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Introduction  

In the fall of 2008, a group of eight graduate students and two faculty members from the Department of Sociology at Colorado State University conducted an evaluation of the Church of the Brethren’s Children’s Disaster Services (CDS) program for training volunteers to assume roles as responders to disaster situations. The project was carried out in the context of a graduate seminar in evaluation research that met weekly for class sessions. In this report, we outline the major research questions and our methods and then describe the findings that resulted from the study.

The evaluation of CDS began with a request by Judy Bezon who serves as Associate Director of CDS. Ms. Bezon facilitated the evaluation project from conceptualization to completion and served as our key organizational contact throughout the evaluation period. Judy Gump, who lives in Colorado and serves as a Regional Coordinator for CDS, met with class at the beginning of Fall Semester 2008 and answered the many questions the evaluation group had. The eight graduate students in the class who participated in the evaluation were (alphabetically): Jesse Fagan, Katherine Hoffer, Chad Kershner, Katherine Koczynski, Michelle Lueck, David Rogers, Cory Wrenn, and Rebekah Young. The instructor for this course was Prabha Unnithan, a Professor in the Department of Sociology, who has expertise in policy analysis and program evaluation. Lori Peek, an Assistant Professor in the same Department who is a CDS volunteer and disaster researcher, served as a consultant for the project. We also thank Jack Brouillette, Sociology Chair, who supported the project by paying for all phone calls made in connection with surveys and interviews from departmental funds.

Below, we provide an overview of our methods and procedures for carrying out the evaluation. The subsequent sections of the report are organized in response to a number of key questions that CDS asked us to answer in the evaluation. After examining our findings that answer each of those questions, we highlight the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and challenges (or SWOC analysis, as it has come to be known in the strategic planning literature; see Bryson, 2004) that pertain to CDS’s training program.

Evaluation Methods

This is not a traditional outcome evaluation where we would be asked to examine if a particular policy or program was working or proven effective, i.e., if the outcomes were as conceived before implementation. It is also not a traditional process evaluation where we assessed a given policy or program against an external ideal or standard (see Weiss, 1997; Rossi, Lipsey, and Freeman, 2003). While the CDS’s expectations involved some of these elements, especially as they related to the training program, we were asked to answer questions that would allow CDS to
better understand their volunteer base and to explore strategies for future expansion and outreach.

As a result, we utilized three main methods to arrive at the findings to be described later. First, we were given access to CDS’s nation-wide database of volunteers. We used this database to answer several questions that CDS had about the general demographic and geographic characteristics of their volunteers. Second, from this database, we randomly selected 180 volunteers who we attempted to contact for a computer aided telephone survey. The survey consisted of closed and open-ended evaluative questions regarding their experiences with CDS training programs and being deployed during disaster situations (see Appendix A). We completed 46 interviews that were analyzed quantitatively. Third, we carried out qualitative interviews (see Appendix B) with 26 CDS leaders, defined as volunteer leaders and CDS staff, out of an identified 61 persons. The qualitative component of the study included questions regarding several strategic issues (e.g., diversity, motivating volunteers, etc.) that are tied to the organization’s plans for the future.

While we have used multiple methods in arriving at our findings, it is also important to note several limitations. First, we found that the nation-wide database had a lot of missing and overlapping information on volunteers. This was explained to us as the result of historical differences in the collection and recording of information that is tied to individuals occupying staff positions who enter data or with responsibility for database properties and maintenance. We suggest that, in the future, CDS establish consistent methods for tracking volunteer information that does not vary so drastically based on changes in CDS leadership or staffing. We also recommend that the database be updated to allow for the collection of basic demographic data, including information on volunteers’ gender, occupation, income, and race. This would allow for more sophisticated analyses of the demographic composition of the CDS volunteers. Second, our completion rate for the quantitative survey was affected by a number of emergent circumstances. Some respondents that we contacted had either not received or not paid attention to the notification from CDS about the survey. These individuals were among those most likely to decline our invitation to be surveyed. Third, given delays in accessing the initial database of all volunteers, our calling period was shortened to a less than optimal period of about three weeks in November of 2008. Difficulties with the schedules of the instructor and the students further limited the number of calls that were made. Thus, the completion rates of 26% for the quantitative survey and 42% for the qualitative interview are understandable in context and acceptable given generally declining rates of participation in telephone surveys (Curtin, Presser and Singer, 2005). Finally, our research design for the evaluative components of the project involves post-hoc analysis of the responses of volunteers who went through the training program, i.e., a treatment group, without a control group of those who did not. This is a less than optimal design in terms of measuring the effects of the training. However, given the constraints identified above, it was impossible to collect pre- and post- information for two groups of individuals who would be separated into treatment and control groups.

Here, it may be useful in the context of a discussion of the strengths and limitations of our findings to also point out some successes and speed bumps in the evaluation process. While the transfer of the national volunteer database to us was delayed, it yielded valuable descriptive information which we were able to summarize and use for reaching those selected for the
telephone survey. The dissemination of information to the volunteers regarding the upcoming survey was problematic in that most said they had no idea they were going to be contacted. In the future, we suggest including a sheet given to volunteers when they complete training, letting them know that they may be contacted in the future by evaluators. Communication between CDS and the evaluation team were positive and mutually beneficial, but sporadic. For a formal evaluation it is important that both sides be in regular contact with each other through, for example, weekly telephone calls or emails. This would allow for more consistent contact between CDS and the evaluation team. Finally, a clearer picture of CDS’s organizational set-up would have been useful. These factors are important to any successful evaluation, and we encourage CDS to continue to work with evaluation teams in the future.

Findings

In the following sections, we outline the major findings of the evaluation project. These findings are grouped according to the ten questions that CDS requested that we find answers for and/or questions that the faculty and students at Colorado State University deemed critical to the evaluation project.

Q1. Who are the volunteers?

Demographically, CDS volunteers are overwhelmingly White, older (often retired), female, and highly educated. Being older or female is presumably related to CDS’s mission since women are often caregivers, and older individuals have fewer family and career commitments to prevent their deployment.

Beginning with age, Figure 1 shows the current age of volunteers in our trainee sample (in red) and those not in our sample (in black). The average age of all volunteers was 63 and the average age of our sample was 61.
Volunteers mostly self-identify as Christian, and as expected, are predominantly members of the Church of the Brethren. Figure 2 shows the religious preference of volunteers from the sample and those not sampled.
Since the database did not contain information on volunteers’ gender, occupation, income, or race, the following tables show our sample’s distribution on these factors. Our sample was mostly female (91%), White (93%), highly educated (64% college degree or above), middle to upper income (63% above $50,000). Over one-third of our sample was retired (36%), and over one-quarter of the respondents were working in educational fields (27%).

