

Govt.

State Office of Volunteerism Program

A Study Paper



ACTION

**Office of Special Volunteer Programs
Washington, D.C.**

February 1977



ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This paper was prepared for ACTION by Dr. Arlene K. Schindler, Director of Education and Training, National Center for Voluntary Action, and J. Dale Chastain of SMART Associates, Inc., Washington, D.C. The opinions expressed are those of the authors and are based on a recent study of the State Office of Volunteerism Program and experience in volunteerism which includes management, program development, training, and evaluation of domestic and international voluntary programs.

The authors acknowledge the cordial cooperation and assistance of all the Directors of State Offices of Volunteerism. Some contributed directly during the preparation of this paper; others, met in different contexts, are aware of their contribution only with this acknowledgement.

Seven Directors of State Offices of Volunteerism were particularly helpful, serving as consultants to the authors at the request of ACTION.

Putnam Barber, Washington
Lavon Bliesener, Michigan
O.P. Bobbitt, Texas
Laura Lee Geraghty, Minnesota
Marcia Penn, Virginia
Phyllis Roark, Rhode Island
Louise Yost, Connecticut

Finally, the authors express gratitude for the assistance of Mr. James E.H. Mayer, Director of ACTION's Office of Special Volunteer Programs, and Ms. Sheila P. O'Brien, Program Specialist of the Office of Special Volunteer Programs.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Paper supports the following positions:

1. The State Office of Volunteerism Program, designed to promote and coordinate volunteerism in the state government and among other public and private agencies, provides a new and unique function. The Program should be continued and expanded.
2. The broad, non-restrictive nature of the Guidelines has given the State Offices of Volunteerism the freedom to respond to locally defined needs with relevant activities. ACTION should continue to support a substantive orientation program for staff who may have difficulty in translating broad purposes into functions appropriate to the individual state.
3. The State Offices of Volunteerism, assisted by ACTION, should develop a 'cost-benefits' measurement to demonstrate the quantitative contribution of volunteerism within the various states.
4. Added emphasis should be given to implementing the Information Collection and Dissemination function. An information system should be established which is uniform throughout the network of State Offices of Volunteerism and which provides a broadened base of readily available information.
5. The distinct needs and specific resources of each state mandate that the individual State Office of Volunteerism defines its role with the state government and private voluntary groups and determines the activities that best fulfill its purposes and functions.
6. The initial approval and continued visible support of the Governor are essential to the success of the State Office of Volunteerism.
7. The placement of the State Office of Volunteerism within a state government structure must assure that the interests of volunteerism among state government departments and throughout the state's private voluntary sector are served.

STATE OFFICE OF VOLUNTEERISM PROGRAM

The State Office of Volunteerism Program was established in March 1974 as an ACTION demonstration grant program to promote volunteerism at the state level. It is a program in which the national government encourages the voluntary movement in America, supporting its independence and promoting self-reliance.

Designed in cooperation with the 1973 National Governors' Conference, the Program was fashioned after offices of volunteerism already established by a few governors in their respective states. Using these existing programs as prototypes, the Program provided for an office of volunteer coordination to be located within the executive branch of state governments. These offices were intended to offer various types of support for the extensive network of government and private voluntary organizations within the states. They were intended to encourage and coordinate existing voluntary programs within state government departments and to assist with design and development of additional voluntary offices and programs. Local, private voluntary organizations within the states were to be assisted and supported, as were the programs of ACTION and other national voluntary organizations.

Fifteen (15) grants were made to states during the first year. Since 1974, thirty-four State Offices of Volunteerism have received ACTION grants. Twenty-nine Offices continue to receive financial assistance from ACTION.

