



Connections. Perspective. Insight.

Volunteerism

The Electronic Journal of the Volunteer Community



Vol. V, Issue 3, April-June 2005

This is an authorized reprint of an article that appears online at:
<http://e-volunteerism.com/quarterly/05apr/05apr-keyboard.php>
May not be reproduced without permission

When Should We NOT Involve Volunteers?

As advocates for volunteers, we are generally in the position of convincing administrators and frontline paid staff to be more creative in designing work for volunteers – to involve them *more*. Yet there are times when an organization might consider assigning volunteers to a role or task, but ultimately decide not to do so.

There are no clear-cut answers to this important topic rarely presented to the field. But this Keyboard Roundtable provides a unique discussion to get all of us thinking about our own opinions. Please post your thoughts alongside the panel's.

Participants in this Keyboard Roundtable are: Loretta Bacon (US), Rebecca Bond (UK), Stephanie Kelly (Canada), Patricia Nabti (Lebanon), Ivan Scheier (US), Sue Vineyard (US). Rob Jackson (UK) served as Convening Editor. ([Bios at end of article.](#))

The group discussed the following questions:

- Question 1: When is a “no” decision best? What criteria should be applied or what circumstances should be considered for *not* involving volunteers, and why?
- Question 2: Of the criteria you use in deciding not to develop a volunteer assignment, which are situational/temporary (that might be resolved and then you would assign a volunteer) and which do you consider basically non-negotiable?
- Question 3: What reasons for not involving volunteers appear reasonable and practical on the surface, but actually speak to fundamental beliefs/assumptions about the relationship between paid work and volunteering? How can we challenge these?
- Question 4: What would you consider a warning sign to say “no” to volunteer involvement?

Rob Jackson, Convening Editor

When is a “no” decision best? What criteria should be applied or what circumstances should be considered for *not* involving volunteers, and why?

Rebecca Bond (UK)

There are a few different issues for me in deciding whether to use volunteers.

Firstly, are the staff that they would be working with skilled enough and willing to work with volunteers? I think that an individual who is managing a volunteer team has to have far superior skills to those managing paid staff - they have to be able to manage entirely by motivation, recognition and by giving meaningful work.

There are no ‘sticks’ to beat the volunteer with – it has to all be done by dangling appropriate ‘carrots’. I have actually refused to place a volunteer with a team who asked for one before, because I felt that the team manager wasn't up to the job.

Sue Vineyard (US)

It's critical to empower volunteers to have a successful experience, and that cannot happen if the staff they work with or under are incompetent, insensitive or inept. I would not place any volunteers with such folks. It would also run the risk of having the volunteer do a good job and the incompetent staff taking the credit, perpetuating disaster. The best recruitment tool for future volunteers are satisfied current volunteers who tell their stories. Under a staff member who is non-supportive, they'd spread the word that this site is a bad place to work.

Patricia Nabti (Lebanon)

I found Rebecca's comment very interesting that she would not involve volunteers where a supervisor does not have the skills to motivate, recognize, and give meaningful work to volunteers. The question then is: Does the position go unfilled, or does the organization hire an employee rather than recruit a volunteer? And if the latter, would it be better to hire a subordinate staff member or retrain/relocate/or replace the supervisor?

In most cases, I would not want a volunteer for a full-time, long-term professional position that needs significant training and other organizational investment. You might ask: But if such a person came along, would you say No? That's a tough question. Even paid staff leave an organization, and yet, the chances are that they will stay longer than volunteers, especially if I have the funds to pay staff what they're worth.

Personally, I think it all boils down to our wonderful list of Volunteer Rights and Responsibilities. We should not accept volunteers when we are not capable of giving them their rights and when we can't find the appropriate people to fulfill our positions who are willing and able to accept their responsibilities.