**Table 1: Gender**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41 (91%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4 (9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: Race**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>40 (93%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>3 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3: Highest Educational Attainment**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td>7 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>9 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>9 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Post-Graduate</td>
<td>5 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Graduate Degree</td>
<td>15 (33%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4: Occupation**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>16 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>12 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daycare/Hospital/ Elderly Care</td>
<td>4 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5: Current Household Income**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; $25,000</td>
<td>5 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 - $50,000</td>
<td>7 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001 - $75,000</td>
<td>13 (41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,001 - $100,000</td>
<td>5 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,001 - $125,000</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Religious Preference of Surveyed and Non-Surveyed Volunteers
The demographic characteristics of CDS volunteers conform to those associated with volunteers in the U.S. overall. Research has shown that volunteer rates differ across gender, race, educational attainment, income, and age (Mesch et al., 2006: 565). Individuals with higher educational levels and income are more likely to volunteer (Mesch et al., 2006: 579; Smith, 2004: 58; Wilson, 2000: 219-220). These individuals can afford to lose some income and take time off from work to volunteer; a prerequisite for CDS volunteers to deploy (Wilson, 2000). This also makes age a consideration since younger people are less likely to have attained a position that affords them the opportunity to volunteer (Wilson, 2000: 226). Due to larger demographic shifts in the United States, and because employed individuals may have time constraints that limit their amount of free time, retirees play an increasingly important role in volunteer organizations (Smith, 2004: 56; Wilson, 2000: 221). Further, women appear to be more likely to volunteer than men and Whites are more likely to volunteer than minorities. The racial differences in volunteering may be due to lower income, educational, and occupational levels among minorities. Also, many minority groups are less likely to be asked to volunteer regardless of their social or economic resources (Wilson, 2000: 228).

Q2. Where are the volunteers?

Drawing on data from the volunteer database, it is clear that CDS volunteers are geographically concentrated in the Northeast, Midwest, and West Coast areas as shown in Figure 3.

Figure 3: Locations of All CDS Volunteers by ZIP Code
Figure 4 illustrates the locations of the sample population that we interviewed. Our sample follows the general trends of the volunteer population, although the sample lacked respondents in the South and Pacific Northwest regions.

**Figure 4: Locations of Sampled Volunteers by Zip Code**

Q3. Where is CDS most needed?

CDS leadership has articulated a desire to increase the number of volunteers in more disaster-prone areas (Bezon, 2008: 10). In many of these areas, CDS faces a dual problem: CDS may be unknown, and Church of the Brethren congregations may be difficult to find or are non-existent (Bezon, 2008: 10). CDS deployments are mapped below in Figure 5, which shows where the historical need has been. California, the Gulf and Atlantic Coasts, and the Midwest (especially Ohio and Pennsylvania) are the areas where CDS has often deployed. With the high number of volunteers in Ohio and Pennsylvania, the availability of volunteers may have influenced the number of deployments to those areas.
An area of concern is the Gulf Coast region, particularly Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama, which has fewer volunteers than areas in the Midwest, but required a high number of deployments. Also, we note a mismatch between the high number of volunteers in the Pacific Northwest, but where few disasters occur.

**Q4. What is happening with demand for CDS services?**

Demand for CDS services is likely to rise significantly in the future, as disaster risk is on the rise in the United States. Over the past five decades, the number of federal disaster declarations has increased substantially (see Figure 6). Beyond better tracking and reporting, the increase in the number of disaster events may be attributed to various demographic, socioeconomic, environmental, and technological factors. The U.S. population more than tripled from 1900 to 2000, placing more people in harm’s way. The growing population has been accompanied by greater diversity, longer life expectancies, and more significant gaps between high- and low-income populations. Climate change, coastal land loss, and environmental degradation have resulted in more extreme weather events and have impacted fragile ecosystems. In addition, increased urbanization, infrastructure decay, and unsustainable development in hazard-prone areas such as floodplains, coastal regions, and earthquake fault zones have contributed to rising disaster losses (for a complete summary, see Peek, 2009).
Figure 6: Number of U.S. Federal Disaster Declarations, 1960-2008

The data on CDS deployment mimics these rising disaster trends. Figure 7 shows a timeline of the average staffing needs, number of events, and average days of deployment per event from the beginning of the program until 2007. Historically, CDS responded to an average of 9 events per year, but the average since 1998 has increased to 11 events per year. The average team size has been 12 volunteers per event, with a median of 8 volunteers and most commonly only 4 volunteers. Not only are there more events, but also the average days of deployment per volunteer has increased. These increases in demand may pose a threat to CDS’s ability to serve if the volunteer base is not increased.

\[\text{\footnotesize\textsuperscript{1}}\] There is some inconsistency in the data as to whether a significant incident is documented under one project number (Hurricane Andrew) or many (Hurricane Katrina).
Q5. Who attends training workshops and why?

When examining who attends the CDS training workshops, we note the importance of the Church of the Brethren, referrals, and personal experience. Social networks are a crucial part of volunteer membership. Research has shown that a pre-existing network of contacts was a necessary precondition for organizational membership (Weinberger and Jutting, 2001). This is true of CDS, and was expected since word-of-mouth is a central component of their recruitment. Figure 8 illustrates how trainees came into contact with CDS. Most found CDS through their church—typically affiliated with Church of the Brethren or United Methodist—or through friends, coworkers, or other non-church contacts. Still others found CDS from newspaper ads or by searching for the program online.
Both church and non-church social networks were important for learning about CDS training. Networks were also important when volunteers attended the training. As shown in Figure 9, the majority of CDS trainees attended the training with someone they knew; most commonly volunteers brought family, such as children, spouses, or parents.

Social networks also affected trainees’ desire to deploy: trainees reported that they were slightly more likely to deploy due to the presence of friends, family, fellow congregation members, and acquaintances at the training.
Since social networks are crucial to hearing about CDS training and attending training sessions, we asked if participants had referred others to the program. In Table 6, we can see deployment was a critical factor influencing whether or not the volunteer referred another person to CDS. In addition to this, if a volunteer deployed more than once, referrals were almost twice as likely to complete the training (24% for deployed at least once, 40% for deployed more than once).