STATE OFFICES OF VOLUNTEERISM WITH ACTION FUNDING

States	Years with funding			
	1974	1975	1976	1977 (incomplete)
Alaska		x	x	
Arizona		x	x	
Arkansas	x	x	x	
Connecticut			x	
Florida			x	
Georgia		x	x	
Hawaii			x	
Indiana	x	x	x	
Iowa			x	
Kansas		x		
Kentucky			x	
Louisiana			x	
Maine		x	x	
Massachusetts	x	x	x	
Michigan	x	x	x	
Minnesota		x	x	
Mississippi			x	
Missouri	x	x	x	
Montana				x
Nevada	x			
New Jersey			x	
New Mexico		x	x	
North Carolina	x	x	x	
North Dakota	x			
Oklahoma	x	x	x	
Oregon		x		
Rhode Island	x	x	x	
South Carolina	x	x	x	
Tennessee		x	x	
Texas	x	x	x	
Utah	x	x	x	
Vermont	x	x		
Virginia	x	x	x	
Washington			x	

Initial ACTION grants are in the \$40,000 to \$60,000 range, but constitute no more than seventy-five per cent of the annual budget projected by the State Office of Volunteerism. After the first year, ACTION's share is reduced and state governments assume a greater proportion of the financial support.

In mid-1975, ACTION, encouraged by the accomplishments of the State Offices of Volunteerism, accepted recommendations to:

- a) continue the program and provide third-year grants;
- b) introduce the program to additional interested states willing to commit state funds.

CITIZEN-GOVERNMENT PARTNERSHIP

Probably no feature distinguishes American democracy and influences the thinking and behavior of Americans more than the belief that citizens have the right and responsibility, individually and voluntarily, to create, manage, sustain, and revise their society. Voluntary citizen participation, associated with every aspect of American development and progress, has never diminished. It was the strength of the first small isolated frontier settlements and continues today. It moves governments. It is as comfortable in the corridors of power as in the parks with protest or the streets with demonstrations. It challenges and changes corporate boards. It actively rejuvenates the spirit and condition of neighborhoods and communities. It pleads, requests, and demands to be heard on issues of social justice, public service, political innovation, and economic change. It commands attention and is the enduring vigor of the American community.

Many citizens speak of the importance of voluntary citizen participation. Its benefits are seen as mutual; the individual, the organization whether government or private, and the society develop and grow. Few persons, however, realize the magnitude of the volunteer community. The awesome involvement in volunteer activities is demonstrated by the statistic that twenty-four per cent of all Americans over the age of 13¹ gave without payment some of their time to as many as six million organizations

in the voluntary sector. They contributed more than fifty billion dollars in service to a host of groups including 350,000 religious organizations, 37,000 human service agencies, 6,000 museums, and 1,100 symphony orchestras. They served in 6,000 block associations in New York City alone.² The impact of volunteerism and citizen participation is seen in:

- ◆ INITIATION OF NEW IDEAS AND PROCESSES in areas where public agencies lack knowledge or are less free to venture;
- ◆ DEVELOPMENT OF PUBLIC POLICY by producing research and analysis, information and viewpoints, clarifying and defining issues for consideration;
- ◆ SUPPORT OF MINORITY OR LOCAL INTERESTS and the ability to experiment with new ideas less cautiously than government;
- ◆ PROVISION OF SERVICES that the government is constitutionally barred from providing;
- ◆ OVERSEEING GOVERNMENT and encouraging better performance and coordination of civic duties;
- ◆ STIMULATION AND CONSIDERATION of activities in which government or business, or both, interact with voluntary groups to pursue public purposes;
- ◆ DIRECT INVOLVEMENT IN PROGRAMS concerned with issues of ecology, consumer protection, poverty, health, minorities, public interest laws, civil rights, etc.³

Edward C. Lindeman ponders in his Fantasy the vicissitudes of Democracy and wonders what would happen if, in the United States, all citizens who work for nothing, who serve as volunteers, were suddenly to 'go on strike.'

"This band of strikers would include all trustees of colleges, universities and private schools; all members of local school boards; all directors of private institutions and agencies; all solicitors of community chests; all lay boards collaborating with public institutions and agencies; all committee members of private institutions and agencies; and that great host of citizens who serve multitudes of educational, welfare, health and recreational organizations in one capacity or another. How large would the total be ?

What would happen if this corps of citizens who labor without pay, who exercise their own free will in choosing the functions they will perform, were to resign their posts, refuse to attend meetings, to disengage themselves from all responsibilities ? It is difficult to imagine what American life minus its volunteers would be like . . ." 4

Were it possible to record the issues on which citizens have voluntarily banded together in concerted expenditure of creative energies, there would be a catalogue of America's priorities. There would be a statement about the desired society; an indicator of the future. Contemporary America is the consequence of the written reflections of a very few, whispered by an aroused some, shouted later by the mobilized many. Jimmy Carter, the candidate, stating aspirations for America, drew attention regularly to the need for citizen involvement. He encouraged Americans to see their participation as necessary in making the established systems responsive and representative. President Carter exhorted citizens to participate in creating the American dream:

"This inauguration ceremony marks a new beginning, a new dedication within our government, and a new spirit among us all. A President may sense and proclaim that new spirit, but only a people can provide.

