



**TRANSFER OF
KNOWLEDGE
WORKSHOP**

**VOLUNTEERS IN
JUVENILE PROBATION, 1987
A CALIFORNIA SURVEY**



108863,

Conducted by
State of California

DEPARTMENT OF THE YOUTH AUTHORITY
Prevention and Community Corrections Branch

State of California

GEORGE DEUKMEJIAN,
GOVERNOR

Youth and Adult Correctional Agency

N. A. CHADERJIAN,
SECRETARY



Department of the

Youth Authority

C. A. TERHUNE
DIRECTOR

FRANCISCO J. ALARCON
ACTING CHIEF DEPUTY DIRECTOR

PREVENTION & COMMUNITY
CORRECTIONS BRANCH

Transfer of Knowledge Workshop
on Volunteers in Juvenile Probation

Richard W. Tillson, Assistant
Deputy Director

Arthur D. Nettles, Regional
Administrator

Patricia Armstrong, Consultant

JAMES EMBREE
Acting Deputy Director
**INSTITUTIONS AND CAMPS
BRANCH**

WILBUR A. BECKWITH
Deputy Director
PAROLE SERVICES BRANCH

RONALD W. HAYES
Deputy Director
**PREVENTION AND COMMUNITY
CORRECTIONS BRANCH**

BARBARA ALLMAN
Acting Deputy Director
**ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES
BRANCH**

108863

VOLUNTEERS IN JUVENILE PROBATION, 1987

A California Survey

Conducted by

State of California
Department of the Youth Authority
Prevention and Community Corrections Branch

NCJRS

JAN 28 1988

ACQUISITIONS

A Report for the
Transfer of Knowledge Workshop
on Volunteers in Juvenile Probation

April 29-30/May 1, 1987

108863

**U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice**

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been
granted by
California Department of the
Youth Authority

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

A Report for the
Transfer of Knowledge Workshop on
Volunteers in Juvenile Probation,
April 29-30/May 1, 1987

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
George Deukmejian, Governor

YOUTH AND ADULT CORRECTIONAL AGENCY
N. A. Chaderjian, Secretary

DEPARTMENT OF THE YOUTH AUTHORITY
C. A. Terhune, Director

PREVENTION AND COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS
BRANCH
Ronald W. Hayes, Deputy Director

CONTENTS

Summaryiv
Background.	1
The Survey.	2
Volunteers in Juvenile Probation--The State of the State.	4
How Many Departments Use Volunteers?	4
How Are Volunteers Used?	5
People, Hours, Settings.	5
Activities	6
Are Volunteers Effective?.	8
Organizing for Volunteers.10
Volunteer Coordinators10
Programming for the Volunteer.11
Recruiting12
Screening.12
Evaluation and Planning13
Organizational Issues.13
The Continuing Challenge15
Appendix: Survey on Volunteers in Juvenile Probation17

SUMMARY

This survey on the status, usefulness, and issues of volunteer work in California juvenile probation was initiated by Chapter 798 of the Statutes of 1986 (AB 4030). In a statewide survey of probation departments, the Youth Authority has found that 75% to 80% of probation departments use volunteers in juvenile work. Statewide, nearly 4,500 volunteers provide these services in a typical month (averaging from one to three "workdays" a month, depending on work site).

About 85% of those volunteers serve in juvenile halls and county camps, delivering a variety of counseling help and other services. Over three-fourths of departments using volunteers in juvenile work rate their services as "very useful," especially as the activities augment and enrich probation programs. Some counties indicate large cost savings as a result.

At least 13 counties have also formed one or more specialized auxiliaries, such as Volunteers in Probation, dedicated to individual help, group activities, and sometimes fund-raising for youth programs in probation.

About nine or ten larger departments rely on volunteer coordinators who work essentially full time in that role. Still, about half the departments which use volunteers in juvenile probation face some organizational issues: lack of time to work with volunteers, sometimes high turnover, and other issues of organizing for effective volunteer use. Findings from a 1974 Youth Authority survey are no less applicable today. The organizational challenge for 1987 is to develop innovative approaches and mechanisms for truly integrating volunteer services into the daily work of probation.