**Table 6: The Influence of Deployment on Referrals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Did not refer another</th>
<th>Did refer another</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not deployed</td>
<td>12 (57%)</td>
<td>9 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deployed</td>
<td>4 (16%)</td>
<td>21 (84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16 (35%)</td>
<td>30 (65%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual background characteristics were also important in determining who would become a CDS volunteer. As expected, CDS volunteers have an affinity to work with children. Not only were many individuals educators or retired educators as seen above, but all 46 respondents had some experience with children either as parents, educators, or a combination of the two. Educators included licensed teachers and volunteers with experience leading children in group settings, such as through 4-H or coaching. Six trainees (13%) were parents only, 15 (33%) were educators only without children of their own, and 25 (54%) had experience as both parents and educators.

The disaster mission of CDS was also salient for some of the sample, though not as salient as the mission to aid children. We found that 37% of the trainees had previous experience with disasters, including personal, volunteer, or employment experience.

**Q6. What do people gain from the training workshops? And, what information do they wish they would have received?**

We assessed the training program using a knowledge-attitude-practice approach, more commonly known as a KAP analysis. Trainees’ attitudes and feelings about the training program as well as their knowledge gained during training are important to a successful implementation of programmatic goals. But, research has shown that attitudes affect the application of training information in the practical setting more than knowledge gains alone. Also, trainees who feel the program is useful are more likely to apply the material learned; and good training sessions increase trainees’ feelings of competence and level of comfort with the skills taught (Cauble and Thurston, 2000).

**Attitudes.** First to assess attitudes, trainees were asked about their feelings toward the CDS training program. Overall, trainees expressed high levels of satisfaction with the program. All trainees expressed high regard for their trainers’ knowledge, competence, compassion, dedication, and passion. Three of the 46 trainees went so far as to indicate that the trainers made the program, “so interesting that you wanted a disaster right then.” Respondents were also asked if they felt prepared to respond to a disaster to which they offered tentative agreement. One
trainee’s response sums the results nicely: “I think as much as you could be prepared for something you haven’t done before.” A previously deployed trainee indicated, “Actually, you never know what you are going to experience, [but I] felt confident I understood their guidelines and [would] be open to all circumstances and be creative… [It was a] very well thought-out workshop for a hypothetical response.” Trainees seemed to understand that each disaster is different and any apprehension about their abilities resulted from their understanding of the variable nature of disaster settings.

We asked deployed trainees about their feelings toward the training program since they had been exposed to the post-disaster field setting. All of these trainees responded in the affirmative ranging from “adequate” and “sufficient” to “very good.” When asked if anything should be added to the training program, 14 of the 25 respondents (56%) could not specify any additional information. Five individuals (20%) wanted discussion on living in close quarters with other volunteers or suggested team-building exercises to help the volunteers work together. One volunteer wanted information about sanitation discussed to prevent spreading germs in the childcare area. Another volunteer thought a refresher course may be necessary since the training program had evolved over the years. One volunteer wished the training and materials were updated on trends for children today such as movies and video games.

**Knowledge.** Trainees were asked to assess their knowledge of various training goals before training, after training, and after deployment (if applicable) on a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 indicating great understanding. Figure 10 shows the average score on six training areas.

**Figure 10: Trainees’ Average Self-Assessed Knowledge of Six Training Areas**

As indicated in Figure 10, trainees ranked themselves very high in knowledge after training. The largest knowledge gains were related to CDS specific information such as setting up the
childcare area and other operational procedures. Volunteers also showed strong knowledge gains about disasters and working with children in the post-disaster context such as understanding the stages of a disaster or the importance of play for children after a disaster. Respondents experienced fewer knowledge gains in understanding children in general. Since all respondents were either parents or educators, their previous experience with children would explain the high level of self-assessed understanding of the characteristics of children and explain the limited perceived increase in that knowledge after training. Some of the trainees with early childhood education indicated that the information about children was redundant for them. These results suggest that CDS may want to consider revising the training program to minimize the time spent on understanding children in general, while maximizing the focus on the most unfamiliar areas (e.g., CDS rules and regulations, the post-disaster setting, etc.).

Among trainees who had deployed to a disaster setting (25 interviewees), the strongest gains in knowledge from the deployment experience were also related to the CDS operational information and understanding disasters. We asked deployed trainees what previous experiences they used during deployment and nearly all discussed their experiences dealing with children either as parents or in structured settings. This previous experience with children was the most valuable to volunteers in the field and comes more from previous experience than from the training. Overall, these results indicate that respondents think the training dramatically increased their knowledge of disasters and CDS operations, with the most dramatic gains in understanding CDS operations.

**Practice.** To understand the influence of training on practice, deployed volunteers were asked about their experiences with the children and the disaster settings, if they had any issues or concerns during deployment, and what training material they remembered using. We identified three frequently mentioned training goals from the interviews: 1) the importance of play for children following a disaster; 2) how to set-up and run the CDS childcare area; and 3) the importance of being flexible and adaptable in the post-disaster setting.

The volunteers indicated that caring for the children was the easiest part of deployment, as could be predicted from their previous experiences with children. Many discussed how they listened empathically and allowed the children to draw and act out their experiences. One volunteer said, “[The] easy part was being able to talk to kids and play with them and let them act out their frustrations with the cars. Let them use towns to act out destruction and draw destruction, black stuff or fires or broken homes or turn over toy cars.” Others were amazed and intrigued to see first-hand how the children worked through their emotions with play. Twelve of the 25 deployed volunteers (48%) mentioned that they specifically remembered these points from training and found them extremely valuable during deployment.

When asked about other training points that were useful, nine of the 25 deployed volunteers (36%) mentioned specific CDS procedures such as setting up the childcare center, checking children in to the center, cleaning up, or working with other agencies. All of the deployed volunteers indicated that the training was sufficient to understand how the childcare area worked, as one woman said, “of course [you] always have a lead [caregiver] who helps, but training prepares you for this well.”
The importance of flexibility and adaptability during the disaster response was particularly salient for the volunteers. The volunteers were not surprised by the variety of situations they encountered, noting that the training had prepared them for having to set-up and operate the center in many environments. For example, one volunteer said, “they super emphasized to be flexible… and to be careful about where you fit into the total group setting.”