Stephanie Kelley (Canada)

It's not the right call to develop a volunteer position or involve volunteers when it isn't a win-win situation; there needs to be mutual benefit for the organization and the volunteer. I don't believe in involving volunteers in work that is not rewarding to the volunteer on some level – I equally disagree with creating roles that don't benefit the organization in any way. My

organization went through an exercise to standardize our volunteer service assignments across the country – in doing so we also linked each role to a "corporate objective" this now links directly to tangible outcomes that we can report on to show the impact being realized by volunteers placed in those roles.

Rebecca Bond (UK)

This logically leads on to the question about whether volunteers should replace paid staff or whether they should supplement and augment the work of paid staff. It's a really difficult question. The majority of organisations are dependent on the work of their volunteers and, certainly in my organisation, many of our fundraising activities just wouldn't be economically viable without them. But I can see other sides of the argument, about accountability, reliability and staff security. Let's hear your thoughts on this debate.

Sue Vineyard (US)

The greater problem in thinking in terms of volunteers replacing paid staff, is that it sets up a tension between them, where making sure the volunteer actually fails may be in the best interest of the staff person fearful of replacement. As to issues like confidentiality, reliability, etc....those questions are set to rest when volunteers are properly and thoroughly screened, trained and overseen. I'm convinced that there is a "right" volunteer for any job, but we may find times when it is very difficult to find and secure this "right" volunteer....in which case, I would never put just anyone into the position simply to fill the need or hole.

There are also times when the willing volunteer has a history that would be in conflict with the assignment. I would not ever, for example, place someone with a history of sexual abuse to children anywhere near kids nor would I ever place a person with a history of drug abuse anywhere near opportunities to handle drugs. In both cases my concern would be for clients/patient with a secondary concern about liability.

Stephanie Kelly (Canada)

It has been my experience that replacing paid staff with volunteers is rarely a good call and should be approached with caution. To frame this statement I am speaking from the perspective of the situation occurring in a large organization. Often, volunteers are placed in former staff positions when budgets are cut and times are tough resulting in looking at this "solution" as a quick fix. Ignoring the work that should be done to frame the new volunteer role and experience to implement the change will take some time and sometimes is not always the answer. The difference often is that people expect volunteers to function in the same way as the staff does – contribute the same amount of time and deliver according to previous expectations. The framework for this kind of change needs to be well established before this happens and it rarely is because there are fewer people to help do that. The other issue is that volunteer rights and benefits are the last thing to be considered and often open the door to risk. For example, corporate and public worker insurance is rarely replaced when volunteers step into a paid role or at least investigated and results in a poor risk assessment and management for the change in staffing.

So, in summary, we shouldn't involve volunteers when the framework has not been properly established (goals for the position, training, a communications system, a feedback process). In particular, this is most critical when replacing paid staff with volunteers in regulated or union type environments.

Rebecca Bond (UK)

I think there's also an issue about when it's appropriate to use volunteers in particular roles, especially where there is a high level of responsibility. For me, however, this comes down to having thorough recruitment and selection systems, rather than whether it's OK to use volunteers.

An example of this is in a charity I used to work for, who are now piloting placing adult befrienders with vulnerable young people. They steered clear of doing this with volunteers for many years because of the fear of the damage to the young person that could be done by a volunteer giving up a short way into the project. The needs of the young person not to feel rejected (often 'yet again') was seen as being too great a risk.

Again, what do you think? How should this risk be managed and is it a greater or lesser risk than using paid staff who may move on?

As a final thought, what about with jobs that are really routine, mundane and boring? How appropriate is to ask volunteers to do the tasks that staff don't want to do? And how do you manage this so that volunteers aren't taken advantage of and so that the staff view of the value of volunteers is not damaged?

At my charity, we have two fantastic ladies that come in for an afternoon a week to stuff envelopes. They are completely happy with this and have been offered a wide variety of tasks, but enjoy sitting together, chatting and doing something simple that helps us. Before we started looking at volunteer management more imaginatively, some staff couldn't see how volunteers could contribute to the charity beyond this level and it was a challenge to get them to identify other projects that volunteers could be involved with. Now we have volunteers involved in strategy work, special projects, supporter services, communications and PR – as well as our happy envelope stuffers!