These survey data contributed to a Transfer of Knowledge Workshop on "Volunteers in Juvenile Probation," as required by Chapter 798 of the Statutes of 1986 (Assembly Bill 4030). The workshop proceedings and findings will be published in the near future.

VOLUNTEERS IN JUVENILE PROBATION, 1987

A California Survey

Background

For years, as California probation departments have worked to straighten out the lives of juvenile offenders, local residents have often pitched in to help. They receive no pay (some college students earn credits), yet many devote hours and energy to a range of probation tasks. These are the volunteers in juvenile probation.

At a statewide level, they are virtually a hidden army of helpers, since their contributions don't easily find their way into our larger justice-system data banks. Their efforts do, however, have impact on young offenders and probation departments. Thus we are led to learn more about volunteers who work with juveniles supervised by probation departments. What is the status of those efforts in 1987? What are the issues and opportunities surrounding volunteers who work with young offenders?

The Legislature's interest was expressed in Chapter 798 of the Statutes of 1986 (Assembly Bill 4030), which required the Department of the Youth Authority to (1) conduct a statewide survey focused on volunteers working

with youthful offenders, and (2) convene a Transfer of Knowledge Workshop as follow-up to that survey. Several of the issues and possibilities raised in these pages were thus key topics in the April 29-30/May 1, 1987 TOK Workshop on Volunteers in Juvenile Probation. Chapter 798 likewise required the Youth Authority to publish summary findings/recommendations of that broad-based workshop.

The Youth Authority is convinced that better understanding can lead to more effective use of volunteers. Nonetheless, any survey count or workshop model proceeds from a more fundamental observation: If volunteers are "resources" to be counted and "effectively utilized," they are, beyond that, people who exemplify the finest traditions of neighborhood and community participation. This is a special group. Some years ago, a national commission urged that if our justice systems are truly going to work, "there must be a willingness on the part of citizens to give of themselves, their time, their energy, and their imagination." The volunteers in juvenile probation take that ideal to heart.

The Survey

In January/February 1987, the Youth Authority (Prevention & Community Corrections Branch) surveyed all 58 probation departments, seeking information on the uses and issues of volunteer work with juveniles supervised by probation. A survey form (see Appendix) was mailed to each chief probation officer, who (in most cases) asked a knowledgeable staff person to fill out the form.

The survey form was designed to gather basic information but also, in small part, to follow up a similar Youth Authority survey conducted in 1974. That survey, hereafter called "Survey '74," was only somewhat comparable to this survey. Survey '74 essentially sought out probation departments (among others) which used volunteers, then focused mainly on combined adult-juvenile probation questions. On the other hand, some survey similarities permit comment on 1974 to 1987 changes.

In the current survey, 49 of the 58 probation departments, or 84%, returned completed forms. Many of those 49 also sent brochures, handbooks, and other material, which was used for TOK Workshop preparation and model development. For data comparison purposes: Of the 9 departments which didn't respond, 6 were small Northern California counties. (Those tended to have similar population characteristics as counties which returned forms but reported no use of volunteers.)

In the summaries that follow, item numbers refer to the survey form in the Appendix.

Elaine Duxbury, Project Director, Correctional Volunteer Programs in California--Survey '74, Department of the Youth Authority, June, 1975.

Volunteers in Juvenile Probation--
The State of the State

How Many Departments
Use Volunteers?

Perhaps 75% to 80% of California probation departments use volunteers in direct contact with juveniles. Judging strictly from Item 1 responses, 78% (38 of the 49 responding departments) use such volunteers. On the other hand, three of the "no" replies were accompanied by descriptions of previous or anticipated use. Balanced against those responses are the 9 non-responding counties, which may be less likely to work with volunteers.

Of the 11 counties which reported not using such volunteers, 10 were rather low population counties in Northern California. Six of the 11 offered comments, ranging from "no, but definitely interested" to "no staff to train and supervise," "have to monitor cases and volunteers," and "doesn't free staff--takes additional staff..." But surely there is an additional factor: The work of volunteers is especially helpful in local juvenile-probation facilities (the site of 85% of volunteers in this survey). Of the 11 small counties which reported not using volunteers, 6 had no juvenile hall, 10 had no county camp/ranch. In a sense, the traditional volunteer "settings" simply aren't available everywhere.