Two issues arose during the interviews. Five of the 25 deployed volunteers (20%) mentioned issues with the lead caregiver. One respondent indicated that the lead was often dealing with the Red Cross, so was not always readily available. Another said that her educational background made her disagree with some of the lead caregiver’s decisions, although she did not say anything during deployment. Another volunteer indicated that, “each lead is an individual so you need to wait and watch and see what their expectations are.” A second issue that arose was working with children outside the designated age range. Two volunteers (8%) indicated that older children came to the childcare area, and they wished they had activities for these children. This is difficult, given that CDS predominantly focuses on the care of young children in disasters.

The KAP analysis highlights four overall conclusions about CDS training. First, the volunteers overwhelming reported positive attitudes toward the training program, which should positively affect their application of the knowledge in the disaster setting. Second, the volunteers were all experienced with children, found working with the children relatively easy and rewarding, and the training did not greatly increase their knowledge about childcare. Third, the training showed the biggest impact on participants’ knowledge of CDS procedures and disasters settings, including how to work with children who have experienced a disaster. Finally, the training program seemed to adequately prepare volunteers for deployment and lead non-deployed volunteers to feel confident in their abilities to serve children and families after a disaster.

To fully utilize the training time provided, we suggest that CDS gather information on trainees’ previous experience prior to training. This may allow the trainers to tailor training sessions to that knowledge, and emphasize the knowledge that participants most need. We would also suggest incorporating team-building exercises since deployed volunteers mentioned personality issues within the volunteer team. With the stressful and rapidly changing environment of disaster response, volunteers need to be comfortable working in the group and adaptable not just to the environment, but also to others’ personalities. Finally, information on older children and new technologies that children are interested in may need to be added to the training to better serve children’s wants and needs.

Q7. Who deploys to the field and why?

The main purpose of the CDS volunteer program is to prepare volunteers for deployment. But as illustrated in Figure 11, only 53% of the entire trained population has actually deployed to a disaster. Around 300 trainees have deployed once and nearly 150 deployed twice.
In examining the rate of deployment according to training year, Figure 12 shows that recent training events generated fewer volunteers who actually deploy than earlier years. Specifically, trainings since 2006 have produced no newly deployed volunteers. There may be a time issue here, since, as shown in Figures 13 and 14, there is an almost decade lag between first training and deployment for volunteers. These recent trainings may eventually show a higher conversion rate after the usual lag.
Volunteer age and Church of the Brethren membership are the best predictors for volunteer deployment. Age and deployment is displayed in the Figures 13 and 14 below. Figure 13 shows that the age of first training for the entire volunteer pool averages to 51 years. Compared to Figure 14, we see that while training may occur in the years before retirement (early 50s), deployment seems to dramatically increase in the early retirement years (62+) and decline in the early 70s. This suggests that, in addition to other challenges to the recruitment and deployment process, there is a limited window wherein CDS must maximize their utilization of volunteers. The aging of the volunteer population, combined with the increasing service demand and the known upper limits for deployment age, suggests a coming shortage in available volunteers.
Figure 13: All Volunteers Age of First Training

Figure 14: Percent of Deployments by Volunteer Age
Deployment is also related to being a member of the Church of the Brethren. As shown in Figure 15, non-Brethren volunteers are slightly more likely to \textit{not} deploy, and dedicated volunteers who deploy two or more times are much more likely to be members of the Church of the Brethren. Since research suggests that group members with high group identification participate more in group activities and contribute more monetarily (Brewer and Kramer, 1986), we anticipated that Church of the Brethren members would make the strongest volunteers. Extending the strong internal and supportive networks within the Church of the Brethren to non-affiliated volunteers may increase deployment probabilities. We would suggest that CDS build its own socially supportive and high group-identifying volunteer base independent of the Church of the Brethren.

\textbf{Figure 15: Deployment by Church of the Brethren Membership}

![Deployment by Church of the Brethren Membership](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRF00</th>
<th>PRF01</th>
<th>PRF02</th>
<th>PRF03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church or the Brethren</td>
<td>46.08%</td>
<td>55.00%</td>
<td>69.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-COB</td>
<td>53.92%</td>
<td>45.00%</td>
<td>30.82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q8. What are the benefits and challenges of volunteerism? What do people gain from going into the field? What are the costs of volunteerism and deterrents to deploying?

One training goal is for participants to learn about other uses for CDS skills in participants’ communities and other volunteer commitments. Respondents were asked if the CDS training knowledge was applicable outside CDS programs and if the training influenced their community involvement. A large majority of respondents (87\%) reported some degree of applicability of CDS training to situations outside of CDS deployments. Respondents found CDS training improved their ability to work with children, especially in teaching or group leader situations. Others cited applicability to other disaster situations or in other community programs such as the Red Cross or Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) activities. This result indicates that the CDS’s training goal is being fulfilled to a good extent.
When asked whether CDS training influenced them to become more involved in their communities, 40% of respondents indicated yes, while 60% reported that it did not. Those who said no indicated they were already overly involved in their communities or with other volunteering commitments, and others were constrained by family responsibilities.

Overall, it appears that CDS’s goal to encourage use of these skills outside CDS is being met to a certain degree. Our findings also support the literature that suggests positive latent effects of volunteerism, such as the application of knowledge to other settings. Since CDS training is useful outside of CDS deployment and can encourage trainees to volunteer outside of CDS, we suggest CDS note this during recruitment and to volunteers to use for referrals.

Q9. How can CDS best recruit and retain their volunteers?

Boosting recruitment and retention are important to every volunteer organization and especially important to CDS as the need for services increases. There are many motivations for volunteering, including a desire to give back to the community, skill acquisition, mission salience, and building relationships (Hobbs, 2001). Research suggests that when soliciting volunteers, an organization must stress that there is an important need for their service. Social networks also play an important role in volunteering and can often be considered social resources. Social ties create trust and these networks can help disseminate information regarding volunteering. Volunteers involved with religious nonprofits are usually motivated in part by their religious convictions (Berger, 2003: 29). But, research has found that a volunteer’s values and desire to belong to a group can serve as important motivators for volunteer service beyond religious convictions (Smith, 2004: 60).

**Current CDS recruitment.** To understand volunteer recruitment and retention, we interviewed CDS leadership. Mirroring the results from the trainee survey, CDS leadership (67%) highlighted the importance of word-of-mouth recruitment and referrals. Talking about the program, whether informally or formally through presentations, seems to be the number one volunteer recruitment tool. The other main form of recruitment, as mentioned by 74% of respondents, is networking through churches and the larger faith community.