Ours was the first society openly to define itself in terms of both spirituality and of human liberty. It is that unique self-definition which has given us an exceptional appeal -- but it also imposes on us a special obligation -- to take on those moral duties which, when assumed, seem invariably to be in our best interests. Let us create together a new national spirit of unity and trust.

These are not just my goals. And they will not be my accomplishments, but the affirmation of our nation's continuing moral strength and our belief in an undiminished, ever-expanding American dream."⁵

The sentiments, differently phrased and accented than by many who preceded President Carter, express the American heritage of citizen-government partnership. They focus on the reality that the sense and essence of community are strengthened with voluntary citizen participation in defining and managing public authority and services.

Today, government encouragement of volunteerism and citizen participation is accepted and expected. It is an important way of renewing citizen-government partnership, which requires initiative and response by both potential partners. If there is to be a partnership, governments must promote 'voluntary collaborative activities' in government agencies and programs. They must encourage citizen participation. For the citizenry, the initiative must be to claim, even to re-claim, work and tasks that are appropriately voluntary. Additionally, it must

respond to volunteer opportunities extended by governments to participate in government financed and managed programs.

With a renewed partnership the citizen voluntary sector and the government may at times merge and blur, at times be independent, yet at all times should recognize interdependence. In every instance, the hope to renew the partnership supports the expectation for, and acceptance of, government initiatives to expand volunteerism both within and without government. This role of government to encourage and support is particularly visible in the State Office of Volunteerism Program.

CONSTITUENCY AND ACTIVITIES

"The purpose of State grants is to expand and/or improve the voluntary services of State agencies in the areas of human, social and environmental needs with particular attention to poverty problems. This will be accomplished by: 1) establishing a volunteer coordinating function at the State level; 2) promoting and coordinating voluntarism in State government and among local and private agencies; 3) providing for appropriate liaison with existing ACTION programs."⁶ (Underlining added.)

This broad statement of purpose has encouraged State Offices of Volunteerism to define an equally comprehensive constituency within the states. They view their constituency as the people who have responsibility and preference for the accomplishment of tasks involving volunteers in significant ways. Voluntary programs exist in nearly every aspect of social life -- human services, civic participation, community improvement, arts and humanities, neighborhood self-help, religion, disaster and emergency relief. Not surprisingly then, the constituency of the State Offices of Volunteerism touches the full range of social life.

Some State Offices of Volunteerism have concentrated on encouraging voluntary programs within state government departments. This encouragement has contributed to the improvement of existing voluntary programs; it has also assisted with the development of new programs. State Offices of Volunteerism have:

- ◆ assisted state government departments in *developing policies and programs* for volunteerism;
- ◆ *coordinated program planning* sessions for government departments with voluntary groups;
- ◆ *provided professional training* to supervisors of volunteers in state agencies;
- ◆ *assessed needs* among the various volunteer advisory board members of state agencies;
- ◆ *compiled statistical data* for evaluating the dimension and value of volunteerism in state governments.

Some State Offices of Volunteerism have focused equally on government and private volunteerism. They have:

- ◆ *organized events to recognize outstanding volunteers* for the benefit of volunteerism throughout the state;
- ◆ *coordinated conferences and workshops* for managers of voluntary programs to improve involvement of volunteers;
- ◆ *published and circulated newsletters and calendars* of events for the volunteer community;
- ◆ *created community resource centers* providing access to literature and materials on volunteerism;
- ◆ *assisted the continuation of local bicentennial committees* as community improvement associations.

Every State Office of Volunteerism has recognized that each constituency is also an important resource for the Office and the voluntary sector. Consequently, they have:

- ◆ initiated community meetings of volunteers and volunteer supervisors to discuss common needs of the voluntary sector;
- ◆ contributed to the efficient use of existing resources within the volunteer community by reducing duplication of effort;

- ◆ utilized training and recruiting capabilities of voluntary associations for benefit of volunteerism within state government;
- ◆ relied on a 'ready volunteer pool' for emergencies and disaster relief;
- ◆ distributed publications and fact sheets of voluntary agencies to the entire volunteer community;
- ◆ encouraged and jointly sponsored activities undertaken by voluntary groups in order to benefit volunteerism generally.