Survey '74 located 37 probation departments which used volunteers, whereas 38 (or up to 41, depending on definition) became known in this survey. Perhaps the difference signifies a small gain, but that is not clear.

NOTE: For the remainder of the report, except where noted, the data are based on those 78% (38/49) of probation departments which reported use of volunteers in direct work with juveniles. (However, not every department answered all items.)

How Are Volunteers Used?

People, Hours, Settings. Throughout California, the number of volunteers and their hours donated to juvenile probation are impressive (Item 4). Statewide, in an average month, 4,486 volunteers give their services, based on survey replies. The mean average (per month) for 38 counties-- 118 volunteers "each"--is misleading because of sheer population differences in a state of immense diversity. In one small mountain county, we are drawn to that single volunteer tutor helping a handful of probationers stay in school. In Los Angeles County, over 1,600 volunteers devote time to young offenders in an average month.

According to the statewide returns, volunteers work in greatest numbers in juvenile-probation facilities. Of those 4,486 statewide volunteers in an average month, 85% (3,798) are used in juvenile halls and camps/ranches.

Juvenile Halls: Volunteers are used by 32 of the 38 departments. The median number of volunteers during any month is 25 per county. The median hours per month donated by each volunteer is 10--more than one workday a month. (Note that 15 California counties do not have juvenile halls.)

Camps/Ranches: Volunteers are used by 21 of the 38 departments. The median number of volunteers during any month is 24 per county. The median hours per month donated by each volunteer is 10--more than one workday a month. (Note that only 23 counties have camps/ranches.)

Field Probation: Volunteers are used by 29 of the 38 departments. The median number of volunteers during any month is 5 per county. The median hours per month donated by each volunteer is 22--nearly three workdays a month.

Elsewhere (Various special tasks): Volunteers are used by 15 of the 38 departments. The median number of volunteers during any month is 5 per county. The median hours per month donated by each volunteer is 15--nearly two workdays a month.

Activities. Survey respondents described a variety of tasks/activities/services provided by local volunteers (Items 4, 7). While no doubt a few volunteers here and there do "busywork," the great majority of survey descriptions indicated that volunteer tasks are integral to program components.

Activity descriptions were grouped in categories to allow a rough comparison of services among departments. Especially does "general counseling" contribute to programming--that is, helpful discussions with youngsters, long talks about problems and practical solutions (usually with youth in confinement), or the friendly support of an "outsider" during stressful times.

Next most often mentioned, though not easily separated, was a category of activity characterized largely by "companionship" and practical help. Here, even "transportation" sometimes adds a personal touch when a youngster needs it. Clearly, a "general personal relationship" with young offenders is a main contribution, as perceived by numerous survey respondents.

Religious volunteers are a major factor in juvenile probation--especially in juvenile halls and camps/ranches. Although survey data did not allow precise accounting, many "religious" volunteers clearly furnish nonreligious assistance, from hobbies and other recreation to counseling and general companionship.

Recreation, targeted drug/alcohol counseling, and various school activities, such as tutoring, likewise comprise volunteer services in most probation departments which use volunteers.

Indeed, the variety of activities in most probation departments is noteworthy. Most departments rely on volunteers for several kinds of services. The 38 departments use volunteers as follows:

<u>Activity</u>	<u>No. of Departments</u>	
General Counseling	35	(92%)
Other ("companionship," practical help, etc.)	31	(82%)
Religious	26	(68%)
Recreation	26	(68%)
Drug/Alcohol Counseling	25	(66%)
School/Tutoring	25	(66%)
Employment-related	17	(45%)

If churches and other religious organizations are important to volunteer efforts, so, too, are other groups and categories of people. At least 28 departments work with college student interns, and 17 departments mentioned the help of various private-sector organizations/affiliations.

Colleges provide a key agency relationship, since students learn about the justice system while contributing service to it. Although use of college interns is widespread, typically just a few students at a time work in most departments. Several departments mentioned plans for even more involvement with college intern programs in the months ahead.