It appears to us that some leaders take a more proactive and creative approach to CDS promotion and volunteer recruitment than others. While we believe that CDS volunteer dedication is a major strength of the organization, and while social networking is important to volunteering and volunteer recruitment, if current volunteers are relying on recruitment through their own social networks, CDS may be limited in the types of potential volunteers that it is able to reach. CDS may need to approach recruitment in a more systematic and coordinated way by engaging existing relationships with other organizations or by seeking to formalize relationships with other disaster-oriented, faith-based, or child-focused organizations.

When reaching out beyond the Church of the Brethren, the research literature suggests other areas in which recruitment can occur, such as at schools, civic groups and clubs, hospitals, and professional organizations. Even though most leadership respondents (70%) indicated that CDS has a volunteer outreach program that recruits from outside of the Church of the Brethren, some
did not know whether CDS had such a program, and a smaller group (11%) believed that recruitment was limited to the Church of the Brethren network. While a majority (67%) of respondents said that CDS uses its relationships with other disaster response organizations to recruit, nearly a third (26%) did not know whether this was the case. A majority (59%) of CDS leadership told us that CDS partners with schools and other faith organizations in order to recruit volunteers, while over a third (37%) did not know of any such partnerships. The results suggest that communication among leadership is problematic. If CDS is going to be implementing new recruitment strategies, communication methods may need to be amended so that leadership understands goals and strategies so that they can implement CDS’s plans as CDS intends.

Suggestions for successful volunteer recruitment are plentiful. Face-to-face volunteer recruitment is more effective than appealing to potential volunteers through mass media (Tu and Huang, 2001: 11; Wilson, 2000: 223). Based on the importance of referrals discussed by trainees and leadership, increasing CDS volunteers face time with other organizations could provide more recruits. By extending a volunteer invitation personally, diverse groups are also more likely to be recruited. Also, face-to-face interaction may build trust within minority communities by building personal relationships through interaction with a community (Hobbs, 2001).

Volunteer motivations and mission salience for recruitment. When designing recruitment strategies, understanding volunteer motivations is important. CDS leadership had similar motivations for volunteering as the trainees: a desire to serve children was the top reason (70% of leadership and 54% of trainees). As the research literature suggests, mission salience and the volunteer feeling important to the mission are key factors in attracting and retaining volunteers. Mission salience draws in volunteers as described by one respondent: “It is a unique program that serves children. I don’t know of any other organization like it.” CDS leadership also focused on faith or religion (41%) as providing a motivation to volunteer. However, only 11% of trainees specifically mentioned faith or religion as a motivation. Recruiting people that tend to have one or both of these motivations will likely prove to be the best strategy as CDS moves forward. We expect that the faith community will continue to serve as a recruiting ground, but CDS may want to expand outreach to child-centered educational programs and professions in order to capitalize on its child-centered mission. Displaying the importance of having volunteers with knowledge of children to the organizational effectiveness can attract skilled, educated, and motivated volunteers from diverse constituencies.

Recognition and usefulness for volunteer retention. To retain volunteers, volunteers need to feel recognized and made to feel useful. Because volunteers are unpaid and free to “withdraw support at any time,” recognition is particularly important to volunteer retention and lack of recognition is a common reason for volunteer attrition (Fisher and Ackerman, 1998: 264; Tu and Huang, 2001: 9; Wilson, 2000: 222, 230-231). In light of this, respondents were asked how CDS thanks its volunteers. The overall impression was that CDS does try to thank its volunteers in some capacity. With that said, the responses as to how volunteers are thanked varied a great deal. Nearly three-quarters (74%) of leadership respondents said they received a gift, 22% said they saw a thank you in the CDS newsletter, and 52% said that other volunteers or project managers thanked them. This indicates that thanking volunteers is inconsistent and depends largely on the initiative of other volunteers including regional coordinators and project managers.
Almost one-quarter (22%) of the CDS leadership indicated during the interviews that they believe that volunteers do not need a thank you, as exemplified by these responses: “Most volunteers don’t need a thank you.” “…anyone who volunteers to do this isn’t looking to be thanked, the work is thanks enough.” These responses are in opposition to the research literature on the topic, which highlights the importance of thanking volunteers. Leadership respondents were also not aware if non-deployed volunteers or volunteers who had not deployed in a long time were thanked for remaining in the volunteer pool or for volunteering in other capacities. While the main office sends out a newsletter at least three times a year, which includes a note that thanks all volunteers, it is clear that this broad and non-specific thank you does not fulfill the recognition highlighted by the research literature as important to retention. Given that CDS volunteers are central to service provision, improved communication strategies should employ more consistent, formalized, and individualized volunteer recognition.

Feeling useful is also important to volunteer retention. Since the main role for volunteers is deployment and half of all trainees do not deploy, this issue is especially important for CDS. When leadership volunteers were asked about other roles or opportunities for volunteers besides deployment, all respondents indicated that there were opportunities available to willing volunteers beyond deploying to disaster sites, sponsoring training sessions, or assembling kits of comfort. For instance, office and other clerical duties were mentioned by almost half (48%) of the respondents. A good portion of the leadership also indicated that volunteer outreach (22%) and improving communication among the volunteer base (19%) were important roles that volunteers do provide and could provide more frequently. Communication is especially important for keeping volunteers motivated, as this leader pointed out: “There is some communication with our volunteers… but keeping them updated with more frequent newsletters would help increase enthusiasm and keep the momentum going. This is something that volunteers could do.” Leadership also reminded us of the importance of the volunteers who support deployed volunteers’ families back home. While many leadership respondents expressed a need for more volunteers serving in the traditional roles, they seemed surprised by the question asking for other opportunities for volunteers to fill. Again, we see a need to diversify the idea of a volunteer and the importance of disseminating this idea to the volunteer pool. CDS might look to underutilized current volunteers for filling some of the roles that it finds lacking.

