s) they felt their member had positively impacted. Rating overall organizational capacity in a multitude of areas that were not part of a member's service description could not provide an accurate picture of the value AFNHA provided to building an organization's capacity to effectively manage volunteers.

Other possible explanations for the inconclusive findings include volunteer management at all 8 small comparison organizations being the responsibility of organization staff which likely implies a more consistent approach to volunteer use generally. Organizations invited to be part of the comparison group that had no staff or without strong practices may have self-selected out of responding to the survey. Also, it is also likely the small organizations that hosted AFNHA members were aware they had limited capacity for volunteer management which motivated them to apply for AmeriCorps support.

All large organizations regardless of group had many more resources and more established volunteer programs. It is unlikely that an ANFHA member would be able to make much significant change in the volunteer program of a large bureaucracy.

Recommendations

The inconclusiveness of the evaluation results has implications for future directions and priorities for the AFNHA program. AFNHA interventions up to now have included volunteer management capacity building as a partial, but significant, portion of the duties for all

members, regardless of their primary direct service assignment. While the evaluation results suggest the value of member support for volunteer management, especially for a number of small community organizations with no or minimal staff, the results also reveal opportunities for continuous improvement of this portion of the AFNHA program moving forward.

1. Reduce the level of priority of capacity building and volunteer management within our program model. This recommendation is reflected in the change in logic model for 2021 grant application to 15% of member time on capacity building, rather than the previous goal of 30%. Remove Capacity Building as a Performance Measure for the program, instead focusing more on member environmental stewardship direct service. AFNHA will continue to collect volunteer data, and member and site reports on volunteer management practices.
2. Work with site supervisors to continue assignment of volunteer management, and organizational capacity building, only for those organizations that identify the need for these services from their AmeriCorps members. Other organizations will prioritize the members' direct service activities if that is needed more for that site.
3. Continue to work to strengthen training in volunteer management and volunteer management practices for the members who have these duties assigned, so that they will be able to follow through with them effectively. Encourage site representatives who also work with volunteers to attend this training as well.

Future Evaluation Opportunities

When measuring the outcomes of member volunteer management activities in the future, revisions to the survey (e.g., the number of questions, content, and wording) would allow AFNHA to more accurately assess the benefits that are directly related to AmeriCorps member service. It would be useful to have feedback from members and supervisors about what specific activities were most feasible for members to assist with, as well as the effectiveness of those efforts.

If still of interest, another evaluation could revisit the second evaluation question that was not included in the current analysis and report: To what extent do community organizations with volunteer management support by AFNHA AmeriCorps members show *improvements* in volunteer capacity over time? This would require a different approach to collecting baseline data and tracking improvements over time than was included in the current study.

For the next round of AFNHA AmeriCorps program evaluation, we plan to look at elements of our member direct service activities, rather than capacity building. We are adapting our program model to focus more on stewardship education, which is appropriate for many of our organizations. Our next evaluation is intended to help us shape this shift in our program focus and give us the tools to effectively measure outcomes, and in the future to measure impact, of stewardship education delivered by AmeriCorps members.

Appendix A: Volunteer Management Capacity Survey

AFNHA Volunteer Management Survey

INTRODUCTION

Thank you for your participation in the Appalachian Forest Heritage Area (AFHA) volunteer management survey. This survey asks about your organization and the site where service members and/or volunteers work.

The purpose of the survey is to understand how volunteers overall are coordinated and managed in order to contribute to the work of sites. The survey will also help AFHA understand how we can support our sites with volunteer management and coordination.

We will ask about two types of help, service members and volunteers. Service members are individuals who are usually paid through a stipend (such as AmeriCorps members or interns). Volunteers are unpaid sources of help who may have many roles in your program (including helping with one-time events, or ongoing roles such as board members, committee members, docents, etc.)

For some questions we ask you to think back over the past year, generally between September 1, 2017, and September 1, 2018. For other questions think about your organization in general.

We use the term "site" to mean the location where service members and/or volunteers are supervised, work, and/or work out of (office, museum, etc.)

If you think there is someone else who should also be completing the survey, please feel free to forward the link. We want survey completed from one person with each site who has substantial interaction with service members and volunteers.