Whatever the emphasis, the activities undertaken demonstrate the role that State Offices of Volunteerism can play as they respond to locally defined concerns. In program, organization, and emphasis, similarities among a few states exist; in other aspects, Offices are very different. Each State Office of Volunteerism has fashioned its own identity. Indeed, the most notable feature of the State Offices of Volunteerism is the distinctive, unique, and individual character each has assumed. This refreshing phenomenon must surely be credited to the innovators of the State Office of Volunteerism Program who had the fortunate insight that permitted relevant programs to be developed within broadly stated purposes and guidelines.

The freedom to define local needs within each state and respond with relevant activities results directly from the non-restrictive nature of the Guidelines. The Guidelines' broad treatment, particularly in the areas of purpose and function, must be seen as having encouraged local interpretation and desired flexibility. It may well be that the first Directors of the State

Offices of Volunteerism, eager to establish a successful program, were initially frustrated by limited examples and experience and the absence of specific 'how-to-do's.' Nevertheless, many Directors, aware of the concerns of their communities and understanding the communication channels and systems by which government relationships are maintained, creatively established responsive and dynamic programs. Those Directors who failed to see absence of restriction as a license for responsiveness sought and did not find specific direction in the Guidelines. And so it should be. In the areas of purpose and function, the Guidelines ought not be specific. Consistency of the activities among the states is not necessarily a virtue.

The unique contribution of ACTION was the invitation to each State Office of Volunteerism to define its own appropriate ways for serving the volunteer community and encouraging meaningful, rewarding citizen participation within the state. The inherent responsibility of ACTION to the Program derives from these same broad purposes. It is important that any new Directors of State Offices of Volunteerism receive thorough orientation to the Guidelines; that they understand the intention; that they are encouraged to proceed effectively and creatively in responsively ordering the priorities of need and program. Now there are successful State Offices of Volunteerism established and performing excellently. These can be used as models and demonstrations. There are talented, experienced Directors

who can assist through example. The task of orientation may be simplified, but it is no less important.

New Directors need to understand, and experienced Directors must be reminded, that each State Office of Volunteerism has different resources, each is working with specific legislative and citizen concerns. The way chosen to use resources in addressing concerns determines the role that the State Office of Volunteerism will play and greatly affect its relationships with other voluntary organizations. Most State Offices of Volunteerism, over the course of three years, have worked out responsive and accepted roles. The role of the State Office of Volunteerism is frequently described as being the: 1) on-going advocate for volunteerism in the state; 2) promoter of citizen participation within state government; and 3) facilitator of linkages among the various groups in public and private volunteerism.

In fulfilling this role, State Offices of Volunteerism readily assume the coordinating and promotional functions. Private agencies quickly assign these functions to them. It is when the State Office of Volunteerism becomes involved in what may be described as direct management of volunteer programs, active recruitment, and placement that concerns about conflicting or competitive roles are expressed within the voluntary sectors. Groups other than the State Office of Volunteerism are more frequently accepted as having direct service responsibilities. The Voluntary Action Center, a private organization, for example,

is generally seen as the: 1) advocate for volunteerism at the local level; 2) provider of direct services by recruiting volunteers for local organizations, and 3) in some instances, fulfilling a technical services function.

Generally, the relationships between the State Office of Volunteerism and other volunteer organizations are mutually supportive. There ought be no competitors in volunteerism. There should be no need for turf protection. There are problems enough for all to share, but where the problem is one of relationship, it usually results from failure to identify which of the many groups in volunteerism has the most suitable and available resource. The function of recruitment of volunteers within a state demonstrates this point. Most State Offices of Volunteerism readily accept responsibility for recruitment when it is seen as part of promoting volunteerism through public information, recognition ceremonies, or in the encouragement given to state departments to involve volunteers. In most instances, they resist active recruitment which can be done more effectively by other groups. Local Voluntary Action Centers and Volunteer Bureaus are among these groups. These already have established systems and personnel trained to screen, interview, and recommend placement for citizens interested in volunteering. The 'recruits' may well be the result of the State Office of Volunteerism successfully promoting volunteerism through the media or the publicity resulting from having sponsored a Governor's recognition ceremony.

