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Executive summary

The Volunteering to Learn project was designed to investigate an under-researched, emerging and important issue in higher education – that of volunteering by university students. It included a specific focus on identifying the learning from various forms of volunteering taking place in Australian universities and aimed to develop an understanding of good practice in university student volunteering.

In general, university student volunteering (USV) refers to those activities that university students do that meet the criteria of time given (time, service or skills), no remuneration (unpaid/without financial gain), free will (willingly), of benefit to the community (for the common good), and formally structured (through a group or organisation). In many organisations, students work alongside and in the same capacity as other volunteers and unpaid workers.

Volunteering has been identified as leading to benefits beyond employability, and researchers have argued that the learning which comes from community interaction, from active civic engagement and from shared experiences, is greater than skills alone (Bromnick, Horowitz, & Shepherd, 2012). Recent emphasis on Work Integrated Learning (WIL) has raised questions as to whether or not student volunteering should be included in its parameters because there is evidence of similar outcomes. Where universities are investing in student volunteering, they seek to contribute to the learning experience and enhance skill development for both employment and citizenship.

The project relied on a qualitative approach within the interpretivist paradigm to develop an understanding of the different perspectives on university student volunteering from a range of stakeholders. This approach sought to collect data in a way that allowed for inclusion of the voices of the three stakeholders identified at the outset: students, universities and host organisations. Both inductive and deductive analysis was undertaken to establish patterns and themes (Creswell, 2013). The multi-stage data collection involved familiarisation with the extant literature, a mapping exercise to capture the publicly available information on USV from all of the Australian university websites at one point in time, and an extensive suite of interviews conducted with key stakeholders.

A systematic review was undertaken to identify the terminology in use in the literature. This review identified that there were 75 terms in use in the current English language literature about student volunteering and related activities. In a more wide-ranging literature review, three themes were identified: motivation to volunteer, multi-dimensional benefits of student volunteering for a range of beneficiaries, and the challenges associated with university student volunteering.

A desk audit of the publicly available information about university student volunteering on Australian university websites was undertaken with over 300 entries identified. Eight models were identified as being in operation in Australian universities:

- Student-driven program including student-run volunteer hubs or referral services
- Student–university partnership program
- Faculty-based program linked to a specific discipline
- Centrally administered program, with little or no input from students
- Integrated model across faculties and university
- Independent (one-off) project
- Information-only model
- External program operating at the university.

Key players in university student volunteering had been identified at the outset as including universities, students and host organisations. It was also identified that there were peak bodies, clients or service recipients, potential employers and the community who were either players or beneficiaries in university student volunteering. Fifty-eight interviews were conducted, after which data analysis was undertaken to identify good practice in university student volunteering.

Two groups were identified within universities – the operational and strategic levels. Operational level staff were staff in faculties and centres with responsibility for organising volunteering activities and opportunities, whereas strategic level staff were involved in policy development and decision making about university student volunteering programs. These groups have different perspectives and different information needs.

Three types of student volunteers were identified:

- **Academic student volunteer** – undertaking assessable course work for academic/course/unit credit associated with their volunteer activity
- **Facilitated student volunteer** – student volunteer associated with the host organisation because of a relationship between the university and the host
- **Independent student volunteer** – self-organising student volunteer giving their time independently of the university.

Further, four host organisation types were reflected in the data:

- Host organisation with student program
- Host organisation which mainstreams student volunteers
- Student-driven host organisation
- University volunteer activity.

From the outset, the decision was made to use the term good practice rather than best practice as a diverse range of approaches to university student volunteering was anticipated rather than one best way.

A set of good practice and concept guides were developed with key elements to be considered by each of the parties to any volunteering program or activity. These guides were refined by consultation with the project reference group, a group of critical friends, a workshop hosted by the ACEN, and a roadshow conducted in all the Australian capital cities. A companion guide and website were also developed to offer further discussion of the findings in relation to good practice.

Five key elements were identified with respect to good practice, which can assist with enhancing the learning in university student volunteering. The elements are:

- Preparation and planning
• Relationship building
• Expectation formation and matching
• Communication
• Feedback and evaluation.

Key to these elements is the notion that development of university student volunteering programs and activities is an iterative process. If formal learning outcomes are being sought, then early establishment and communication of all of these is likely to enhance outcomes.

All types of volunteering can lead to student learning. Students say that they learn: soft skills, communication skills, self-awareness, professional skills, and leadership skills. They also report experiencing satisfaction, creating new networks and making friends, finding out about career opportunities, increasing their understanding of community involvement and developing informed life perspectives.

From this project, it is evident that a number of factors may contribute to learning and level of learning:

• Having already organised volunteering activities, rather than ad hoc arrangements
• Allowing student choice of volunteering experiences, type of volunteering and level of commitment
• Clarifying expectations, with a clear understanding about the role of university and host organisation in assisting students, whether for credit or not
• Encouraging self-reflection, either formal or informal, so that students can articulate the learning gained through volunteering, and its impact
• Host organisations providing feedback to students on their volunteering.

Universities have an important role to play in all aspects of this process, with expectation formation and matching being an area where they can have a significant influence.

Finally, the project identified a range of grey areas associated with university student volunteering. These can be briefly summarised as:

• The not so voluntary nature of some student volunteering
• Questions about who benefits from student volunteering, and the point at which it might be considered to be exploitation of students, of hosts or of clients
• Questions of ownership of programs, and demarcation disputes
• Consideration of where activism and politics fit in.

Two mysteries were also identified:

• Why would some employers not value experience gained from volunteering?
• If all students volunteer, will the capacity to present as different be sought through other means?

Universities, students, host organisations and the broader community can benefit from greater understanding of university student volunteering, in particular where good
communication and better understanding are developed, which allow all parties to benefit from the experience.

Further information on this project is available on the project website where five good practice guides, two concept guides, a companion guide and links to other resources are available.

See the site at www.murdoch.edu.au/projects/volunteeringtolearn/

Enquiries should be directed to the project leader Megan Paull m.paull@murdoch.edu.au
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1. Introduction, context and project aims

The *Volunteering to Learn* project was designed to investigate an under-researched, emerging and important issue in higher education – that of volunteering by university students. It included a specific focus on identifying the learning from various forms of volunteering taking place in Australian universities and aimed to develop an understanding of good practice in university student volunteering.

The project was undertaken against the backdrop of a period of rapid change in the Australian university sector, particularly in relation to the broader learning undertaken by students to prepare them for work and employment. At the same time, the volunteering sector in Australia was also undergoing change, with the Volunteering Australia definition of volunteering and the National Standards for Volunteer Involvement being reviewed by separate steering committees, and changes in government policy leading to change in nonprofit organisations across the country.