Sue Vineyard (US)

I was always shocked to find that the mundane jobs that some people hated were someone else's delight! Yikes! Also, some mundane jobs can often be enhanced. Stuffing envelopes is rarely someone's idea of a great career objective, but getting a small group of volunteers together at a pot luck supper so that they could work together to do the stuffing task went over big for walkathons! Go figure!!

A bigger issue, of course, is the concern that volunteers would feel they were simply being used to dump yucky jobs on them. Bad plan...unsatisfied volunteers talk even more to about their negative experience to other people and having a reputation of a program being interested in "dumping" won't win friends.

Ivan Scheier (US)

This question digs at the great underlying reflex in the culture of volunteerism: more volunteers is always better and we will therefore be judged by the numbers we put up on the board! A dysfunction too sacred to be questioned and, of course, that's just what this discussion does!

When should we NOT use volunteers? Here are three suggestions; I'm sure there are more:

1. When we don't have volunteers with the qualifications called for, we should not ordinarily try to substitute partly qualified people. Thus, if you want an Outward Bound type of experience for young people, you could easily find a shortage of truly qualified leadership volunteers – in fact, the training for that role is most intensive and extensive. A partly qualified substitute can ruin the program, and maybe a few young people along the way, plus add to the prejudice about volunteers being second-raters.
2. When there is something (seriously) wrong with the program, reflected in volunteer turnover statistics, accompanied by correlative miserable experiences reported by volunteers, it is inappropriate to feed more volunteers into the meat-grinder, until you diagnose and treat the program ailment (s), be they staff resistance, poorly designed volunteer work, inadequate training, etc. Generally, escalating program problems are NOT solved by escalated recruitment.
3. When there is an appropriate ratio of paid staff to volunteers, and the "powers that be" want to "save money" by firing paid staff and "hiring" more volunteers. That's a tough one to stare down when, say city managers tell you your choice is to swallow staff cuts and "replace" them with volunteers, or else see the library close down. Putting in volunteers, of course, besides "saving" the library" helps aforesaid city managers get off the hook in their responsibility to provide reasonable services. But if you can, hang in there. Often as not, they'll "discover" they really had the money somewhere, elections coming up and all that.

Patricia Nabti (Lebanon)

Personally, I don't think there is ANY position in which I would not be willing to put a capable, reliable, available, and willing volunteer. None! But *finding* a capable, reliable, available, and willing volunteer for every position I need is next to impossible. No in reality, it IS impossible. So my answer is – I would NOT involve a volunteer where I can not find the right one.

The organizations I work with, as the director of a volunteer center in Lebanon, have a slightly different take on the same point. There are some excellent volunteers in Lebanon but, in general, the complaint of most organizations is that volunteers are generally not committed or reliable. In principle, the difference between a volunteer and paid staff is a paycheck and that represents a hold on the person to fulfill responsibilities or risk a financial loss. In a country with a high unemployment rate, that hold is a very serious one. So organizations would generally choose to have paid staff in roles where reliability is critical (and they have the money).

In addition, in a country where transparency and accountability are only gradually becoming accepted values, volunteers are also not welcome in cases where it is feared that they will know too much and might use that knowledge against the institution, again because there is no financial hold on them. I certainly know the professional response to both those perspectives, but it is not easy to refute what is proven by experience here. Of course, what is needed is to make sure that both volunteers and agencies understand their rights and responsibilities. But where that is not secure, then having paid staff in the critical positions that demand reliability is important.

Lacretia Bacon (US)

Here's a situation that may be unique to government, but also applies heavily to grant-funded

organizations. How do you resolve your job and responsibility to the organization as your employer when you are asked to help find volunteers for an “advisory committee” or other group where you KNOW there is no “service” to speak of? That is, staff will run everything, plan everything, and evaluate everything, thereby only using the volunteers to rubber stamp their work in order to report that a volunteer group’s input was sought?