This determination of role, which conditions the nature and quality of relationships, should and can only occur when the involved, affected groups of the state's public and private voluntary community jointly determine appropriate ways for fulfilling purposes and implementing functions. Successful relationships cannot be mandated. They are the demonstration of mutually agreed upon and accepted functions. Those that are translated into programs and activities for the State Offices of Volunteerism must be identified in concert with ACTION personnel and other appropriate groups within the state, both in the public and private sectors. The techniques for effective and enduring citizen participation must be learned and re-learned. The recital of programs which died as a result of being defined by others than those most affected by the outcome, are lessons that ought not be ignored. What is appropriate in one state may very likely be inappropriate for another. ACTION has demonstrated its recognition of this by the nature of the purposes presented in the Guidelines. ACTION can provide guidance in resolving the dilemma of the role relationship by assisting in the development of a State Office of Volunteerism leadership with abilities to effect dialogue and establish united efforts among organizations with diverse skills, varied constituents, and different agendas.

There is one activity assigned to the State Offices of Volunteerism which should, however, be performed with consistency in every state. This is information collection and dissemination.

Many Voluntary Action Centers and Volunteer Bureaus share this function but are quick to admit that they have neither the capability nor the interest in fulfilling this responsibility statewide. Few State Offices of Volunteerism are seriously engaged in this activity so, unfortunately, a necessary resource is frequently not available to the volunteer community.

The need for information is expressed so frequently that it is not necessary to present a wordy defense of the function of collecting and disseminating. It is important to remind one another that the collection of information is not sufficient, and is in fact useless, if there is no calculated determination as to what should be collected or no uniform, effective way to retrieve the information. According to Dr. Helga Roth, "the chief information consumers and/or producers are voluntary organizations and volunteer programs in churches, businesses, or government agencies. They need information both on a local and a national scope." She writes that the continuous flow from local communities to a broader resource (state or national) and back is a vital exchange of experiences and information, which when "collected, synthesized and distilled builds a general body of knowledge in volunteerism and ensures continuous growth and renewal."⁷

The function of information collection and distribution is one that clearly belongs to the State Offices of Volunteerism. It is one which many Directors feel ill-prepared to undertake.

Additionally, it is a function, unlike many others assumed by State Offices of Volunteerism, that is better if it is uniform and consistent in all the states. In this way, information would be exchangeable and add to the total national information base on volunteerism.

The State Offices of Volunteerism, with ACTION, might consider strengthening their program by undertaking a thorough investigation to:

- a) Determine the extent of information needs;
- b) Develop a uniform system;
- c) Train personnel to perform the necessary tasks;
- d) Explore support possibilities from ACTION to initiate and maintain state information centers since ACTION would be one of the greatest of those benefited.

MONEY AND STATURE

The continued effective operation of the State Offices of Volunteerism requires reflection and decision on two factors of vital importance. One is money; the second is the stature of the Office.

All governments currently experience gaps between available revenues and desired expenditures. The expected, traditional services of governments inflate in cost as do the additional services sought from governments. The tax base and revenues have not increased sufficiently to meet inflation and greater demands for more services, money is scarce and will remain so for a long time.

Despite these serious financial restrictions, State Offices of Volunteerism were created and in varying degrees financially supported by states. The inherent value of volunteerism and the ACTION grant encouraged states to appropriate money for the Office. Practically every State Office of Volunteerism received the amount necessary to match the grant from ACTION.

The time during which to demonstrate the value of the State Office of Volunteerism to volunteerism is considered by some to be very brief. Yet, when judged by those familiar with volunteerism, State Offices of Volunteerism have records of considerable accomplishment. For individuals less informed, the measures of success and accomplishment -- communication,

coordination, liaison, information systems, technical assistance, recognition, training, recruitment -- are sometimes not easily seen and are admittedly difficult to document.

The public needs information on 'where the money goes.' Customarily, presentations show 'where the money goes;' personnel benefits, facilities and utilities, printing and mailing, workshops and conferences, travel, and recognition ceremonies. State Offices of Volunteerism should provide additional information about what the money buys.'