Volunteering by students is a practice adopted and encouraged by universities to enhance student learning, although little has been known about how and why this learning takes place. There was need identified to understand how universities, students and (volunteer-involving) host organisations work together to enable successful outcomes for all parties, and so promote volunteering as a credible, cross-disciplinary legitimate component of the curriculum and university life.

Student volunteering is increasing, and has been identified as a priority by government and by universities. It is conceptualised in different ways in different parts of the world, and it is unclear how its many forms relate to student learning (Hustinx, Meijis, Handy, & Cnaan, 2012). In Australia, there appeared to be contradictions in the understanding of what might be classified as student volunteering, with *The National Volunteering Strategy* having identified that “In some cases, students gain academic credit for completing volunteering or service learning electives” (DPMC, 2011, p. 13). The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) (ABS, 2011, p. 3) had specifically excluded unpaid work undertaken as part of study commitments from its measurement of volunteering.

Recent emphasis on Work Integrated Learning (WIL) has raised questions as to whether student volunteering should be included in its parameters, despite evidence to the effect that it has similar outcomes to WIL. Volunteering has been identified as leading to other benefits beyond employability. Researchers argue that the learning that comes from community interaction, from active civic engagement and from shared experiences is greater than skills alone (Bromnick, Horowitz, & Shepherd, 2012). University investment in student volunteering needs to be based on relevant curricula, which can contribute to the learning experience and enhance skill development for employment and citizenship.

The review of extant research prior to the study commencing had identified a clear need for a cross-institutional study involving all three stakeholders to develop models of good practice.

Australian universities were identified as being in need of clarity about a range of elements to facilitate better outcomes. These elements included:

- The nature and goals of student volunteering programs
- The learning outcomes desired and achieved by students who volunteer
Volunteering to Learn

- The available options for locating programs within universities.

Other elements identified as requiring consideration were:
- Student workloads associated with programs
- Staff time requirements associated with programs
- Expectations from both universities and host organisations about outcomes.

The proposal for this research identified an urgent need to identify the best options available for implementation of university student volunteering in order that it may deliver enhanced student learning.

Volunteering

In the Australian context, the term volunteering has a number of accepted definitions. Volunteering Australia has recently conducted a review of its definition of volunteering, and in 2015 has adopted the following definition:

*Volunteering is time willingly given for the common good and without financial gain.*

(Volunteering Australia, 2015a).

The ABS uses a definition with four criteria: unpaid, willingly undertaken, help in the form of time service or skills, and formal, through a group or organisation (ABS, 2007).

What is meant by Volunteering in the university setting?

The accompanying notes to the Volunteering Australia definition of volunteering indicate that,

*Compulsory educational service learning (where students are required to volunteer as part of a course)* (Volunteering Australia, 2015a)

... is not considered to be volunteering, but is recognised as a valuable activity, and a pathway to volunteering. Similarly, in their definition of volunteering, the ABS excludes activities done “as a result of a legal or institutional direction” (ABS, 2007, p. 72) and “student placement” (p. 87).

In general, University Student Volunteering refers to those activities that university students do that meet the criteria of time given (time, service or skills), no remuneration (unpaid/without financial gain), free will (willingly), of benefit to the community (for the common good), and formally structured (through a group or organisation). In many organisations, students work alongside and in the same capacity as other volunteers and unpaid workers. They are welcomed and offered the same processes, recognition and events. Volunteering activities are integrated into universities in a variety of ways, whether within units and courses or independent from academic programs.

Volunteering has been identified as leading to benefits beyond employability, and researchers have argued that the learning which comes from community interaction, from active civic engagement and from shared experiences, is greater than skills alone (Bromnick, Horowitz, & Shepherd, 2012). Recent emphasis on WIL has raised questions as to whether or not student volunteering should be included in its parameters as there is evidence of similar outcomes. Where universities are investing in student volunteering, they seek to
contribute to the learning experience and enhance skill development for employment and citizenship.

While investigating this phenomenon, the project team identified that application of the term in practice encompassed a number of activities, which included some not entirely voluntary, but which universities and host organisations classify as being in the volunteering family. These are service learning and community participation activities in which participant students are often referred to as volunteers by the universities or host organisations.

Activities not specifically designated as volunteering, including service learning and community participation, have been incorporated into the findings of this study where these overlap with university student volunteering, and have provided valuable insights that will enhance volunteering. Amongst these are the key elements of the National Standards on Volunteer Involvement (Volunteering Australia, 2015b) – also released in 2015 by Volunteering Australia – which seek to emphasise the importance of good practice in the two-way relationship between organisations and volunteers.

**Proposed outcomes and deliverables**

Initial discussions with the project evaluator led to a revised set of outcomes and deliverables being developed.

**Proposed outcomes**

The outcomes sought by this project fall into two categories –

1. increased awareness and understanding across the university sector of university student volunteering in its many forms and models, and
2. Increased awareness and understanding across the university sector of good practices in the implementation of the various models to improve outcomes for all stakeholders. This latter outcome would also include awareness of obstacles and pitfalls, and of strategies to ameliorate these.

While the primary focus is on greater awareness and understanding in universities, particularly amongst those with responsibility for implementation of student volunteering projects or programs, there was also a stated intention to raise awareness and understanding among host organisations and student volunteers to increase the likelihood of appropriate choices by these stakeholders.

**Proposed deliverables**

The following deliverables were proposed:

1. A comprehensive review of studies completed, and in progress, on student volunteering, globally, with particular attention to institutional and host organisation roles.
2. A comprehensive map of the alternative models of student volunteering operating in Australian universities.
3. A Good Practice Guide including:
• Principles and examples of university student volunteer programs (or models) that have been found to enhance learning, including a set of case studies

• A set of materials for use in the establishment and operation of student volunteering (projects and programs).

4. A comprehensive website.

5. A series of workshops to disseminate the outcomes with the materials for these to be made available via the website.

6. Findings presented to the university and nonprofit sectors via conferences and through publications as well as the website.

7. A final report and discussion paper. The report will include the set of models for student volunteer programs that address the tensions outlined by Kezar and Rhoads (2001), and outline the dimension of the role of host organisations.

This final report describes the project achievements, including the processes, dissemination strategies, and final products. It summarises the implications for students, host organisations and universities.
2. Project team, management and processes

The project team

The initial Volunteering to Learn project team comprised individuals from the research committee at Volunteering Western Australia who had served together for a number of years: Dr Megan Paull (Murdoch University), Associate Professor Kirsten Holmes (Curtin University), Dr Rowena Scott (at that time Edith Cowan University) and Dr Susan Young (The University of Western Australia). To this core was added Associate Professor Judith MacCallum (Murdoch University) as a mentor to the project.