While leadership mentioned various roles for volunteers, 15 (33%) of the 46 trainees interviewed had not performed any service to CDS beyond training. Only 17% of the trainees said they provided other types of service besides deployment, with building kits of comfort (7 volunteers) the most common. Of the 7 trainees who made kits, 3 did this with another person or in a group. Only 2 trainees mentioned performing the other services that leadership mentioned: one trainee made phone calls to volunteers and one assisted the regional coordinator. Yet, 31 of the 46 trainees (67%) said they would be interested in other opportunities to serve if these were provided by CDS. As one volunteer said, “[I] volunteered to assemble kits of comfort, but no one followed up from CDS.” Others would be interested if they knew what opportunities were available. Of those who were not interested, many mentioned current time constraints that prevented increased involvement. The contrasting responses between trainees and leadership show a lack of communication with the volunteer pool. Since identification with the group and feeling useful are important to retention, promoting and facilitating sessions for building kits or
organizing and publicizing other volunteer roles could increase volunteer retention and commitment.

**Q10. Where does CDS stand on diversity issues?**

In 2007, CDS, as presented in the Ministry Plan, incorporated the overlapping goals of volunteer base expansion and increased ethnic and linguistic diversity among volunteers (Personal Interview). In order to achieve a diverse and expanded volunteer base, CDS plans to partner with other organizations, but continue to rely on its typical methods of volunteer recruitment, which focus on word-of-mouth recruitment through existing volunteer social networks and speaking engagements (Personal Interview). The target population currently appears to be the larger faith-based community, particularly the Church of the Brethren network. The emerging program also targets potential volunteers through the faith-based, disaster response, and child-centered communities across the country, with some emphasis on recruitment in disaster-prone areas in the Southeastern and Gulf Coast regions of the United States.

To understand CDS’s current attempt to diversify, leadership was asked to discuss their understanding of diversity and recruiting for diversity. When respondents were asked to provide a definition of diversity, almost all (78%) mentioned race, culture, or ethnicity, and over one-third (37%) included faith or religion. Gender, language, disability, age, and education were mentioned in some form by about 30% of respondents. Most respondents (63%) believed that CDS’s organizational definition would be similar to their own; indicating that the primary ways that diversity is defined at CDS is through racial, ethnic, and religious differences. While volunteers suggested that diversity includes multiple faiths, some respondents suggested that the volunteer recruitment program should be or is limited to those within the Christian faith. This is an internal conflict that may be remedied by clearly defining diversity in the training materials or other organizational publications. This “official” definition will serve to enhance communication and understanding among the volunteer base by explicitly stating what CDS means by its goal to diversify the volunteer network.

Most of the respondents (89%) suggested that increased diversity among the volunteer base would improve service provision, which is in line with the literature on the subject. Over one-third of respondents (37%) mentioned that increased diversity would help overcome language barriers. CDS leadership clearly recognizes the need for and benefits arising from a more diverse volunteer population. Over half (52%), however, of the respondents did not know that this was in fact a goal at CDS, and a larger proportion (63%) of respondents were unaware that CDS has developed strategies to increase diversity.

Since CDS relies on word-of-mouth for volunteer recruitment and a majority of the leadership interviewed (85%) felt that the faith community was a target for recruitment, diversification will be difficult. As discussed above, future threats are too few volunteers, increasing demand for CDS services, and a relatively homogenous and regionally uneven volunteer base. Figure 16 maps volunteers by religious orientation. This map shows the concern that current recruitment and diversification mechanisms relying on word-of-mouth from the Church of the Brethren or CDS members will likely fail since areas needing more volunteers, particularly in the Gulf Coast, have fewer numbers of Brethren volunteers.
Other strategies will need to be implemented if diversification is to be successful. Diversification is a problem in most voluntary organizations across the U.S., especially with respect to racial diversity (Weisinger and Salipante, 2005: 29-30). It is important for organizations to utilize existing and new networks for volunteer recruitment (Fredette, Bradshaw, and Inglis, 2006: 64; Schmidt, 2006: 16).

**Figure 16: Spatial Distribution of Volunteers by Church of the Brethren Membership**

Methods to recruit diverse volunteers include: presenting bilingual or multilingual information, demonstrating the importance of the volunteer to the organizational mission (such as the importance of bilingual volunteers), producing promotional materials with pictures of diverse people, reaching out through multicultural and multilingual representatives, inviting representatives of diverse communities to speak at public events, and giving awards to individuals and groups that promote diversity (Berthoud and Greene, 2001: 3; Hobbs, 2001).

Clear communication needs to be a vital component of CDS’s strategic goal to diversify the volunteer base. Most members of the CDS leadership recognize the need for a diverse volunteer corps. As individuals are dedicated to the success of CDS, they are likely to be willing to undertake the diversification effort once they are made aware of CDS’s future plans and strategies by those who have central responsibilities for the direction of the organization.
Conclusions

We begin our conclusions with a summary of what we found. CDS’s volunteers are similar demographically to those who are likely to volunteer in general. They are mainly from the Northeast, Midwest, and Western United States. Their services are needed most in California and the Gulf and Atlantic Coasts. The future is likely to result in more, rather than less, demand for CDS services. Attendees at CDS training sessions come to them through social networks of similar groups. Being deployed is likely to lead volunteers to refer other potential volunteers to the program. The main motivation for volunteers is their interest in working with children. Most trainees gain knowledge from the CDS training programs. Most volunteers have positive attitudes regarding what they have learned in the training, and this positive response increases after deployment when volunteers find the knowledge gained to be of practical relevance. However, deployment takes quite a bit of time after training. Volunteers judged their training to be useful in other spheres of their lives and it motivated them to undertake similar efforts in their communities. Yet, clearer internal and external messaging is needed along with recognition of volunteers in order to keep up their motivation and for retention purposes. The issue of diversifying CDS’s volunteers needs to be addressed proactively. Recruitment to the volunteer base is dominated (understandably) by members of the Church of the Brethren. Therefore, multiple communication methods with external groups particularly focusing on the salience of CDS’s child-centered mission and emphasis on the strategic importance of diversity to those within the organization are recommended. One final suggestion is for CDS to undertake similar evaluations periodically (e.g., every 5 years) for both demographic analyses and future planning.

The organizational strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and challenges that this assessment of selected aspects of CDS highlighted in terms of our findings are summarized in Table 7. While this is a simplified SWOC analysis, it does identify major internal and external features of CDS that can be examined for the development of a strategic plan.

Table 7: CDS SWOC Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERNAL</th>
<th>EXTERNAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengths</strong></td>
<td><strong>Opportunities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Highly committed volunteer base</td>
<td>• Possibility of working with other groups and recruiting from them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Effective training program</td>
<td>• Expanding effects of CDS volunteers on their own communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weaknesses</strong></td>
<td><strong>Challenges</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low rates of deployment among trained volunteers</td>
<td>• Increasingly diverse population in terms of race/ethnicity and religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Less than adequate internal communication</td>
<td>• More disasters, more demand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix A: Trainee Survey Instrument

Finding Out About CDS
To begin, I am going to ask you some background questions regarding how you learned about the CDS program and other topics related to volunteering and childcare.