This is pretty sticky – and doing your job unenthusiastically only half solves the problem.

What the organization wants is simply someone to fill a position, but this runs ethically against the basic tenets of why we believe in the power of volunteer involvement.

Do we shut up and do our job?

Do we protest and risk damaging the whole volunteer program?

Do we shut up, do our job, and recruit volunteers who will do the REAL spirit of the job – probably setting them up for frustration and disappointment?

Maybe I’ve just been doing this too long.

Anyway, this is a place where I would not WANT to place volunteers, but sometimes we have to make incredibly difficult decisions.

I think there are more situations out there. Such as where a high-profile program/event is being developed and volunteers are included and placed prominently. But, they are viewed more from their PR value than from a real dedication to service or solving a community problem. I’m speaking of those non-event events that somehow seem to draw high profile sponsor money and lots of media coverage.

Are these conundrums for our field? Or conundrums for American (and possibly any other) society?

I was on the VolunteerMatch.org volunteer opportunity registry site yesterday and saw that they have a national call out for volunteers – and you have a chance to win a Mini-Cooper CAR if you “serve”! Is anyone else out there bothered by this? Is this an offshoot or an aberration of our field? Is this covered by our ethics statements?

Again, the question is where would we personally not want to involve volunteers. But, most of us do not run our organizations. We may not want to, but we may have to....

Rob Jackson, Convening Editor

Of the criteria you use in deciding not to develop a volunteer assignment, which are situational/temporary (that might be resolved and then you would assign a volunteer) and which are do you consider basically non-negotiable?

Lacretia Bacon (US)

I find that consistency of staffing in a site or program where volunteers are to be working is vital.

If the position that has primary responsibilities for the actions of volunteers has been filled by a rotation of staff, then the likelihood of success is lessened.

For example, I have seen an active, vibrant volunteer program at a site basically die because the new staff person does not know how to delegate and/or is a micromanager. When a position is undergoing change and there are interim staff assigned, that is not the time to try to institute or strengthen the volunteer program.

This is also relevant during the initial phase of starting a new site for an existing program as it takes time for things to settle down and staff to settle into their roles.

I would also not develop any new assignments where there are staffing problems or issues because of the work environment. Constant change or constant infighting is not conducive to a healthy volunteer program. It's not fair to the volunteer to put them into that situation. When these issues are settled, then it's time to bring new factors into the mix: volunteers. This one is particularly hard because the volunteer manager is not the person that has the staff supervision responsibilities.

Stephanie Kelly (Canada)

Situational would be...

- ...when the development time involved in creating and filling the assignment outweighs the benefits. One example is students in a few of our provinces require 40 hours of community service in order to graduate high school. I work in a highly regulated and unionized environment. We are examining how limited student involvement might be more balanced to make it more attractive to both the organization and potential volunteers. Currently, the time it takes to prepare and place these students far outweighs the benefits. We are considering asking for a bigger time commitment (60 hours for front line service assignments, more hours for other assignments, and so on) so that, as the students increase their level of commitment, the benefits they receive also increases (e.g., speaker training, access to workshops and special projects/events, etc.).
- ...when a request for volunteers occurs as an afterthought and hasn't been planned into a project/event. This happens in all organizations. We do reserve the right to say no. This is situational because sometimes things can be put into place to make this work. For example, this happens a lot with our marketing group; we will generally look to recruit among staff and their family and friends as long as there is support from the requesting group and sufficient time to prepare, orient and integrate these new event recruits.

Non-negotiable would be...

- ...when asked to assign volunteers tasks/work that staff refuse to do. There is no circumstance where I endorse this.