Associate Professor Debbie Haski-Leventhal (Macquarie University) joined the project at the suggestion of the Office for Learning and Teaching (OLT) after the development of the initial proposal. Original team member Dr Rowena Scott left her role at ECU and secured employment with Curtin University. By agreement, Dr Scott continued with the project in her new role at Curtin University. An invitation was extended to Associate Professor Maryam Omari to join the project as the ECU representative. Research assistance was provided by Gabrielle Walker (Murdoch University) and Simone Faulkner (at Macquarie University).

The project team brought breadth and depth to the project, with the members of the Volunteering Western Australia Research Committee already knowing each other and industry partner Volunteering Western Australia. The expanded team added to this depth. In addition, during the course of the project, the role of the project mentor Associate Professor Judith MacCallum evolved from mentor to team member, in part due to her changed availability, but also due to the evolution of the project team and the project. This change in roles added further expertise in relation to the learning perspective of the project, as Dr MacCallum is from the Education discipline.

This expanded project team required greater attention to communication and collaboration. For example, expansion beyond Perth-based universities necessitated Skype and teleconferencing for meetings, and liaison measures such as additional phone calls were included. The increased size of the project team also necessitated a decision that not all team members would have to be available for meetings, as it was difficult to schedule times where all were available. In all, 19 team meetings were held during the project, with smaller one-on-one meetings held at different times between individuals, and a face-to-face analysis workshop being held in September of 2014.

In team meetings, processes and meeting communications were checked at the end of the meetings to ask whether members had something to contribute which had not been raised, minutes were distributed and members were encouraged to provide feedback. Outside meetings, the project leader contacted team members individually to check that people felt able to speak up. This included phone calls and emails to all team members at some point. Towards the end of the project when meetings were less frequent due to time commitments of team members, the team leader emailed regular updates on progress to team members. The team leader and project manager met regularly to discuss how the project was proceeding, and to coordinate forward planning.
Future projects may benefit from inclusion of additional communication mechanisms for inclusion of remote partners; minutes and follow up emails from meetings are important, and team size is a key element of team management.

**Industry partners**

The original industry partner to the project application was Volunteering Western Australia. Their in-kind contribution included access to their expertise and also the inclusion of their Tertiary Community Engagement Committee as a reference group (See below). At the suggestion of the OLT, Volunteering Australia was invited to join as a second industry partner. Despite changes in personnel at Volunteering Australia, they have been supportive of the project. The inclusion of both industry partners facilitated inclusion of other state and territory peak organisations in the project.

**The reference group and critical friends**

The initial reference group for the project was the Tertiary Community Engagement Committee at Volunteering Western Australia. Upon the inclusion of Macquarie University to the project, a representative from Macquarie was invited to join this reference group. Two elements led to a review of the reference group for the project: 1) The challenges of including someone remotely located from the committee, and 2) The realisation that the turnover of members of the committee meant that there were no longer any academic university staff in the reference group.

The Tertiary Community Engagement Committee was a good source of feedback for the project. It was this group, for example, that confirmed that team members should not conduct interviews in their home university. This has been important in at least two interviews where sensitive data was offered due to confidentiality and anonymity provisions. The decision was made to form a group of critical friends to assist with the review of the good practice guides as they were developed. Invitations were extended to two academics, two university policy/decision-makers, two host organisation representatives, one individual from an interstate volunteer centre, two individuals from student organisations, one OLT fellow, and two program-level university staff. Seven individuals provided feedback via the online survey conducted at the end of 2014. Two friends provided feedback directly to members of the project team. (See Appendix C for details of the reference group and the list of critical friends.)

**Project management**

Project management was provided in the first instance by Linda Butcher (Centre for University Teaching and Learning, Murdoch University) and then by Gabrielle Walker, who was employed on a casual basis to undertake this role.

The need for an effective project manager is a prime lesson confirmed. Good documentation and clear communication are elements to a successful project. The appointment of an experienced project manager at the outset provided a sound footing for the project, and established clear patterns of meetings and communication. When university arrangements meant that the original project manager was unable to continue in her role, the team was in a position to offer research assistant Gabrielle Walker the
opportunity to take on this role. The original project manager was able to provide a handover and to mentor the new project manager to some degree, but this change of roles placed greater workload on the team leader.

Appointment of an evaluator with whom agreement was reached about formative and summative evaluation aided in the management of the project. (See Appendix B for the Evaluator’s report.)

**Project management tools**

Development of an authorship agreement, dissemination plan, publication plan and contact list for the project were key elements for later work. Early establishment of an interim website was also a factor in the development of the project.

**Authorship agreement:** The size of the project team, and Murdoch University’s requirement for authorship agreements for publications, led to the establishment of an agreement at the commencement of the project to assist with determining such matters as inclusion as an author, and author order on academic publications arising from this project. (See Appendix D.)

**Dissemination plan:** The plotting of dissemination activities assisted with such matters as identifying potential avenues for dissemination, as well as establishing the need for regular newsletter updates to keep stakeholders informed. This plan also identified such activities as letters to all the state volunteer centres, and Australian Collaborative Education Network (ACEN) and Engagement Australia at the commencement of the project. (See Appendix E.)

**Publication plan:** A plan has been developed to continue publications beyond the project. This needed to be flexible enough that team members could propose new ideas as they emerged, and take opportunities to submit conference abstracts and papers as calls for papers were discovered. (See Appendix F.)

**Contact list:** The development of a contact list by the project manager enabled newsletters to be distributed and publicity about events such as the launch of the website to be emailed directly to those who had expressed interest in the project.

**Website development:** Volunteering Western Australia hosted an initial website on behalf of the project to assist with early contact with stakeholders. In the second year of the project, the website was taken over by lead institution Murdoch, and resources added on a step-by-step basis. The final website came together in the final weeks of the project, and is set up so that references can be added as publications in peer-reviewed journals become available. The final website was launched on 14 August 2015.

**Budgetary arrangements:** Tracking of the budget for the project was a joint task for the project leader and project manager. Monthly transaction statements from the Murdoch University finance department assisted with this process. Murdoch University School of Management and Governance provided in-kind administrative support, including bookings and travel arrangements for the roadshow and reconciliation of accounts resulting.

**Partnership agreements:** Agreements with the partner institutions were established to pay teaching buyout monies to those institutions at each of the semester points in the project. The system does not allow for the lead partner to report on monies paid to partner institutions other than as a block amount paid. In-kind contributions were received from
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partner institutions, not only in the form of additional teaching buyout, but also hosting a workshop (Macquarie), catering costs for a roadshow workshop (Curtin) and publicity. The Tertiary Community Engagement Committee, ACEN, and state peak volunteering organisations also provided in-kind support, publicising and hosting workshops and events.