1. First, could you tell me how you found out about CDS?

Pre-CDS Experience

2a. Before joining CDS, what experiences did you have with disaster settings?
   Probes:
   - Have you ever been through a disaster personally?
   - Do you have friends or family members who have been through a disaster?
   - Had you volunteered for other disaster programs or during any disasters?

2b. Before joining CDS, What experiences did you have with children
   Probes:
   - Do you have children? How old are they?
   - Have you ever watched many children together at one time?
   - Did you have experience teaching or volunteering with children?

Sign-Up Process
Thanks for your responses! Now I am going to ask you a few questions about the decision to become a volunteer and deciding to sign up.

3a. How did you first hear about CDS?
3b. What made you decide to volunteer with CDS?
3c. How did you sign up for the CDS training?

Family & Social Associations in Signing Up

4a. Did you attend the training with family members? If so, how many? # ____________ of _________ (total) family members

4b. Did you attend the training with friends? If so, how many? # ____________ friends (who are trainees, facilitators etc.)

4c. Did you know any other people in the program, for example, trainers, facilitators, trainees, etc.) before the training began? If so, who? (Probe to specify relationship.)
Training Experience
Thanks so much for your response. Now I would like to ask you some questions about the actual training experience.

5a. What was your opinion of your trainer? Was s/he
   Well-informed?
   Easy to understand?
   Likable?
   Approachable?

The next set of questions requires short answers, and I just will ask you to tell me if you:
Strongly disagree/Disagree/Are Neutral/Agree/Strongly Agree

6a. I felt more comfortable at the training event due to the presence of
   Family                     SD  D  N  A  SA  N/A
   Friends                    SD  D  N  A  SA  N/A
   Acquaintances              SD  D  N  A  SA  N/A
   Co-workers                 SD  D  N  A  SA  N/A
   Fellow congregation members SD  D  N  A  SA  N/A

6b. I made friends with one or more persons while participating in the training
   SD  D  N  A  SA

6c. Did you feel prepared to respond to a disaster after completing the training?
6d. Did you have any trouble deciding whether you wanted to become certified after completing the training? [This question is attempting to get at whether folks had any trouble deciding if they wanted to go through the criminal background check, get the required 2 letters of recommendation, etc. These people do not automatically become volunteers after the training – they still have to complete these additional steps.]

Deployment Experience in the Field

7a. Since completing the training, have you been sent out into the field? [If the answer is No, skip to Question #8a below]
7b. After training, tell me about your experience caring for children in a disaster setting by CDS? [Make sure and gather specific information on the # of times the person has been in the field, the places he/she was sent, and the type of disaster event he/she was sent to]
7c. Can you tell me more about your experiences at the child care centers after the disaster?
   Probes:
   Did anything unusual come up?
   Was there anything you were worried about before you went? Were you still worried about this after you actually got to the disaster site?
   Were there any surprising parts about going into the field?
   Anything you were not prepared for?
   The easy parts?
   Any difficulties?
7d. Was there anything that you distinctly remembered from training that you used during your deployment?

7e. Once you at the disaster site, did you understand how the CDS childcare area worked?
   
   Probe:
   
   Were there any issues with the set-up or procedures in the childcare area?

7f. How did you feel when working with the children in the disaster childcare center?
   
   Probe:
   
   Any surprises?
   
   Anything difficult about working with the youngest survivors?

7g. What was it like working in a disaster affected area?
   
   Probe:
   
   Any surprises?

7h. What information (knowledge) from your personal life or past experiences did you use during the disaster response?

7i. What questions did you have during the disaster response for the lead caregiver?

7j. How did you feel about the quality of the training after you deployed?
   
   Probe: Do you think the training adequately prepared you for responding to a disaster?

7k. What could have been added or emphasized during training to help you?

7l. If called by CDS, will you respond to a disaster again? Why or why not?

**Training Impacts**

For the following questions, we’d like you to rate your level of knowledge and understanding of each issue on a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being no knowledge and 10 being great deal of knowledge. After I read the question, will you tell me the number between 1 and 10 where you fit?

8a. Before training, rate your level of understanding of the role of a CDS volunteers in the post-disaster context.

8b. How about after training?

8c. (IF DEPLOYED) And how would you rate that same knowledge after your deployment?

9a. Before training, rate your understanding of the stages of disasters and response.

9b. How about after training?

9c. (IF DEPLOYED) And how would you rate that same knowledge after your deployment?

10a. Before training, rate your level of understanding of the characteristics and needs of small children.

10b. How about after training?

10c. (IF DEPLOYED) And how would you rate that same knowledge after your deployment?

11a. Before training, rate your level of understanding of the characteristics and needs of children after a disaster.

11b. How about after training?

11c. (IF DEPLOYED) And how would you rate that same knowledge after your deployment?
12a. Before training, rate your level of understanding of the appropriate responses to children suffering from stress and loss.
12b. How about after training?
12c. (IF DEPLOYED) And how would you rate that same knowledge after your deployment?

13a. Before training, rate your level of understanding of how to set-up and operate the CDS childcare area.
13b. How about after training?
13c. (IF DEPLOYED) And how would you rate that same knowledge after your deployment?

Will you please tell me if you
Strongly disagree/Disagree/Are Neutral/Agree /Strongly Agree
with the following statements?

14. I was more willing to volunteer after a disaster because of the following:
   Family present during the training     SD  D  N  A   SA   N/A
   Friends present during the training    SD  D  N  A   SA   N/A
   Acquaintances during the training      SD  D  N  A   SA   N/A
   Co-workers present during the training SD  D  N  A   SA   N/A
   Fellow congregation members present during the training SD  D  N  A   SA   N/A
   Knew someone who deployed and told me about his/her experience SD  D  N  A   SA   N/A

Outside Applicability of Training

15. Did you find that CDS training provided you with knowledge that was applicable to situations and events outside of CDS disaster response?
16. Did your CDS training influence you to become more involved in your community?
16. What aspects of CDS training do you find applicable to other volunteer or community involvement activities?