We appreciate your taking the time to complete the survey, which should take 15 to 30 minutes. If you have any questions please feel free to contact our researcher, Maryann Durland at mdurland@durlandconsulting.com or 630.650.9944

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Location Information

Name of Person completing survey:

Email _____

Phone number _____

Name of site: Town nearest site location _____

2. What type of an organization is your site a part of?

[--Please Select--]

- Federal Government
- State Government
- Local Government
- Legal Non-profit
- Unaffiliated/ friends of/ etc
- Other

3. Which best describes your site?

[--Please Select--]

- Subsidiary, branch, or office of a larger organization
- Program focusing on specific purposes within a larger organization
- Commission/Authority or other quasi-governmental organization
- Single stand-alone organization
- Other (describe) _____

4. Estimate the percentage of program emphasis for each relevant service focus area for your site.
 (To equal 100%) The sum of all entered values must be 100.

- Community Development _____
- Cultural Networking & Arts _____
- Tourism _____
- Environment/natural resources conservation _____
- Environmental education & outreach _____
- Heritage development & interpretation _____
- Historic Preservation _____
- Other _____

5. During the past year (September - September), what was the number of full-time paid staff for your site?

6. During the past year (September - September) what was the number of part-time or seasonal paid staff for your site?

7. Overall, how important are volunteers to your site?

- Extremely Important
- Very Important
- Moderately Important
- Slightly Important
- Not at All Important

8. Additional Comments

SERVICE MEMBERS & VOLUNTEERS

9. Over the past year, what was the total number of service members (stipended or paid) who helped your site; and how many total hours did they work, per type.

	Numbe	Hours

AFHA Americorps	—	—
VISTA	—	—
Other National Service Member	—	—
Student Conservation Association (SCA) with stipend	—	—
College Intern with stipend	—	—
Other	—	—

10. Over the past year, what is the total number of volunteers (unpaid) who helped your site, and approximately how many total hours did they work, per type.

	Number	Hours
Episodic (1-3 times a year) volunteers		
Ongoing volunteers (board members, docents, committee members, etc)	—	—

11. Over the past year, did you have a process to track hours for volunteers?

	Number	Hours
Episodic (1-3 times a year) volunteers	—	—
Ongoing volunteers (board members, docents, committee members, etc)	—	—

0. If you selected yes, could you briefly describe your process?

1. Who at your site had primary responsibility for coordinating volunteers (including; planning, recruiting, managing, training, recognizing, etc.)

[--Please Select One--]

- No-one
- Exec Director or similar leadership position
- Volunteer Coordinator or similar staff position
- Other staff as part of their position
- AmeriCorps service member
- Other stipended service members
- Volunteer assigned as volunteer coordinator
- Other
- If other, please specify _____

14. Approximately how many total hours did they spend coordinating volunteers?

15. Who else at your site assists with coordinating volunteers (Including: planning, recruiting, managing, training, recognizing, etc)? (Select as many as applicable)

- No-one
- Exec Director or similar leadership position
- Volunteer Coordinator or similar staff position
- Other staff as part of their position
- AmeriCorps service member
- Other stipended service members
- Volunteer assigned as volunteer coordinator
- Other
- If other, please specify _____

16. Approximately how many total hours, altogether, did they spend coordinating volunteers?

17. What was your role regarding supervising and working with volunteers?

18. Your volunteer coordinator, staff, and/or board receive specific training in working with volunteers effectively.

	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Volunteer coordinator	○	○	○	○	○
Staff	○	○	○	○	○
Supervisors	○	○	○	○	○
Administration	○	○	○	○	○
Board	○	○	○	○	○

VOLUNTEER MANAGEMENT

The next sets of questions apply to your overall site and volunteers in general. Volunteers are unpaid, and may include board members and other ongoing volunteers, as well as episodic or occasional volunteers.

The sections will include:

- Volunteer Planning
- Volunteer Recruiting
- Volunteer Training
- Volunteer Management
- Volunteer Recognition
- Volunteer Data & Evaluation

19. At what level does your site have a process or plan that methodically and strategically addresses volunteer involvement in the organization.