**Ethics approvals:** Ethics approval was obtained for the pilot project on 5 August 2013 (Murdoch HREC 2013/142). Outright approval for the main project was obtained from Murdoch University on 24 February 2014 (Murdoch HREC 2014/007). It was then necessary to obtain approval from all partner universities, and to gain gatekeeper approval from The University of Notre Dame in order to interview current students. Reciprocal arrangements aided this process, but it was still a time-consuming exercise to obtain approval from all six institutions. An ethics closure report will be filed once this project is signed off.

**Process enablers and barriers**

The project largely ran on time and on budget. Key enablers have been identified as:

- Regular face-to-face team meetings: Project team meetings were held to keep the project progressing smoothly. It was not possible to include the Macquarie team member in person but on most occasions she was included via telephone. Regular meetings were a significant contributor to the progress of the project.

- A project team: Constructed from different disciplinary backgrounds, but all with some understanding of volunteering, aided development of the project.

- The project proposal: Provided milestones for progress and anchored decision-making, and the project management processes listed above kept progress on track.

- An experienced project manager: Enabled establishment of good project management practices at the outset. When the initial project manager stepped down, the appointment of the research assistant to the role of project manager and a sound handover process enabled continuity of the sound practices put in place.

- An experienced evaluator: Provided timely advice and assisted with reporting.

As is the case with most projects, the team encountered a number of barriers:

- One of these was the location of one team member at a distance from most of the project team. The role of the mentor in following up on this team member at different times in the project aided communication.

- A further barrier was the removal of the project manager from her role due to a restructure of the university. As discussed above, the availability of the research assistant to take over this role, and a sound handover, reduced the impact of this barrier. This did mean, however, that the project leader took on a greater role in managing communication with the project team. This included emails with updates to all team members. The feedback from team members indicated this was helpful. In addition, weekly meetings were held between the project manager and the project leader so that key elements such as budgets were monitored by both.

The project was conducted in a time of rapid change in student volunteering and university structures. The desk audit and development of the matrix required that a cut-off date of
December 2013 be selected in order to progress development of the matrix. To ensure the ongoing relevance of the project, the good practice guides and associated concept guides were developed to incorporate the widest range of student volunteering activities.

3. Project approach and processes

Overall research approach
The VTL project has relied on a qualitative approach within the interpretivist paradigm to develop an understanding of the different perspectives on university student volunteering from a range of stakeholders. The use of an emerging qualitative approach sought to collect data in a way that allowed for inclusion of the voices of the three stakeholders identified at the outset: students, universities and host organisations. Both inductive and deductive analysis was undertaken to establish patterns and themes (Creswell, 2013). The multi-stage data collection has involved familiarisation with the extant literature, a mapping exercise to capture the publicly available information on University Student Volunteering (USV) from all of the Australian university websites at one point in time, and an extensive suite of interviews conducted with key stakeholders.

Desk audit and development of the matrix
A comprehensive exercise was undertaken to discern the alternative models of student volunteering operating in Australian universities. This was designed to establish the current state of student volunteering in Australia and identify patterns and trends. This took the form of a matrix, which mapped out the student volunteer programs at every university in Australia.

The initial matrix took the form of a spreadsheet, which represented the diversity of student volunteering across Australia. A distilled matrix was then developed to enable the project team to analyse the data and to communicate the findings with stakeholders. A classification of university student volunteering models was developed based on who manages the program. Both the full spreadsheet and the distilled matrix were presented to the reference group for discussion. More details on the conduct of the desk audit and development of the matrix are included in the companion guide developed for this project, available on the project website.

The matrix identified eight models of student volunteering programs, which informed the later typology of student volunteers developed as a result of the interviews. While these two typologies overlap, the different data sources mean there are key differences. For example, independent student volunteering is difficult to identify via a university’s website. The matrix showed that there is a mixture of programs at each university. Most universities have at least two models of volunteer programs, creating diversity within student volunteering across the sector. The models are also changing as universities develop new modes of volunteering and discontinue programs. Hence, the matrix captures student volunteering at one point in time.
Literature review

A literature review was conducted in several stages. An initial scan of the literature identified that there was limited Australian research on university student volunteering. A more comprehensive review identified that terminology was a significant area requiring further consideration and this informed the work on terminology, which built on the data collected in the project.

Pilot study

A pilot study, funded by the state government Department of Local Government and Communities was also undertaken during this initial phase of the project. The pilot study involved two workshops conducted in Perth and Adelaide for open discussions on university student volunteering. These workshops were documented and their content analysed. The findings of the pilot were made available on the project website.

Interviews

Semi-structured interviews were conducted on a one-to-one basis by members of the project team who developed and used a set of interview frameworks to ensure some level of consistency across the various interviews. The interview frameworks were informed by the literature, by the mapping exercise, the pilot study and by the pooling of knowledge and experience of the research team. In the development of these frameworks, it soon became apparent that there needed to be considerable overlap between the interview questions to allow for comparison and data analysis.

The interview guides (See Appendix G) were designed to encourage interviewees to talk expansively about their experience, perspectives and opinions, to allow probing to follow lines of inquiry, and to elicit responses that would inform further development of the study as the interviews progressed.

All interviews were recorded and transcribed with the informed consent of participants. In order to ensure that no conflict of interest could arise, team members did not interview staff or students at their home university; and ethics clearance was obtained at all of the universities represented in the project team. Transcripts were de-identified and retained for data analysis.

Sampling for interviews

A theoretical sampling method (Birks & Mills, 2011) was applied in recruiting individuals for interview for this project. Members from stakeholder groups were invited to participate from each of the participating institutions: Murdoch University, Curtin University, Edith Cowan University, The University of Western Australia and Macquarie University. In addition, due to its unique nature as a private and faith-based university, members of the same stakeholder groups at The University of Notre Dame were invited to participate. Stakeholder groups were identified as students, universities, and host organisations.

An initial list of potential interviewees was drawn up across the participating universities, including The University of Notre Dame, with the assistance of project team member and reference group contact at each of the universities.
In keeping with the theoretical sampling approach (Birks & Mills, 2011), a snowball method was used to identify additional individuals who are likely to know more, and be able to provide more depth of understanding or knowledge with respect to the themes that began to emerge from the data. This meant that interviews were also conducted with representatives from peak organisations who were identified as being able to provide unique overviews of university student volunteering. Peak bodies were identified as organisations whose goal is to develop university student volunteering or related activities. These included volunteer centres and cross-university membership-based organisations. Peak body representatives were included as belonging to their stakeholder group. Interviews were not conducted with non-volunteers, with clients, or with employers.