"Outside" groups, according to a number of respondents, bring vitality and fresh perspective to agency work with young offenders. Describing group events as well as individual volunteer help, statewide respondents gave credit to many organizations, such as various "juvenile hall auxiliaries," service leagues, Foster Grandparents, Big Brothers and Big Sisters, large and small corporations, a host of civic organizations, specialized groups (Alcoholics Anonymous, etc.), 4H groups, cultural/ethnic associations, fraternities, and on and on.

And inevitably, each locality draws on its own resources: In metropolitan areas, a famous football player from the NFL Alumni Association may speak about drugs to a group of youngsters, whereas a small mountain county may depend on neighborhood activity groups to work with youth on a one-to-one basis. At least 13 counties have formed one or more specialized auxiliaries, such as Volunteers in Probation, dedicated to individual help and group activities in juvenile probation. In at least 14 counties (Item 16), volunteers are involved in fund-raising activities in behalf of youth programs in the probation setting.

Are Volunteers Effective?

Although it's beyond the scope of this survey to connect volunteerism to youth behavior, it is patently evident that probation departments perceive

a unique effectiveness in the work of volunteers. They provide valuable contributions, according to survey respondents. Item 5 asked for a rating of overall usefulness of volunteers working with "juveniles supervised by your department." The response of the 38 departments was highly favorable:

Very useful	29	(76%)
Somewhat useful	8	(21%)
Unsure	-	
Not especially useful	-	
Useless, waste of time, or harmful	1	(3%)

But what do volunteers bring to youth in trouble and to probation departments? When asked about the benefits of volunteers (Item 5a), respondents tended to describe (in detail or concept) a dimension of "program enhancement," a kind of augmentation of program that otherwise wouldn't--perhaps couldn't--be developed:

<u>Benefits: Response Emphasis</u>	<u>No. of Departments (of 38)</u>	
Provides program enhancement, addition to resources, enriched programming, expanded services, etc.	34	(89%)
Provides more individualized help/attention to the juvenile offender	20	(53%)
Provides personal help with a special slant: nonauthority, nonsystem, a "real" person with no ax to grind	14	(37%)
Practical, targeted help: school, work, access to resources, etc.	7	(18%)

These are tangible benefits, several departments pointed out. One department of medium size indicated that its annual 10,000-plus volunteer hours were valued at nearly \$36,000. A large department had calculated "over \$500,000" cost savings due to volunteer work in 1985-86.

When asked about the problems of volunteers working with young offenders (Item 5b), the two leading replies were variations on inconsistency in providing those program benefits. Sixteen departments mentioned high turnover of volunteers, and 16 mentioned "attendance problems with some," or drifting commitment (which some respondents viewed as an occasional drain on probation work in contrast with the usual augmentation of department effectiveness). About 10 or 12 respondents mentioned some variation of lack of qualification/experience or failure of some volunteers to adhere to procedures, including overfamiliarity with court wards. (Some volunteers, according to a number of respondents, are overzealous, expecting to perform a "quick fix" with maladjusted youngsters.) Nonetheless, while respondents were asked to discuss both benefits and problems--and they freely did--the bottom line, clearly, was to extol the usefulness of volunteers in juvenile probation.

Organizing for Volunteers

Volunteer Coordinators. About 9 or 10 probation departments have full-time "volunteer coordinators" devoted essentially to that function, based on Items 2 and 3, combined with other comments. Those, of course, are larger departments in more populous counties.

Of the departments using volunteers with juveniles, about two-thirds assign a single staff person (or a few people) to oversee matters pertaining to volunteers. That responsibility, however, tends to be "added duty"--often low priority--except in the 9 or 10 larger departments mentioned above.

In the other one-third of departments using volunteers, the coordination/supervision of volunteers is less centralized, sometimes variable, depending on the particular assignment of a volunteer. Clearly, the smaller departments, using fewer volunteers, depend more on informal relationships and ad hoc assignments. Although the data are difficult to compare, centralized coordination of volunteers may have decreased somewhat in recent years. (Survey '74: "Almost all probation departments have someone designated to head their volunteer program.") In a number of departments, as we shall see, coordinating and managing volunteer activities is not without difficulty.