Process is in place and consistently used	Process is in place but not consistently used	We are developing a process	We do not have a process, but is on agenda	A process is not required or needed
---	---	-----------------------------	--	-------------------------------------

If other, please specify

20. Your site plans and allocates resources for the support and management of volunteers.

Consistently	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
--------------	---------	-----------	--------	-------

21. Your site has and applies written policies and procedures for volunteer management.

Consistently	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
--------------	---------	-----------	--------	-------

0. Volunteer policies for your site adequately and appropriately address risk management and safety issues.

Consistently	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
--------------	---------	-----------	--------	-------

0. Your site actively recruits volunteers.

Consistently	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
--------------	---------	-----------	--------	-------

1. Your site conducts targeted volunteer recruitment efforts based on specific needs or jobs.

Consistently	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
--------------	---------	-----------	--------	-------

2. Job or task descriptions for volunteers have been developed.

Consistently	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
--------------	---------	-----------	--------	-------

3. Volunteers are matched to positions based on their interests and skills

Consistently	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
--------------	---------	-----------	--------	-------

4. Flexibility has been built into the positions to suit varying volunteer skills, schedules and interests.

Consistently	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
--------------	---------	-----------	--------	-------

28. Your volunteers undergo orientation training which provides them with a clear understanding of the site and its policies.

Consistently	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
--------------	---------	-----------	--------	-------

29. Your volunteers are provided with specific training for their position.

Consistently	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
--------------	---------	-----------	--------	-------

30. Your organization provides additional skill training and/or professional development for your volunteers.

Consistently	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
--------------	---------	-----------	--------	-------

31 Your site has regular supervision and communication with volunteers.

Consistently	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
--------------	---------	-----------	--------	-------

32 Volunteer projects are well planned and adequate resources provided to support the volunteer.

Consistently	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
--------------	---------	-----------	--------	-------

33 Each volunteer is provided with team leader, mentoring or individual support that they need to serve effectively.

Consistently	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
--------------	---------	-----------	--------	-------

34 Volunteers are encouraged to get more involved with the organization, and offered opportunities for additional or different tasks when they are ready

Consistently	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
--------------	---------	-----------	--------	-------

35 Your volunteers receive informal or personal thanks for their service.

Consistently	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
--------------	---------	-----------	--------	-------

36. Your volunteers are publicly recognized for their service.

Consistently	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
--------------	---------	-----------	--------	-------

37. Volunteer performance is regularly evaluated and feedback given to volunteers.

Consistently	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
--------------	---------	-----------	--------	-------

38. Your site collects and tracks volunteer hours and numbers of volunteers.

Consistently	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
--------------	---------	-----------	--------	-------

39. Your organization collects information and data on volunteer accomplishments, results and outcomes of their activities.

Consistently	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
--------------	---------	-----------	--------	-------

0. Evaluation results of volunteer activities and outcomes are used for continual improvement of our site and volunteer program.

Consistently	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
--------------	---------	-----------	--------	-------

1. Your site regularly and actively seeks advice or input from its volunteers.

Consistently	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
--------------	---------	-----------	--------	-------

40. Data and evaluation results of volunteer activities and impacts are shared with:

	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
No one	<input type="radio"/>				
Volunteers	<input type="radio"/>				
Service members	<input type="radio"/>				
Board and Administration	<input type="radio"/>				
Community or public	<input type="radio"/>				
Funding sources/donors	<input type="radio"/>				
Main office	<input type="radio"/>				
others	<input type="radio"/>				

41. If you would like to add anything to help us understand volunteer management at your organization, please do so here. Thank you.