**Table 3.1: Interviews by stakeholder category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Data about students and student experiences were also obtained from representatives of host organisations who were also students (i.e. student-run host organisations), from university representatives who were also studying, and from alumni now employed in either host organisations or universities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Data about the university perspective were sought from both program-level managers and more senior staff with responsibility for policy and decision-making. Peak body representatives were included here for organisations whose membership is university program managers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host organisations</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Some of the program managers in universities were classified as university representatives but were also considered to be host organisation representatives. Peak body representatives were included here for organisations whose membership is volunteer involving organisations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data analysis**

Data analysis was conducted by the research team in a methodical and systematic manner. An interpretive approach was used to organise themes from the analysis conducted on the data gathered from the interviews. It was at this stage that the decision was made to develop a series of good practice guides (GPGs) rather than a single guide. In this study, interview data were analysed in three stages:

Firstly, a within-case analysis was conducted to gain familiarity with the data and for preliminary theory generation (Eisenhardt, 1989). Next, a cross-case search for patterns was conducted to decipher the main themes. Members of the research team were asked to familiarise themselves with transcripts of interviews they had conducted, followed by those associated with their home university. To increase the validity of the data analysis, each researcher then conducted an analysis for one sub-group of interviews: students, hosts, universities. Themes, patterns, trends, issues and curiosities were identified by the project team. This process was followed by an intensive collective analysis by the entire team. A two-day data analysis session was held in early September 2014 to compare notes, debate and share insights on emerging themes, as well as to identify dilemmas, controversies and conundrums. It was during this session that the range and number of good practice guides
and their audience was determined, and the need for other accompanying information and the concept guides emerged. The concept guides were determined to be a useful addition to the suite of good practice guides. The team began the development of draft good practice guides and concept guides according to the areas for which they had taken the lead in transcript analysis. As part of this process, team members began to collate stories and quotes, which served as evidence for the themes and concepts identified in the data. The decision was made to develop vignettes rather than detailed case studies.

**Development of good practice and concept guides**

Dissemination, discussion and refinement were conducted to a number of levels to subject the data and theories to scrutiny, and to ensure that the outcomes were both practically grounded and theoretically sound (Birks & Mills, 2011).

- At the first level, an iterative process of development of Good Practice Guides (GPG) and of drafting the findings for both reporting and publication involved the whole team. Team members led theoretical and conceptual analyses with the various stakeholder views in mind.

- At the second level the draft guides were presented to the reference group associated with the project (see Appendix H), to an ACEN workshop conducted at Curtin University (See Appendix H), and to the critical friends for feedback and refinement (see Appendix H).

- The reference group members were frequently updated on the progress of the project, and invited to contribute to data collection. Their participation in a workshop held at Murdoch University in November 2014 involved interaction between the various members of the project team and the members of the reference group. Feedback from the group is discussed in Appendix H1.

The ACEN workshop offered an opportunity for different groups to discuss the content of the draft guides with each other and compare ideas. The emergence of the importance of legal frameworks was highlighted in this session, which was presented by two members of the project team with assistance from the project leader and the project mentor. The participants included student groups, university program managers and host organisations. The draft guides provided a basis for discussion, and the networking between workshop participants was an additional outcome of this workshop. Feedback from the ACEN workshop is discussed in Appendix H2.

The critical friends worked independently of each other and were invited to provide feedback based on their acknowledged expertise in the field. The feedback from these groups provided a sound basis for the next round of revisions of the guides. The inclusion of elements associated with the legal requirements was discussed at the ACEN workshop as a priority, but it was also considered to be a changing area, with the team unable to provide legal advice. It was also apparent at this stage that an additional guide – that of learning from university student volunteering – was an important inclusion. Learning from volunteering was embedded in the other guides, but required separate consideration to be able to provide a focus on this aspect of the project. Feedback from critical friends is discussed in Appendix H3.
• At the third level the penultimate drafts of the good practice guides and concept guides were presented to a wide range of stakeholders and interested parties at a series of workshops conducted by team members around Australia both in the university sector and in the wider volunteering sector – referred to as the roadshow. The feedback from the first and second levels of development of the guides included presentation as well as content, and the language in use was tested with this group after it had been amended. The first workshop was in Hobart in March of 2015. Amendments were made based on feedback from that workshop. The next iteration was presented in Canberra, Sydney, Brisbane, Darwin, Adelaide and Melbourne. Amendments based on that round of feedback included the renaming of the guide for program managers in universities from managers and co-ordinators to university program managers, to avoid confusion with program managers in host organisations. Feedback from those workshops, conducted by team members on 8 and 10 April 2015, was incorporated into the guides, which were presented in Perth on 22 April 2015. Details of attendances at the roadshow are included in Appendix I.

Highlights from the roadshow feedback included one participant who responded:

All aspects of volunteering are addressed: for instance, legalities, good practice, why do it etc.; all of this is very helpful in enhancing opportunity in volunteering for students, university staff and host organisations – the guides assist in providing reason and benefits to sell the idea and practice, and importantly to provide community connection and growth. The guides assist in outlining university’s responsibility in preparing students and getting students together, to assist in advising students on what employers expect etc.

While some respondents perceived that the guides were well written, succinct, and practical, others commented that, there are sections where the voice is quite academic. Feedback assisted the research team as they revised and refined the GPG content and format.

Another participant responded:

The learning concept guide is really important because it provides a really good overview of student development and co-curricular learning outcomes. By making explicit the learning that occurs outside of the classroom, the learning concept guide legitimises co-curricular activity and student engagement in that space. I liked the overlapping content in the guides, too, and their potential usefulness for the different stakeholders (managers, employers, students) who will be involved in volunteering.

Many stated they would refer the GPGs to others, mostly students, but also senior management and host organisations. When asked how they or their organisation might use the guides, most participants mentioned educating students and staff. Responses included: research into employability of graduates; to enlighten management; and to make sure we
are addressing all the information for students to make informed decisions about Volunteering.

When asked how they would adapt the guides for their organisation’s use, participants wrote, “I would be very interested in incorporating two or more of the pamphlets as resources in my current course”. Also, “The guides work well just as they are for us at this time. This work reflects a stunning capacity to contain a huge volume of (research) work in very readable and informative guides”.

Further feedback from the roadshow is discussed in Appendix I.

The analysis was given rigour by the iterative process of drafting and redrafting based on the consultation processes. In some areas, the outcome was identification of a debate or controversy rather than the emergence of an area of consistency or saturation, with those areas requiring extra discussion and a further literature search, and some being considered appropriate for further research.

**Finalisation of guides, including the companion guide**

Finalisation of the guides was a process that included incorporation of feedback from all of the workshops, from a review of their content by the project team and from the process of developing the companion guide. Once the guides were in print-ready form, a process of proofing and checking was undertaken.