- ...when volunteers are asked to replace unionized staff for coffee breaks and lunch. Often the roles where we see this type of request are expert roles where specialized training, protective wear and supervision are required, yet these are not offered to volunteers.
- ...when volunteers are asked to perform work that is deemed high risk but are not going to receive proper training or direct supervision.
- ...when volunteers are not privy to the benefits or even the same amount of insurance coverage as staff are to perform the same role.
- ...when an assignment is being created to suit a particular volunteer as opposed to be of mutual benefit to the volunteer and organization. I've seen this often where a volunteer comes in the door and has great skills but is not necessarily the right person at this time. So we create a role that isn't needed and find a way to hang onto that volunteer for no apparent reason. Wouldn't it be best to be honest and say "we have nothing to suit you but would really like to contact you when we do"? It's OK to say *no*. I've come across a lot of this over the years and it drives me batty, there are far more beneficial ways to spend our time than developing roles to suit a particular person as opposed to filling a role to meet a need where real, tangible benefits can be realized and in turn fulfill the volunteer – as opposed to make-work projects to "hang-on" to that great volunteer. When you do behave this way, in the end everyone loses.
- ...to replace paid staff with volunteers in a unionized environment

Sue Vineyard (US)

In every instance we need to determine cost versus payoff, using the benefit to the clients/patients/cause as our measuring stick. We are not responsible for helping students or court-demanded service folks fulfill their requirements. If the volunteers will help the clients (and the ultimate goal of the organization), and can be equipped with the training and staff support needed to do a good job, then let them volunteer. If not, or it will cost too much energy, draining it from other efforts to benefit clients, then no, don't bring them aboard.

Rob Jackson, Convening Editor

What reasons for not involving volunteers appear reasonable and practical on the surface, but actually speak to fundamental beliefs/assumptions about the relationship between paid work and volunteering? How can we challenge these?

Patricia Nabti (Lebanon)

In my view, fundamental beliefs/assumptions about the relationship between paid work and volunteering exist because there *are* fundamental differences between paid work and volunteering. These have to do with the inherent differences between monetary and non-monetary motivations for human behavior. We constantly talk about these differences that make some jobs more appropriate for volunteers. We should be equally willing to accept that these differences make some jobs more appropriate for paid staff. But more appropriate and exclusive are two different things, and I think there are exceptions in both directions that we should be flexible enough to accept.

Lacretia Bacon (USA)

In my own volunteer work, I am constantly dealing with the “they are only volunteers” issue from staff. Although the group that I volunteer with produces an annual event that rivals – and in a couple of cases surpasses – the work of their own staff, it is still difficult to get over that issue.

I think that this speaks to work requirements (and sometimes convenience) of staff. Volunteers are sometimes not accessible for meetings during the 8 to 5 workdays of staff. Volunteers sometimes require meetings, training, and communication accessibility after 5 and on weekends.

While this seems superficial, it is an important factor. If business needs to be done between 8 and 5, Monday to Friday, a volunteer who also holds a full-time paying job elsewhere may not be able to make phone calls and meetings on behalf of the organization during those times. The volunteer’s contribution is often left out because she or he is not there and can’t represent themselves as part of the “team.” And the organizations loses their knowledge base. This is especially true of those volunteer positions that are “middle management” themselves – maybe beyond doing direct service and working more as a volunteer team leader or on another level to represent the organization.

Some of these issues are because the staff peoples’ hands are tied – that is, they are restricted from flexible work hours and any extra time after their workday is ended is either prohibited or discouraged. Sometimes the staff person is jealously guarding their personal time. If the volunteer manager is free assist in off-hours, it still effectively puts a layer between the staff and the volunteer and all communications are filtered.

So, there is a disconnect between the volunteer and the organization. Sometimes this is just bureaucratic, and sometimes it is necessary that the organization’s business be conducted from 8-5, Monday through Friday.

In the US, there’s still a huge gap between the 8-5, M-F positions that are offered and the evening/weekend availability of people who want to get involved. Bridging that gap takes some creativity and change in the organization’s work structure.

(Aside: I once went to a workshop on organizational change titled “Teaching an Elephant to Dance.” Think there’s hope?)