Programming for the Volunteer. Only a few larger counties--6 of 38--reported a volunteer program budget (Item 10). A little over half (20/36, Item 11) have a written statement of policy or objectives, involving various degrees of detail and focus. That was slightly fewer than reported in Survey '74. In the current survey, some 40% of departments (14/35) have written job descriptions for volunteers, about the same as Survey '74.

Recruiting. Methods of recruiting volunteers vary with locale (Item 9). Especially do some larger counties recruit via the public media. Smaller counties depend more on informal contacts and word of mouth. Popular recruitment approaches among the 38 departments include:

	<u>No. of Departments</u>	
Colleges (interns)	20	(53%),
Organizations, community service clubs, speakers bureau, other agencies, etc.	17	(45%)
Local volunteer bureau/coordinator, volunteer organizations	14	(37%)
Newsletters, brochures, posters, etc.	10	(26%)
Churches, religious organizations	10	(26%)

Screening. Screening of volunteers is no small matter to probation departments (Item 13). Nearly all counties perform a law enforcement check on volunteer applicants, with nearly 60% (21/36) checking fingerprints. About three-fourths of departments obtain and check personal references. (Law enforcement/fingerprint checks are more common now than in Survey '74.)

Nearly two-thirds of the departments indicated they don't use "clients or ex-offenders" as volunteers (Item 17). In Survey '74, two-thirds of the departments said they do use clients/ex-offenders, with one-third "actively recruiting." For some departments in the current survey, there is a one-year (or other) "clean" waiting period. Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous groups were typically cited on this question.

Evaluation and Planning. Only six departments said they do not evaluate their volunteer activities, but two-thirds called their evaluation "rather informal" (Item 19). In Survey '74, nearly one-third of probation departments reported no evaluation.

In early 1987, less than half (17) the probation departments are planning to increase the number of volunteers working with juvenile offenders (Item 20). In Survey '74, over three-fourths of departments were planning increases. It is unknown whether the passing years have culminated in a point of diminishing returns, a leveling off in the possibilities--or in an increasing recognition that even volunteers require an organization's careful attention.

Organizational Issues. When asked about any consistent problems "in coordinating use of volunteers in your department," county respondents often acknowledged that even volunteerism (involving "free resources") can raise planning issues (Item 18):

<u>Problem</u>	<u>No. of Departments (of 38)</u>	
Lack of time to deal with volunteers	21	(55%)
High turnover of volunteers	20	(53%)
Lack of facilities, funding, or department staffing	18	(47%)
Lack of staff acceptance/ support	12	(32%)
Lack of volunteers	11	(29%)
Lack of organization/ coordination	9	(24%)

Volunteers not reliable	8	(21%)
Insurance problems	5	(13%)
Lack of community acceptance/ support	3	(8%)
Confused match: volunteers with tasks	3	(8%)
Lack of administrative support	2	(5%)
Volunteers not effective	2	(5%)
Other	2	(5%)

In short, about half the departments perceived problems involving lack of time, high turnover, and staffing issues. Survey '74 results were not dissimilar. Six of the checklist choices were offered by both surveys. The two leading problems in the current survey (lack of time, high turnover) were not on the Survey '74 problem list. But the third leading problem in the current survey (lack of facilities, funding, staffing) was the top problem in Survey '74. In the current survey, 47% checked off that staffing problem; in Survey '74, 54%. (Lack of staff acceptance/support was the next-highest-rated problem in both surveys: current survey, 32%; Survey '74, 51%.)

Judging from survey comments, "lack of time to deal with volunteers" is one aspect of "lack of facilities, funding, staffing." For effective utilization, volunteers do require more time and attention from paid staff--planning, supervision, training--than often occurs under the press of other staff duties. When volunteer turnover is high, the problem is obviously compounded.

One distinction is worth emphasizing: If volunteer turnover, combined with limited staff time, is a problem, volunteer effectiveness per se is not. Only two departments checked "volunteers not effective."