A companion guide was developed by the project leader with contributions from all team members to add depth to the detail contained in the good practice guides and concept guides. Collected stories were converted into vignettes for inclusion in the companion guide, and quotes to illustrate key points were inserted to illustrate findings.

The content for the good practice guides, concept guides, companion guide and website were drawn from the data. These data are being further considered as deeper data analysis continues for the purposes of academic publications (See publication plan at Appendix F).
4. Project deliverables findings, and outcomes

This chapter briefly discusses the deliverables and key elements of the findings, and considers progress against proposed outcomes. A brief summary of achievement of deliverables is included in Appendix J.

Literature review

As discussed in the previous chapter, a literature review was conducted to examine the extant literature on university student volunteering. In addition, to identifying the limited Australian research on university student volunteering, the terminology associated with university student volunteering was identified as an area of interest. A systematic review was undertaken to identify the terminology in use in the literature. This review identified that 75 terms in use in the current English language literature about student volunteering and related activities. This review was presented to a conference audience and has been submitted for peer review in an academic journal (see Appendix F for publication plan).

In addition to the review on terminology, a more wide-ranging literature review was conducted. Three themes were identified: motivation to volunteer, multi-dimensional benefits of student volunteering for a range of beneficiaries, and the challenges associated with university student volunteering. This review is included in the companion guide available via the project website.

Desk audit and map of models

The conduct of a desk audit of all Australian university websites to map university student volunteering forms and models highlighted the variety in these, as well as the complexities of terminology, ownership and structure. The initial matrix, which was developed on the basis of the desk audit, included over 300 entries and demonstrated not only the interest across universities, but also confirmed that terminology was an area of difference. The distilled matrix developed from the mapping exercise can be found in the companion guide.

The mapping exercise identified eight models of university student volunteering, based on how they are set up at each university. These were classified as:

- **Student-driven program, including student-run volunteer hubs or referral services:** In these programs, a student-centred guild, union or organisation facilitates the volunteering opportunities.

- **Student–university partnership program:** In these programs, students work with paid university staff to deliver volunteer programs. These programs often began as student-driven.

- **Faculty-based program linked to a specific discipline:** The faculty, independent from the central volunteer hub or referral service, facilitates or promotes volunteering within their school or area.

- **Centrally administered program, with little or no input from students:** Volunteer programs across and external to the university are organised centrally by paid university staff.
- **Integrated model across faculties and university:** This model coordinates all volunteer opportunities both on and off campus within the same administrative framework.

- **Independent (one-off) project:** Volunteer projects organised occasionally by the university, faculty or students but not on an ongoing basis.

- **Information-only model:** The university encourages students to volunteer and provides information about off-campus opportunities but does not organise any programs or engage in any formal partnerships with volunteer-involving programs.

- **External program operating at the university:** A volunteer-involving organisation or broker organisation operates on campus and provides volunteer opportunities to students. Examples include Entrepreneurial Action for Us (ENACTUS Australia – http://enactusaustralia.org.au/) and AIME (https://aimementoring.com/).

### Key players in university student volunteering

Key players in university student volunteering had been identified at the outset as including students, universities and host organisations. The project identified that within universities there were two levels of players – the operational and strategic levels. The project team also identified that there were peak bodies, clients or service recipients, potential employers and the community who were either players or beneficiaries in university student volunteering. While peak body representatives were interviewed, clients and employers were not, but data was gathered with respect to these players and is discussed in the Good Practice Guides and in the Companion Guide. Figure 3.1 below illustrates the parties in the University Student Volunteering relationship.

![Figure 3.1: The parties in the University Student Volunteering relationship](image)

Amongst these parties, three types of university student volunteer were identified in the data:
• **Academic student volunteer (ASV)** – student volunteer undertaking assessable course work for academic/course/unit credit associated with their volunteer activity in the host organisation.

• **Facilitated student volunteer (FSV)** – student volunteer associated with the host organisation because of a relationship between the university (or the guild hub, referral service or some other agent) and the host organisation or host university program.

• **Independent student volunteer (ISV)** – self-organising student volunteer giving their time independently of the university. The volunteer activity may or may not be related to their university studies but, nevertheless, their studies make demands on their availability.

Four types of host organisations were also identified.

• **Host organisation with student program (HOS)** – In this mainstream volunteer-involving organisation, specific volunteer activities are established for students to undertake around their university studies (often short term or periodic).

• **Host organisation which mainstreams student volunteers (HOV)** – In this volunteer-involving organisation, student volunteers are not specifically catered for and are expected to fit in with existing programs.

• **Student-driven host organisation (SHO)** – This volunteer-involving organisation has as a primary aim the involvement of students in community activities, or student-focused activities. Students run these organisations.

• **University volunteer activity (UVA)** – The university sets up student volunteer activities or recruits students to assist with university activities, including orientation and open days.

As with all typologies, there are variations within each of these types. These include organisations that offer specific university student volunteer opportunities in some parts of their organisation and incorporate students with all other volunteers in other volunteer activities; and hybrid volunteer-involving organisations.

It was also determined that within universities there was interest in university student volunteering at two levels – the senior decision-making level, and the program manager level – with differing information needs for these two groups. Further it was identified that there were other parties to the relationship – potential employers, clients and the community. These are discussed further in the Companion Guide available on the project website.

**Good practice in university student volunteering**

From the outset, the decision was made to use the term good practice rather than best practice as a diverse range of approaches to university student volunteering was anticipated rather than one best way. The Good Practice and Concept Guides that were developed offer

---

1 The term volunteer-involving organisations is used because these types of organisations can be found in the public, private, nonprofit and household sectors.
key elements for consideration by each of the parties to any volunteering program or activity. Further discussion of the findings in relation to good practice are included in the Companion Guide.

The project website (www.murdoch.edu.au/projects/volunteeringtolearn/) includes links to the five Good Practice Guides:

- Students, Host Organisations, Senior University Managers, University Program Managers, Potential employers

and two Concept Guides: Terminology and Learning

The detailed Companion Guide is also available, which elaborates on the contents of the Guides.

**Enhancing the learning in university student volunteering**

Five key elements have been identified with respect to good practice. These can assist with enhancing the learning in university student volunteering. The elements are:

- Preparation and planning
- Relationship building
- Expectation formation and matching
- Communication
- Feedback and evaluation

Key to these elements is the notion that development of university student volunteering programs and activities is an iterative process. If formal learning outcomes are being sought, then early establishment and communication of all of these is likely to lead to enhanced outcomes.