Here’s a very interesting question: Staff who resist working with volunteers at their place of paid employment are often volunteers in another organization and in another context themselves. What causes this dichotomy? I think work environment plays a part.

Rebecca Bond (UK)

I'm really interested in this area and was hoping for some thoughts from everyone to help be develop a clear opinion. Staff who are reluctant to use volunteers may feel that way for a number of reasons: that they are unsure of how to work with volunteers, lack confidence/ability in their management skills or perhaps worry that the involvement of volunteers may expose their own failings or weaknesses.

In my organisation, many volunteers will think nothing (rightly or wrongly!) of picking up the phone to the Chief Executive and telling him if they are unhappy with a member of staff. There are some staff, therefore, who are frightened by the power of volunteers – although they would never give this as a reason for any difficulties in their relationship with volunteers. These are often the same members of staff, however, that don't understand the importance of volunteers to the organisation, reflected by the fact that they don't always return calls promptly, or move mountains to solve problems when required.

I think this has been highlighted, for me, by the Volunteer Advisory Panel that we have set up in my organisation. It gives volunteers the opportunity to feed in to our strategic planning process and provides a route directly to our Board of Trustees. The panel has now been running for two years and is generally successful, with good attendance and lively discussion. There have been a number of difficulties, however, with the staff/volunteer relationship around the Panel - mainly in encouraging staff to give ownership to the panel and to take their recommendations and follow them through. The challenge that I believe this represents is about the role of volunteers in the organisation. Who's organisation is it? Who are the primary stakeholders? And how are those relationships managed? I'd like to hear other people's thoughts on this.

Sue Vineyard (US)

If groups are refusing to involve volunteers because the individuals do not “fit” the needs of the assignment, that's a valid reason to say no. But if the no is coming out of a belief that volunteers are incompetent, unskilled, etc., then there needs to be an education of the folks assuming such incorrect concepts. Certainly, not all volunteers are capable of doing every job, but there is someone, somewhere who is probably as capable or even more capable than the staff person!

When I was with Project Concern, we had a volunteer doing heart surgery on a child at our hospital in Mexico. If that sounds impossible, understand that he was one of the most renowned heart surgeons in the world who had volunteered to help the child! Blanket assumptions about volunteers are as wrong as blanket assumptions about any one category of folks.

Lacretia Bacon (US)

I agreed with the above statements. But my my follow-up question is: What do we do about this? Our ability to affect the organization's actions depend upon our strength in the organization.

Perhaps those of us who are in the volunteer management field because we believe in the inherent value of volunteer service should NOT stay in the field long enough to be a “professional.” Perhaps we should always aspire to rise to the highest position of leadership that is possible in order to be able to influence these types of decisions.

I've been lucky in being called in as a "consultant" when some of these programs are being developed. I've won a few and lost a few. The best I can do when I "lose" is to try to distance myself as far away as I can so I don't have to witness the carnage on a daily basis.

Rob Jackson, Convening Editor

What would you consider a warning sign to say "no" to volunteer involvement?

Stephanie Kelly (Canada)

When you know that the volunteer role is not going to be supported, when you feel that the volunteer is being set up to fail, when the agency staff have no intention of integrating that role into their project/activity. Sometimes people throw together a role because they are pushed into it by a leader or by the wrong ideal or intention (funders/management says we need more volunteers and community partners). I've seen organizations create loose partnerships with volunteer organizations so they can apply for funding, but only because that is one of the criteria for qualification. Sometimes agencies will create roles because no one else wants to do the work. That's OK, but they have to support the role and the person doing it. Generally, my biggest warning sign is when there is no ownership and follow-through intended.

Rebecca Bond (UK)

I agree with Steph's thoughts about warning signs for volunteer involvement...the big ones would be a lack of support for the volunteer and a feeling that the volunteer role is being created as a "dumping ground" for the jobs that staff don't want to do or can't be bothered to do. I'd be particularly concerned about if there could be no sense of achievement. I believe that everyone needs to be able to look back and say "I did this" or "I achieved this" – if the role would not provide that opportunity it would worry me. It doesn't need to be achieving an objective in the traditional, work-based way, but the work has to make a genuine contribution to the aims of the organisation.