ACTION can assist State Offices of Volunteerism develop techniques to demonstrate the return to the state for investments in volunteerism. No elaborate 'cost-benefits' measure is necessary. In fact, a simple plan to indicate the statewide -- government and private -- benefits realized from the state's financial support is preferable. A 'cost-benefits' measure can supplement the usual budget presentations. For example, one State Office of Volunteerism, shortly after its establishment, surveyed volunteer programs in eight human service departments of state government. The survey collected data from eight full-time Supervisors of Volunteer Services. Using the records maintained by the Supervisors, it was determined that volunteers contributed 3,712 hours of work per week. That is nearly the equivalent of 100 full-time staff in return for the total investment in eight full-time employees. A financial return of better

than 12 to 1 cannot be easily ignored. The survey provided information of immediate use with state officials; 'what the money buys' could be indicated. Additionally, the survey provided a base from which to measure the subsequent growth of volunteerism within government departments.

Yet, measures of 'cost benefits' and dollar equivalency are not sufficient. Such presentations must be reinforced with information about improved quality of human services, personal growth of volunteers, influence of volunteer participation, the satisfaction and rehabilitation of clients within institutions, and impact on local communities. Qualitative factors are specified and measured with difficulty, but they must be included as part of 'what the money buys.'

The State Offices of Volunteerism, most appropriately with ACTION assistance, should design a simple method, easily administered and offering relatively precise data. State legislatures would respond to requests for money fortified with data directed toward greater understanding and broadened perspective. The ACTION objective of State Offices of Volunteerism that are financially secure and independent of national assistance would be promoted.

The placement of the State Office of Volunteerism has been an enduring concern of ACTION. According to the ACTION Guidelines:

"...preference will be given to those States which have permanently established a Volunteer Coordinator's function by either having a Governor's Executive Order establishing it, with drafted legislation proposed, or by having the necessary legislation enacted, or drafted and under consideration by the State Legislature." 8
(Underlining added.)

The State Offices of Volunteerism were created, for the most part, by a Governor's Executive Order. Furthermore, most of the Governors installed the State Office of Volunteerism with the Executive Office. On the one hand, this seemed a favorable placement since it could be accomplished expeditiously and ACTION desired a quick beginning. Also, establishment of the State Office of Volunteerism by an Executive Order indicated strong support by a Governor, another factor considered important for success.

On the other hand, the relation of the Governor and the State Office of Volunteerism was viewed with reservations. A State Office of Volunteerism with program continuity was thought difficult, perhaps impossible to achieve if identified with partisan activities. ACTION's mid-1975 evaluation of the Statewide Program tended to confirm suspicions that "close association with the Governor will eventually carry some adverse political implications." These suspicions, buttressed with some examples

of damaging consequences and exaggerated by the absence of experience, pressed with additional intensity for *institutionalization*. Generally, the meaning of *institutionalization* included legislation re-locating the State Office of Volunteerism in an established department of state government.

Yet neither pressures to *institutionalize* nor concerns about *close association* with Governors have been successful in diminishing the importance of three factors:

- a) Initial approval and support of the Governor for a State Office of Volunteerism are vital. There is simply no alternative leadership to the Governor's for the expeditious establishment of the State Office of Volunteerism.
- b) Continuing support of the Governor must be demonstrated and is as important as initial approval and support.
- c) The location of the State Office of Volunteerism must facilitate and coordinate volunteerism throughout the state and among many state government departments.

The ACTION evaluation of mid-1975 stressed the need for initial support from the Governor, but stated that "there appears to be little relationship between the placement of the Office within the Executive Office and its success in crossing department lines." Beyond the Governor's initial support, the evaluation concluded that "the abilities, energy, and ingenuity of the Coordinator and Statewide staff" are the essential ingredients of success. Since the evaluation was done when the program was relatively new, the initial support may have been a factor in creating an impression that there was no relationship between

placement and ability to be effective. There is a very close relationship.