Universities have an important role to play in all aspects of this process, with expectation formation and matching being an area where they can have a significant influence. The figure below depicts the role universities, hubs or referral services can play in expectation formation and matching. This figure shows that universities, hubs or referral services can assist with addressing the expectations gap, in particular by encouraging students and host organisations to be somewhat flexible in their expectations, but also by influencing the relationship between host reasons and student reasons for being involved. Even where the volunteer activity is extra-curricular, if universities, hubs and referral services are facilitating student volunteering or merely providing information about volunteer opportunities, they can enhance the volunteer experience for hosts and students by tempering high expectations of either party. Figure 3.3 posits this ability to influence the formation of expectations as being influenced by contextual factors, including university and community requirements and expectations.
The evidence is that students are likely to be able to learn from their volunteering, and to learn to volunteer, but it may be more likely where their volunteer activity is extra-curricular or independent – an area for further investigation. Potentially, it is the passion of the individual that contributes to the learning that occurs. The influence of universities on extra-curricular or independent volunteering is more likely where good practice is promoted and championed in all forms of student volunteering.

Grey areas in university student volunteering

Over the course of the Volunteering to Learn project, a range of controversies and contradictions, myths and mysteries emerged, some of which could be explained by further analysis, and others of which require further investigation. A further set were conundrums which puzzled the research team but which are merely that – puzzles. This was an area of considerable interest during dissemination activities and is included as a separate section in the Companion Guide available on the website. The areas discussed in the Guide include:

- **How voluntary is voluntary?** – referring to the possibilities associated with course requirements
- **Who benefits?** – referring to whether students, organisations and communities benefit from volunteering
- **At what point is it exploitation?** – referring to the potential for exploitation of students, universities, and host organisations and their clients
- **Ownership of ideas, programs and organisations** – referring to adequate recognition of pioneers and program stalwarts
- **Student government, politics and activism** – and the link to benefits, and terminology
- **Myths and mysteries** – referring to a number of myths that had developed about student volunteers, and some questions that puzzled the research team.
Comprehensive website

The website is a collation from across the project. The final website can be found at www.murdoch.edu.au/projects/volunteeringtolearn/. This site provides access to the Good Practice Guides and Concept Guide as well as to the Companion Guide and to other resources identified as useful by the project team. This site also links to the websites for the industry partners and will be updated with details of academic publications as they become available.

Project outcomes

As discussed earlier, outcomes sought by this project were as follows:

1. Increased awareness and understanding across the university sector of university student volunteering in its many forms and models; and

2. Increased awareness and understanding across the university sector of good practices in the implementation of the various models to improve outcomes for all stakeholders. This latter outcome sought to include awareness of obstacles and pitfalls, and of strategies to ameliorate these.

While the primary focus was on greater awareness and understanding in universities, particularly amongst those with responsibility for implementation of student volunteering projects or programs, the intention was also to raise awareness and understanding among host organisations and student volunteers to increase the likelihood of good choices by these parties.

The data-gathering and dissemination processes for this project have contributed to awareness-raising with respect to university student volunteering; the dynamic nature of the field and the complexities of university student volunteering and related activities have been a core part of the discussions. The dissemination activities and impact are discussed in the next chapter of this report.

This final report describes the project achievements, including the processes, dissemination strategies, and final products. It summarises the implications for students, host organisations and universities. Further details are available in the Companion Guide available on the website.
5. Dissemination and impact

Dissemination activities during the project

The research team utilised multiple stages and media for dissemination on progress at different stages of the project. Some of these were used to elicit further feedback and refine study findings. Information was shared with the main stakeholders and other groups including:

- universities – with senior and junior staff, and at relevant forums, including University Curriculum Teaching & Committee (CTLC) meetings
- peak volunteering and nonprofit organisations
- host organisations
- student representatives.

A contact list was developed over the life of the project and newsletters outlining progress were distributed via email and posted on the project website as new developments could be reported. Opportunities to publicise the project and obtain feedback were also taken up at conferences and workshops.

The dissemination activities were mainly by way of presentations, workshops, draft Good Practice and Concept Guides, oral reporting, and e-newsletters but also included posters, emails and updated information on the VTL website. Appendix E includes a list of dissemination events, which are briefly discussed below.

Learnings from dissemination events

Dissemination events provided opportunities to discuss the project with a wide range of people and allowed the project team to gain valuable insights into university student volunteering. The learning obtained from dissemination events included the following:

- One of the key areas of learning was the realisation of differing expectations of the parties to university student volunteering and the subsequent influence on practice. This included expectations regarding learning, and also timing and terminology.
- Conduct of the desk audit and development of the matrix based on publicly available information on university websites relating to university student volunteering revealed the dynamic nature of the field, and the interest of universities in university student volunteering.
- Interviews and data analysis revealed some concerns from host organisations about student volunteers.
- At the analysis session where all team members were present, the importance of identifying learning in relation to curriculum was strengthened.
- At the ACEN workshop in November 2014, the importance of the legal frameworks was identified more clearly.
- Roadshow workshops identified that more intra-university sharing is needed, that greater clarity on terminology was warranted, and that state volunteer centres can play an important role in awareness-raising about student volunteering.
- Participation in the Tertiary Community Engagement Committee meetings in 2015 by the project leader highlighted the need for mechanisms to understand the value and contribution of student volunteering as an avenue for further research.

**Impact of the *Volunteering to Learn* project**

The *Volunteering to Learn* project was commenced at a transitional time between reporting requirements of the Office for Learning and Teaching. Therefore, the considerations of the impact of the project against the Impact Management Planning and Evaluation Ladder (IMPEL) were not explicitly outlined from the outset of the project. Nevertheless, the IMPEL model has provided a framework for understanding the impact from this project.

**Table 5.1: Impact of the *Volunteering to Learn* project using the IMPEL model**

| Team members | • Team members have increased understanding across disciplinary areas. An example of this is the discussions on curriculum led by members from the education discipline.  
• Team members have increased understanding of the relationship of volunteering to work integrated learning.  
• Team members have increased understanding of the relationship of student volunteering to employment, both in relation to graduate attributes, and to employer attitudes.  
• Two team members have contributed to the definition of volunteering for the Volunteering Australia National Steering Committee with specific mention made of compulsory service for credit not being volunteering but being a valuable pathway to volunteering.  
• A team member not originally involved in volunteering research has joined the research committee at Volunteering Western Australia.  
• A team member who was not currently involved in student volunteering has become involved in ENACTUS at ECU since joining the project, including attendance at the national championships in July of 2014 and 2015.  
• The team leader has experienced increased involvement with the Murdoch University Student Guild–operated Volunteer Hub as a result of the project.  
• The team leader has been invited to join the Tertiary Community Engagement Committee at Volunteering Western Australia to share expertise. This will provide opportunities to further increase knowledge of student volunteering. |
| Immediate students | • Evidence of the impact on students interviewed included observations such as that from a student that she had not really reflected on the learning achieved from her volunteering before.  
• Students interviewed commented on how much volunteering they were doing, some with surprise.  
• One student interviewed expressed dismay and puzzlement at potential employer comments dismissing the value of volunteering and discussed this with the interviewer. |
Students who attended workshops commented on understanding how their volunteering fitted in with the bigger picture.