Among departments using volunteers, there seems a near consensus that solving those occasional organizational problems is well worth the effort. One survey respondent summed it up:

Volunteer work in corrections enables the person on the street to experience first hand the opportunity to help. People enjoy it and provide wonderful services... The clients begin to see another side of life, and many times benefit from the relationship. Despite the usual daily problems of any program that brokers people, volunteering provides a climate for a win-win situation.

The Continuing Challenge

Volunteers in juvenile probation continue to provide valuable--and appreciated--services to youth and local agencies. Still, in many departments, the main challenge persists. For a number of localities, the findings of Survey '74 are no less applicable in 1987. How do we best "build in" volunteer resources to agency work?

Concluded Survey '74:

As this human resource has grown, so too has the problem of adequately providing the necessary operational and organizational tools to successfully integrate citizen volunteers with government functions. The problem of providing adequate program staff to mobilize volunteers to contribute a variety of services to the correctional process within a definitive program structure is by no means easily resolved. (P. 48.)

In the current survey, too, ideas for improvement (Item 6) were usually broad themes on managing/supervising/structuring volunteer efforts inside a department. Nineteen of the responses recommended more or different training of volunteers (or training volunteers and staff). About 16 responses essentially pointed to the need for a better "volunteer coordinator" role, or equivalent approaches to integrating volunteers into the tasks of probation.

In at least one county, a knowledgeable volunteer is the coordinator. Elsewhere, a well established volunteer auxiliary group itself coordinates the recruitment and placement of individual volunteers. Other respondents recommended a revitalizing of a previous statewide network of volunteer coordinators, with regionalized sharing of plans and solutions.

Can some volunteer-coordinator functions be better structured, formalized, and provided more time and priority? Thus did a variety of survey replies underscore the challenge for the decade ahead--integrating the volunteer into the everyday work of juvenile probation.

Based partly on this survey, the April 29-30/May 1, 1987 Transfer of Knowledge Workshop (see pp. 1-2) explored these and related issues. The summary findings of the TOK Workshop will be published in the near future.

APPENDIX

SURVEY ON VOLUNTEERS IN JUVENILE PROBATION

conducted by

Department of the Youth Authority
Prevention & Community Corrections Branch

The purpose of this statewide survey is to learn more about volunteers who work with juveniles supervised by probation departments. The Legislature's interest was recently expressed in Chapter 798 of the Statutes of 1986. What are the issues and opportunities surrounding volunteers who work with young offenders?

We in the Youth Authority hope you might share your expertise on volunteer activities, issues, and possibilities. Your information is indispensable to our understanding, and we thank you for your help.

We would much appreciate your taking the time to fill out this survey form. Would you PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM BY FEBRUARY 7, 1987 if possible? Enclosed is a postage-paid envelope for return to: Survey on Volunteers in Juvenile Probation, California Youth Authority, Prevention & Community Corrections Branch, 4241 Williamsborough Drive, Sacramento, California 95823.

Could you send along any other material?
We would also find extremely useful:

Any brochures, fact sheets, or
reports on volunteers working
with juvenile offenders.

If you have questions or comments, please phone our survey coordinator: Doug Knight, Youth Authority, Prevention & Community Corrections Branch (Sacramento), at (916) 427-4752.

Name of Agency _____ Date _____

Form completed by _____
(Name) (Title) (Phone)

1. Does your department use any volunteers in direct contact with juveniles?
(Volunteers are generally considered to be persons who perform services without pay, possibly excluding expenses. Includes individuals, groups, people from service organizations, etc.)

_____ Yes _____ No

(Even if No, please indicate and return form. Even if No, we would appreciate any comments or discussion of issues/plans.)

2. Does your department have one or more persons assigned to coordinate your overall efforts with volunteers?

_____ Yes _____ No

If yes, full time _____ or part time _____?

paid _____ not paid _____?

3. If we have further questions, may we phone your volunteer coordinator (if any) directly?

(Name/Phone Number)

Or do you prefer another contact person?

(Name/Phone Number)

4. Please indicate your department's USE and ESTIMATED NUMBER of volunteers. Summarize by tasks, activities, or services (based on 1986). Where relevant, show names of private groups/organizations.