Patricia Nabti (Lebanon)

"No," in my view, is when no appropriate volunteer answers the call or when I don't have the time to make the call. It is not a matter of what the position is, but who is there (or not there) to fill it. I cannot be forever hunting for the elusive perfect volunteer enthusiastically willing to fill every job I have. Work needs to get done and I need to get on with finding someone to do it. And for most long-term, full-time, professional positions, looking for a volunteer is a waste of precious time.

Sue Vineyard (US)

There needs to be a case-by-case assessment of appropriate placement of volunteers just as there is for paid staff. When there is a "fit" it should happen; if not, it shouldn't. Generalized assumptions are too dangerous to fit all the scenarios that could come up. The only generalizations that I think might fit decisions of placement or non-placement are:

#1: Use common sense;

#2: Measure decisions with the clients as the main concern; and

#3: Listen to the hair on the back of your neck!

Bios of Participants

Lacretia Bacon (US)

Lacretia is the single point of contact for the City of Phoenix Volunteer Programs, placing volunteers throughout city government.

Rebecca Bond (UK)

Rebecca is currently on maternity leave from her job as National Volunteer Manager at Action Medical Research, a UK-wide medical research charity (www.action.org.uk), where she's worked for 2 1/2 years. She has put in place their volunteering strategy, policies and procedures, training and development programme, and other volunteer management elements.

Stephanie Kelly (Canada)

Stephanie is National Manager, Volunteer Program with Canadian Blood Services(CBS), where she is currently implementing a business plan to realign and modernize the organization's volunteer involvement program. Her past accomplishments include coordinating volunteer involvement in such celebrations as Canada Day and Winterlude in Canada 's Capital. Working with the Canadian Red Cross, she also oversaw volunteer resources management in the 1997 Manitoba Floods and the 1998 Eastern Ontario Ice Storm effort. In 1992, she received the Governor General's 125th Anniversary of Confederation Commemorative Medal for her role in the development and coordination of a volunteer program to engage youth.

Patricia Nabti (Lebanon)

Patricia is the founder and director of the Association for Volunteer Services (www.avsg.org.lb), the first volunteer center for all of Lebanon. She is a Lebanese of American origin who first came to Lebanon as a student at the American University of Beirut (AUB). In 1992, she moved to Lebanon to teach at AUB and in 1998, she left academia to found AVS. She is finishing the first book on volunteer management written for a Middle East audience.

Ivan H. Scheier (US)

Over the past twenty-five years, Ivan Scheier has been a cutting-edge thinker in the field of volunteerism. The numerous publications that Ivan has written include *When Everyone's a Volunteer - The Effective Functioning of All-Volunteer Groups*, and *Building Staff/Volunteer Relations*, both published by Energize Inc. Ivan's latest book, *Making Dreams Come True without Money, Might or Miracles*, was published by Energize, Inc. in 2000. Ivans Archival Collection is at <http://academic.regis.edu/volunteer/ivan>. Ivan is Consulting Editor for *e-Volunteerism*.

Sue Vineyard (US)

Sue is a trainer and author of 24 books on volunteer management, training and wellness. She has been the Managing Partner of Vineyard-McCurley Systems since 1983 and President of Heritage Arts Publishing since 1981. She holds a Bachelor of Science in Education degree from Western Illinois University, Macomb, Illinois and C.V.M. (Certified

Volunteer Manager) designation from the University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado.

e-Volunteerism: The Electronic Journal of the Volunteerism Community

ISSN: 1531-3794, Copyright © 2005

Articles may not be reproduced without permission.

Energize, Inc., 5450 Wissahickon Ave., Philadelphia PA 19144

Phone: 215-438-8342, Fax: 215-438-0434,

E-mail: info@energizeinc.com Website: <http://www.e-volunteerism.com>