Basic ingredients of organizational success are always staff "abilities, energy, and ingenuity." State Offices of Volunteerism are not exceptions, and the staff can more easily concentrate on the performance of functions important to volunteerism, when the Office is identified with the statewide elected official with executive responsibility in state government. Coordination of certain functions of state government often resides with the Executive Office; these may include functions of planning, purchasing, budget, and general administration. These functions may also be performed within separate departments, but the coordinating among state departments occurs within the Executive Office where a government-wide perspective exists. Identically, the coordination of volunteerism throughout a state government with a perspective comprehending all state government departments is required.

Placement within a particular state department encourages the view of the State Office of Volunteerism as an office of volunteer services for that department, whether mental health, criminal justice, education, or human resources. The ability to coordinate among state departments is almost inevitably diminished. Similarly, identification with a single state government department portends an identification with a

narrowed range of volunteerism for the private voluntary network. The "abilities, energy, and ingenuity" of the staff of State Offices of Volunteerism can best be employed in supporting and enhancing volunteerism within the state by a recognized statewide placement, the Executive Office. State Offices of Volunteerism need the benefits of close association with the Governor. Hopefully, Governors and Directors can cooperatively avoid potential liabilities.

The arrangement in one state will illustrate successful achievement of the benefits while avoiding disadvantages. The State Office of Volunteerism operates under a Commission for Volunteers within the Executive Office. The Commission is legislatively established. It has the Governor's sanction and is not a creation of an Executive Order. The staff of the State Office of Volunteerism is confident that a change of Governor and Commissioners will not adversely affect the continuity of the State Office.

In other states, other arrangements exist which contribute to the permanence of the State Office of Volunteerism. Advisory boards or councils (often volunteer positions) are appointed by Governors and have the effect of:

- a) providing the State Office of Volunteerism access to statewide constituency and support;
- b) establishing relevance among purpose, functions, and activities;

- c) representing different, and sometime, differing components of the constituency of the State Office of Volunteerism;
- d) contributing to the permanence of the State Office of Volunteerism by developing and demonstrating contributions to the voluntary sector.

Two important and simply stated issues emerge in a discussion of Money and Stature. The State Offices of Volunteerism need additional time to develop their new and unique contribution to volunteerism. They need time to demonstrate their work as useful, effective, and efficient. The continued financial commitment of ACTION to the State Offices of Volunteerism to achieve these ends is vital. Second, the State Offices of Volunteerism need close association with the Governors for the stature necessary to accomplish the purpose and perform the functions benefiting volunteerism in contemporary America.

CONCLUSION

Volunteerism, a force long evident in translating America's dreams to reality, is gaining increased stature as a dynamic resource for improvement and innovation. Today's volunteers are serving new causes, solving complex social problems, and making alliances for greater influence in organizations, local communities, and government. They are citizens, participating and involved. And significantly, the State Office of Volunteerism successfully works to encourage their participations and to expand their volunteer opportunities. Significantly, the State Office of Volunteerism contributes to the renewed partnership of citizen and government.

"We can no longer have the kind of voluntarism which is unrelated to government policy and action. We can no longer walk alone nor can we behave as rivals and survive. We must travel the road together, as partners, with each influencing the other while in the process of making the journey. We need the government and the government needs us in making this long and arduous trip to a better society. . ."9

REFERENCES

1. Americans Volunteer 1974 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975-586-335/17). ACTION Pamphlet 4000-17. p. 3.
2. Giving In America: Toward a Stronger Voluntary Sector (Report of the Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs, 1975), pp. 11, 36.
3. Ibid., pp. 41-46.
4. Quoted in Eva Schindler-Rainman and Ronald Lippert, The Volunteer Community (Washington, D.C.: Center for a Voluntary Society and NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, 1971).
5. Inauguration Address 1977. Quoted in Washington Post, January 21, 1977.
6. Guidelines For Preparing Application For State Volunteer Services Coordinator Program. (ACTION Pamphlet 4805.1, Revised February 1976), p. 3.
7. Helga Roth, "The Role of State Offices for Voluntary Action in a National Information System for Volunteerism," Unpublished paper prepared for the National Center for Voluntary Action, Washington, D.C., July 1975.
8. Guidelines For Preparing Application For State Volunteer Services Coordinator Program. (ACTION Pamphlet 3480.2, March 1974), p. 3.
9. Robert Hilbert, President of the Philadelphia Health and Welfare Council. Quoted in Harriet H. Naylor, Volunteers Today (New York, Association Press, 1967), pp. 28-29.