Tasks, Activities, or Services*	Average No. per Month	Estimated Average Hrs. per Month**
---------------------------------	--------------------------	--

a. In Field Probation:

b. In Camps/Ranches:

* Includes individuals as well as groups (such as AA, 4H, religious, civic and service groups, etc.).

** Per individual volunteer. Please give estimate for individuals even if a group of volunteers is involved.

ITEM 4, CONTINUED: Please indicate your department's USE and ESTIMATED NUMBER of volunteers. Summarize by tasks, activities, or services (based on 1986). Where relevant, show names of private groups/organizations.

Tasks, Activities, or Services*	Average No. per Month	Estimated Average Hrs. per Month**
---------------------------------	--------------------------	--

c. In Juvenile Halls:

d. Elsewhere (specify):

* Includes individuals as well as groups (such as AA, 4H, religious, civic and service groups, etc.).

** Per individual volunteer. Please give estimate for individuals even if a group of volunteers is involved.

5. Rate the overall usefulness of volunteers who work with juveniles supervised by your department:

Very useful	Somewhat useful	Unsure	Not especially useful	Useless, waste of time, or harmful
----------------	--------------------	--------	-----------------------------	--

- a. What are the benefits/advantages, if any, of volunteers working with young offenders? (Which activities are most helpful?)

- b. What are problems/disadvantages, if any, of volunteers working with young offenders?

6. Do you have any recommendations for improving the use of volunteers in probation work?

7. Describe any MODEL approaches/organizations using volunteers in your department--which especially deserve public attention or duplication elsewhere. (E.g., perhaps an innovative use of volunteers or an unusually effective service organization)

For that MODEL, we would appreciate your mailing us any brochures/handbooks, reports, etc.

For that MODEL, please list (if available to the public) name, address, and phone number of organization or contact person:

_____ (phone)

8. Do you know of any other contact person (your department or other organization) with special expertise or unique skills in some aspect of volunteer programming: recruitment, marketing, training, etc.?

(name, affiliation)

(address)

(special expertise)

(phone)

We would like to understand the facts and issues of organizing for volunteers in juvenile probation.

9. How are volunteers recruited?

10. Does your department have a volunteers program budget?

Yes No (Comments?)

11. Does your department have a written statement of policy or objectives concerning use of volunteers?

Yes No (Comments?)

12. Does your department have written job descriptions for volunteers?

Yes No (Comments?)

13. What methods are used for screening volunteers? (Check all that apply.)

Interview References Law enforcement check
 Fingerprints Other: _____

14. How does your department train volunteers? (Check all that apply.)

Orientation On-the-job training
 Regular meetings/discussions Other: _____

15. What materials do you have available related to your work with volunteers?
(Check all that apply.)

<input type="checkbox"/> Public information brochures	<input type="checkbox"/> Volunteer handbook/guidelines
<input type="checkbox"/> Training material	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff handbook/guidelines
<input type="checkbox"/> Application form	<input type="checkbox"/> Tapes, films, slides
<input type="checkbox"/> Periodic volunteer reporting forms	<input type="checkbox"/> Others: _____

16. Are volunteers involved in any fund-raising activities on behalf of youth programs or events?

Yes No

If Yes, please describe:

17. Are clients or ex-offenders used as volunteers in your department?

Yes No (Comments?)

18. Check below any consistent problems in coordinating use of volunteers in your department. (Check all that apply.)

Comments

- lack of facilities, funding, or department staffing
- lack of staff acceptance/support
- lack of volunteers
- high turnover of volunteers
- lack of time to deal with volunteers
- lack of community acceptance/support
- lack of organization/coordination
- volunteers not effective
- volunteers not reliable
- confused match: volunteers with tasks
- lack of administrative support
- insurance problems
- other (specify):

19. Do your volunteer efforts have an evaluation component?

- Yes, rather formalized
- Yes, rather informal
- No

20. In 1987, is your department planning program expansion of:

a. The number of volunteers?

b. The number of program activities volunteers are involved in?

DO YOU HAVE ANY OTHER COMMENTS ON USE OF VOLUNTEERS WITH JUVENILE OFFENDERS?