

**Summary Report
Volunteer Structure Committee (VSC) Meeting
November 5-7, 2011
Minneapolis, MN**

Background

The Volunteer Structure Committee (VSC) held an in-person meeting November 5-7, 2011 in Minneapolis, MN. The goals and objectives of that meeting were:

- Complete a thorough assessment of the current AFS-USA Volunteer Structure (2 years in its existence) and make recommendations for changes (if needed) to the National Council and the 2011 National Volunteer Assembly
- Complete a thorough analysis of the current co-support payment amounts, taking into account the motion that was approved by the 2010 National Volunteer Assembly to move co-support payment amounts from a flat \$ amount to a % of the hosting and sending transfer fee. Develop a recommendation to be presented to the National Council on the % amount that should be applied for the 2011 co-support payments for hosting and sending
- Revise the non-compliance piece of the Team Assessment Tool to be presented as a motion and voted on at the 2011 National Volunteer Assembly
- Plan for 2011 committee work

Volunteers and staff who attended this face to face meeting were:

- **Volunteers**
 - Esra Kucukciftci – National Council Member & Chair of the Volunteer Structure Committee
 - Bill Callahan – One World Area Team
 - Audrey Pinchock – Michigan Area Team
 - Suzanne Reiss – MissTennKY Area Team
 - Dave Schrader – Greater Los Angeles Area Team
 - Debra Tholen – CHAT Unaffiliated Chapter
- **Staff**
 - Jorge Castro – President AFS-USA
 - Mary Jo Brock – Volunteer Development
 - Vicki Toepper – Finance
 - Rich Dollery – Hosting
 - Scott Hume – Volunteer Development
 - Paula McGrath – Travel
 - Jennifer Peck – Sending
 - Damayonti Rowe - Volunteer Development
 - Paula Schumacher – Finance
 - Joanne Yokoyama-Martin – Sending
 - Julie Baker—IT

Assessment of the Current Volunteer Structure

After fully reviewing the status of each Area Team (AT) and Unaffiliated Chapter (UC) as well as the staff and volunteer survey results, the Volunteer Structure Committee (VSC) discussed the structure changes that were enacted in 2008 and the consequences for those not meeting criteria.

The VSC first discussed the data as a whole then broke up into 3 small groups to discuss if the structure was actually helpful in supporting volunteers in their core activities of hosting and sending and whether the current structure should be kept or revised. Next, what the consequences should be for teams who did not meet the structure.

The three groups reconvened to share their plans and a discussion took place to shape a decision taking into consideration all groups work.

All three determined that the current structure is not working since **only 16 of the 59 ATs** would remain an AT today with the data we have. Also, volunteer and staff feedback was greatly to the point that the structure should be as simple as possible. All teams voted to eliminate the Chair Elect as a required position and wished to explore the number of participants further.

As a group we went through all of the particular recommendations of each group and agreed on one groups overall plan with the details to be discussed by the VSC in future meetings.

Therefore, the recommendation is to:

1. Extend the deadline for the roll-out of the new volunteer structure until the next chartering timeline in 2011
2. Freeze restructuring into Unaffiliated Chapters and define open enrollment with space for exceptions submitted to the National Council (NC)
3. Finalize the NVA motion about the volunteer structure by mid Jan 2011
4. Identify the stakeholder groups (NC/AGs/OETF/Finance/IT/GL Superuser group and others recommended by NC) and finalize their input to the proposal by Jan 31st, 2011
5. Finalize the NVA motion by March 1

The VSC proposes that we have three tiers of “functional units” defined by

1. Existing territorial zip-codes
2. Participant volume responsibilities for the team
3. Incentives for the team

VSC will

- finalize the proposal until end of Dec,
- identify and contact the stakeholders to receive input to finalize this new proposed structure until end of Jan,
- receive the input until third week of Feb and finalize the motion until March 1st

The preliminary draft of the proposal is as follows:

Tier One AT	Tier Two AT	Tier 3 AT
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Chair and Treasurer (2-year term limit for Chair) · 2-10 participants per year · Complete annual team quality/compliance assessment · Defined geography, based on ZIP codes · Will be combined with other teams for arrival and EOS orientations for hosted participants · Not eligible to attend national conferences (except possibly the NVA, as a delegate representing multiple Tier One ATs), unless at individual expense · Not eligible for chaperone flights · Will be combined with other teams, for NVA delegate representation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Chair and Treasurer (2-year term limit) · One or more Hosting Coordinator and Sending Coordinator required · 11-39 participants · Can have Chartered Chapters · Eligible to attend national conferences · Eligible for chaperone flights · Complete annual team quality/compliance assessment · Defined geography, based on ZIP codes · Will be combined with other teams, for NVA delegate representation · May be combined with other teams for arrival and EOS orientations for hosted participants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Chair and Treasurer (2-year term limit) · One or more Hosting Coordinator and Sending Coordinator and Volunteer Coordinator and Support Coordinator required; · Compliance Coordinator? · 40+ participants · Minimum of two Chartered Chapters · Eligible to attend national conferences · Eligible for chaperone flights · Complete annual team quality/compliance assessment · Defined geography, based on ZIP codes · Eligible for their own NVA delegate(s) · Some sort of incentive (scholarship \$ and/or t-shirts) – options need to be discussed and evaluated · Add something related to # of schools/ school relationships

Revision of the Non-Compliance Piece of the Team Assessment

The VSC first discussed the data as a whole then broke up into 3 small groups to discuss how the quality assessments can contribute to understanding the health of an AT or UC in order to support volunteers in their core activities of hosting and sending.

All three groups determined that less is more. Volunteers are in their positions to be able to work with students, not to excel at leadership or fill out paperwork. VSC recognizes that at this time with increasing regulatory concerns and essential sending and hosting program needs to be met AFS should consider this tool as a way for teams to assess and improve their existing resources to fulfill program deliverables and compliance.

VSC, with IT, will prepare a dashboard of statistics that will help the teams assess their health and be able to make decisions with their teams on where and how to improve. These would be found when going to their AT or UC in the organization module in Global Link (GL). All data would be able to be pulled from other sections of GL and therefore factual data. This tool will be a service and means for staff and volunteers discuss improvement goals rather than a potentially punitive evaluation. We will have a completed proposal to the NC by January.

Additional helpful data will be introduced into the Team Profile Report (TPR). This report currently can only be pulled by people with access to Report Builder. It will be possible to turn this TPR into a GL report to which volunteers also have access. The details of what is to be held in the TPR will be discussed in further VSC meetings.

2011 Co-Support Payments

A task force for co-support payments has been formed under VSC to:

1. Finalize co-support payments are % numbers with reference to determined fees.
2. Finalize the second part of the recommendation to collect the data we lack on the spending trends of the co-support payments

Questions for the Co-Support Payment Task Force to answer:

- The fact that there are unused and positive balances across the country, what are we missing, in terms of coding or reporting?
- Currently very small amount is being spent for Sending activities. Why? Are the numbers at hand reflective of the reality?
- How are we supposed to allocate funds between different functions (Hosting to Sending and vice versa) or should we?
- How do we ensure that volunteers do not bear the costs, more than they are willing to?
- Are chapters under-funded?
- How do treasurer role/attitude impact the number reported to finance?
- How do we make sure that co-support payments are used for supporting other necessary activities?
- There are mis-coded and unreported expenses
- Does Sending need a different co-support structure?
- How do we communicate the changed realities of fundraising vs. co-support payment activities?
- How do we support the teams sufficiently and secure the bottom line impacts for AFS-USA?