Appendix B: References

- (UPS 1998) "Managing Volunteers, A Report From: United Parcel Service." 1998.
<http://academic.regis.edu/volunteer/specialcollection/specfiles/1998upssurvey.pdf>
- (Volunteering 2015) "Volunteering and Civic Life in America 2015", Corporation for National and Community Service & National Conference on Citizenship.
(www.VolunteeringInAmerica.gov),
- (Urban, Charities 2004) "Volunteer Management Capacity in America's Charities and Congregations" Mark A Hagar, The Urban Institute 2004
<http://www.urban.org/research/publication/volunteer-management-capacity-americas-charities-and-congregations>
- (Knepper 2015) "Volunteer Management Practices during Challenging Economic Times," Knepper, Hillary; D'Agostino, Maria J.; and Levine, Helisse (2015) Journal of Public Management & Social Policy: Vol. 20: No. 2, Article 7. [Http://digitalscholarship.tsu.edu/jpmsp/vol20/iss2/7/](http://digitalscholarship.tsu.edu/jpmsp/vol20/iss2/7/)
- (Volunteering: Issue Brief 2010). "Volunteering in America 2010: Issue Brief. National, State, and City Information", Corporation for National and Community Service, Office of Research and Policy Development Washington, DC. 2010, June.
http://www.nationalservice.gov/organizations/default/files/documents/10_0614_via_final_issue_brief.pdf
- ([Idealist.org](http://www.idealists.org)) "Why is Volunteer Management Important?"
[Idealist.org. http://www.idealists.org/info/VolunteerMgmt/Important](http://www.idealists.org/info/VolunteerMgmt/Important)
- (Urban, Volunteers 2004) "Volunteer Management Practices and Retention of Volunteers". The Urban Institute. June 2004.
<http://www.urban.org/organizations/default/files/alfresco/publication-pdfs/411005-Volunteer-Management-Practices-and-Retention-of-Volunteers.PDF>
- (ruralvolunteer.org) "Toolkit for Working with Rural Volunteers". Appalachian Coal Country Team and Western Hardrock Watershed Team <http://ruralvolunteer.org/>
- (Transforming, 2010) "Transforming Communities Through Service: A Collection of the Most Innovative AmeriCorps State and Volunteer Generation Fund Programs in the United States" A report by America's Service Commissions and Innovations in Civic Participation, April 2010, <http://www.icicp.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Transforming-Communities-Through-Service.pdf>
- (volunteer.maryland.gov) Web site of Volunteer Maryland AmeriCorps program, Our Impact tab. (<http://volunteer.maryland.gov/volunteer-maryland-results/>)
- (CaSERVES 2012) "AmeriCorps VIP Volunteer Capacity Study", JBS International, Inc., November 2012,
http://www.nationalservice.gov/organizations/default/files/evidenceexchange/FR_CaliforniaVolunteers_CaSERVES-NCOE_AmeriCorpsVIP.pdf

(United Way, King County 2009) “Volunteer Management: Challenges and Opportunities Facing Non-Profits”. Rick Lynch, Nikki Russell, United Way, King County. 2009.
<http://www.thenonprofitpartnership.org/files/volunteer-management-uw-king.pdf>

Building Volunteer Management Capacity for Community Organizations, Outcome Evaluation Study, Appalachian Forest Heritage Area AmeriCorps: Enhancing Assets to Benefit Communities, Durland, Maryann, AFNHA staff, January 2017.

Appendix C: Evaluation Team

Dr. Maryann Durland Ph.D – Senior Evaluator, Study Analysis

Dr. Durland began her work in evaluation in the mid-1970's with Title I monitoring and evaluation at the Louisiana State Department of Education. She received her Doctorate in Educational Research Methodology, August 1996, from Louisiana State University and holds a Class A Evaluation Certificate from Louisiana. She specializes in social network analysis and mixed methods and models evaluations and is currently completing the Field Guide to Social Network Analysis in Evaluation, for Stanford University Press (2016). She was one of the founding members of the American Evaluation Association TIG, Social Network Analysis. She has conducted evaluations for non-profits, schools and school systems, and businesses. She has very strong communication and facilitation skills as well as problem solving skills. In addition, she has strong research skills including both quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis and social network analysis. She has presented consistently conferences since 1996.

Durland Consulting started in 2001 and since then has conducted over 40 mixed methods and models evaluations. Durland Consulting's clients have included WESTAT, University of Washington, Community Science/ Robert Woods Johnson, NDI, Price-Waterhouse-Coopers, Battelle Energy Alliance, Arthur Andersen, Rockford School District, North Cook Intermediate Service Center, South Cook Education Consortium, the Knight Foundation, National Lewis University, West Virginia University at Parkersburg, as well as consultation on social network analysis to many independent consultants.

Dr. Durland conducted statistical analysis of the Volunteer Capacity Survey results and developed findings from that analysis.

AFNHA Staff

Phyllis Baxter, AFNHA Executive Director has worked with AFNHA since 2001 and has been Program Director for AFNHA AmeriCorps from the start of the program in 2007. She has a Masters degree in History with a post-graduate certificate in Public History. She has extensive experience with grant writing, project management, and administration over a 25-year career in historic preservation and non-profit management. She attended the CNCS Research Summit in December 2015 and has participated in Volunteer West Virginia evaluation trainings. Baxter had primary responsibility for overseeing this program evaluation.

Logan Smith, AFNHA Financial and Program Administrator, is responsible for administration and bookkeeping for AFNHA and the AmeriCorps grant, and assists with program supervision. Smith has attended CNCS specific trainings such as the Leadership Forum for Non-Profit Executives held at the University of Washington, which included a week-long evaluation module, CNCS sponsored financial management training held in Wisconsin, and CNCS Regional Conferences. He assisted with evaluation and survey design and data collection.