Post-Training Feelings/Actions/Roles/Networking

17. Following training, did you refer others to CDS (Check all that apply)
   A friend
   A family member
   A co-worker
   A fellow congregation member
   Other (specify)___________________

18. Did he/she/they complete a CDS training session?
   Note number of completions #________
19. What volunteer role(s) have you performed for CDS? (Check all that apply.)
20. What new information did you learn during the actual disaster response is experience that helped you as a volunteer?
   Sponsoring a training session.
   (If yes) How did you get information about the CDS training session out?
   Assembling a kit of comfort.
   (If yes) Did you do this on your own or through your church or other community organization?
   Other (specify)__________________________

21. Would you be interested in volunteering in roles besides deployment, kit of comfort assembly, or sponsoring a training session? If yes, please specify.

22. How many other CDS volunteers have you met socially outside of CDS-related activities? #__________

**Demographics**

Finally, I have a few questions about you.

23a. Sex

23b. Occupation [If retired, find out former occupation.]

23c. Race /Ethnicity

23d. Educational Attainment

23e. Current Household Income; please stop me when I reach the right range (Read out and check one category)
   Below $25, 000
   $25, 001-$50, 000
   $50, 001-$75, 000
   $75, 001-$100, 000
   $100, 001-$125, 000
   $125, 001 or above

24. We have been talking awhile; do you have any questions for me? [Note questions]

Thank you very much for participating in this important evaluation! I really appreciate the time you took to talk with me. Thanks to your answers, we will be able to give CDS a good picture of what is working well with their workshops and what can be improved. I enjoyed our conversation. Thanks again for talking with me!
Appendix B: Leadership Qualitative Interview Guide

1. **What do you think motivates people to volunteer for CDS?**
   a. *Do you think that all CDS volunteers share this motivation?*
   b. *Are there different motivations for different people?*

2. **Can anyone volunteer for CDS? (RE: Diversity)**
   a. *We expect to hear something along the lines of “Sure, except for those who don’t pass a criminal background check, or those who can’t provide references.”*
   b. *Are the use of background checks and letters of reference the only criteria that CDS uses to determine who may volunteer and who cannot, or does CDS use additional criteria for approving volunteers?*
      1. *Can you describe this criteria to me?*

3. **Do CDS volunteers need to have previous experience with children?**

4. **Are individuals with disabilities able to volunteer with CDS?**
   a. *If “yes”: In what capacities do they typically volunteer?*
   b. *If “no”: Do you think that there are roles at CDS that might be filled by such people?*

5. **Are there opportunities for volunteers besides deploying to disaster sites, sponsoring training sessions, and assembling kits of comfort? (RE: Current and future outreach and diversifying the idea of a volunteer)**
   a. If “yes”: Can you describe some of these opportunities to me?
   b. If “no”: Can you think of any other functions that volunteers might serve at CDS?

6. **How does CDS thank its volunteers? (RE: Current outreach –Since outreach includes retention)**
   a. Have volunteers who haven’t deployed been thanked for remaining in the pool?
   b. With which type of volunteer does CDS have a better record of retention?

7. **How does CDS recruit volunteers? (RE: Current outreach)**
   a. *We expect to hear responses similar to those given by Judy Bezon: Church bulletins, newspaper coverage, word of mouth, and that people see them at disaster sites and call.*

8. **Would you say that these methods allow CDS to recruit enough volunteers to meet its needs? (RE: Current outreach)**
   a. *If “yes”: Which method would you say is the most successful and why? Which method would you say has been the least successful and why? / Which methods would you say work the best?*
   b. *If “no”: What do you think CDS needs to do in order to remedy this shortfall? (RE: Future outreach.)*
      1. *Are there any other factors that you believe limit the ability of CDS to recruit an ample volunteer base?*
9. **Does CDS tend to target particular groups of people in order to recruit volunteers?**
   a. *If “yes”: Can you tell me which groups in particular CDS tends to target? And why?*
      Examples: do you tend to recruit volunteers from Church of the Brethren, retirees, stay-at-home moms, etc.
   
   b. **Do you think that CDS should broaden its outreach to attract a wide variety of people?**
      i. *If “yes”: How might this be done? Are there certain groups that CDS might begin to target that it hasn’t in the past?*
      ii. *If “no”: Move on*

10. **What types of roles does CDS need filled (by their volunteers)?**

11. **Does CDS look for volunteers with particular skills/abilities?**
    a. *Can you describe some of those skills to me?*

12. **Does CDS have an outreach program that solicits volunteers from outside the Church of the Brethren?**
    a. *If “yes”: Can you tell me a little about this program?*
       1. *If needed: Has this program been successful in attracting volunteers from outside the Christian community? Can you tell me a little bit about how they were recruited?*
    b. *If “no”: Would you say that this helps or hinders CDS at disaster sites? How?*

13. **Do you believe that the attachment to the Church of the Brethren tends to assist in or inhibit volunteer recruitment?**

14. **Does CDS use its relationship with other disaster-response organizations to attract/recruit volunteers?**

15. **Does CDS partner with any other organizations such as schools or faith organizations in order to attract volunteers?**
    a. *How does this relationship work?*

16. **How do you define diversity? (RE: Diversity)**

17. **Would you say that CDS as a whole defines diversity differently? (RE: Diversity)**

18. **Do you think it is important for CDS to reach out to volunteers from diverse cultural and religious backgrounds? (RE: Diversity as a purpose)**
    a. *If “no”: Why not?
    b. *If “yes”: Why?*
       1. *What do you think are the most important reasons for reaching out to a more diverse volunteer pool?*
       2. *How does a lack of diversity impact operations in the organization as a whole? At disaster sites?*
19. **Would you say that greater diversity among the volunteer base is a goal at CDS?** *(RE: Diversity as a Goal.)*  
   a. If “yes”: How were you made aware of this goal? What have you been told about this goal?  
   b. If “no”: Should this be a goal at CDS? Why? / Why not? *(Why questions: RE: Diversity as a purpose / the purpose of diversification.)*  

20. **Does CDS have any plans to change its strategies in order to attract a greater number of volunteers?** *(RE: Future outreach)*  
   a. If “yes”: Can you describe some of those plans and strategies to me?  
      1. How were these plans and strategies communicated to you?  
   b. If “no”: Would you say that CDS has enough volunteers to meet its current and foreseeable needs?  
      1. If “yes”: How does CDS determine the number of volunteers that it needs?  
      2. If “no”: How does CDS plan to deal with this potential shortfall?