Students who attended workshops could provide feedback in shaping good practice guides (this included a group of students at the ACEN workshop at Curtin who highlighted the need for accessibility in terms of language).

Dissemination activities are listed above and in Appendix E, and include workshops, presentations at local, national and international conferences.

One OLT fellow asked to be put on the contact list after attending a presentation at the West Australian Teaching and Learning Forum held at The University of Western Australia in February 2015, where some of the more controversial aspects were discussed.

At that same presentation, another audience member commented on how useful it was for such things to be being discussed in front of senior university staff.

Volunteering staff (in NT) had not considered university students as a source of volunteers until this project.

Workshop participants in Canberra from the Australian National University and Volunteering ACT commenced a conversation about how to cooperate on university student volunteering.

Workshop participants in Adelaide from the state government department for Education and Child Development South Australia networked with university representatives about activities on university campuses.

Attendees at the website launch commenced discussions about possibilities of working together.

Presentations were made by team members at seven conferences to date (see Appendix F), with abstracts accepted at a further three and submitted for two more.

A post-project publication plan has been adopted by the project team with a range of outlets including refereed and non-refereed publications (See Appendix F).

Feedback in the form of an email from a workshop attendee indicated: “We are in the initial stages of thinking through and developing a social enterprise unit [in Tasmania], where the student will undertake a project volunteering with a not-for-profit organisation with business mentors. This unit will be the trial towards the development of a larger unit offering. So this workshop is really relevant and timely”.

This was demonstrated by the participant, who shared: “The guides work well just as they are for us at this time. This work reflects a stunning capacity to contain a huge volume of [research] work in very readable and informative guides”.

The quality of the guides at this early stage resulted in a number of workshop attendees requesting the use of the good practice guides.
for their universities prior to their official release. Requests came from a range of areas, including a career advisor from a Queensland university office, a student engagement team leader from NSW, and from Volunteering Queensland. It also included a volunteer coordinator from a host organisation indicating that the guides fill a gap in the resources available concerning university student volunteering.

- A workshop attendee at a roadshow workshop took extra copies of the draft guides to pass on to the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic) at his university as they were in the early stages of developing a policy.
- Attendees at the website launch indicated that they are likely to use the guides and the website, and to refer it to others.
- Following the website launch two emails were received requesting further information.

| Narrow systemic adoption | • Roadshow participants and website launch attendees indicated that they are likely or very likely to use the guides. Details of this feedback are included in Appendix I.  
• Feedback from the Tertiary Community Engagement Committee at Volunteering Western Australia indicates that the good practice guides and website will form part of the resources they will use.  
• Emails from interested parties include one from Volunteering Queensland for promotion during National Student Volunteer Week and another from a careers advisor at The University of Queensland seeking to use the good practice guides at a careers expo.  
• Emails from contacts outside Western Australia have requested copies of the good practice guides for use in their organisations.  
• The Tertiary Community Engagement Committee at Volunteering Western Australia has invited the project leader to participate in the committee for the next 12 months to share expertise and learnings from the project. |
| Broad opportunistic adoption | • Dissemination activities will continue, including the launch of website and promotion of project.  
• An ACEN webinar has been scheduled for October 2015 to discuss findings with interested members. |
| Broad Systemic Adoption | • Roadshow participants’ have indicated that they are likely or very likely to use the guides, and the website, and to refer others (See Appendix I).  
• Website launch feedback has indicated likelihood of adoption across a range of universities and organisations (See Appendix I). |

Post-project plans

A post-project dissemination plan is given in Appendix E. This includes the provision of workshop materials to Volunteering Western Australia and Volunteering Australia for workshops and activities relating to university student volunteering. These materials will also be made available via the project website.
Two members of the project team have been invited to attend a service-learning summit in Queensland in 2016 to share learnings from project.

Agreement has been reached for workshop materials to be developed by the project leader for use by Volunteering Western Australia and Volunteering Australia based on roadshow content, good practice guides and the website for use by staff in those organisations. These also have the potential for use by other state peak bodies, host organisations, universities, and student bodies.

A post-project publication plan has been agreed by the project team and is included in Appendix F. The plan includes further development of the data and targeted publications. Project team members have committed to continue to work on the analysis and development of publications in accordance with the publication plan (Appendix F) and authorship agreement (Appendix D). Successful publication in reputable journals will be supported and encouraged by team members’ universities. Details of publications will be posted on the project website as they become available.
6. Discussion and conclusions
This report has detailed the context, aim, processes, products, key areas, and dissemination and impact of the Volunteering to Learn project. In this section, the implications of the work for students, universities and host organisations are discussed.

How does this project benefit universities?
Universities were identified as a primary stakeholder in university student volunteering. As the project has evolved, rather than identifying models of best practice, key elements of good practice have emerged; and the importance of establishing good communication and tailoring programs and activities to fit circumstances has been identified. The role that universities can play in the expectation formation and matching process has also been highlighted. Where the goal of the volunteering activity is learning, there are a number of elements that can assist in meeting this goal:

- having organised volunteering activities, rather than ad hoc arrangements
- allowing student choice of volunteering experiences, type of volunteering and level of commitment
- clarifying expectations, with a clear understanding about the role for university and host organisation in assisting students, whether for credit or not
- encouraging self-reflection, either formal or informal, so that students can articulate the learning gained through volunteering, and its impact
- host organisations providing feedback to students on their volunteering.

There is evidence in the data that a variety of types of learning take place for students involved in university student volunteering. These include, discipline-based learning for those who undertake activities associated with their degree across the three forms - academic, facilitated or independent volunteering. It is also clear that students involved in university student volunteering can learn about community, gain life and employment skills, and can learn to volunteer (or at least about volunteering). It is also evident that capturing the learning is an area requiring further investigation.

How does this project benefit students?
Understanding the motivations of students to volunteer has enabled a clearer set of guidelines to support and promote volunteering. Students can be supported to volunteer according to their circumstances. This requires that transparent structures are put in place, that the expectations of students and host organisations are negotiated, and that the connections and differences between academic, independent and facilitated volunteering are clearly articulated. Such understandings contribute to how universities engage with university student volunteering, and can benefit students whichever stage they enter the volunteering activity.

How does this project benefit host organisations?
Working with students and universities on expectation formation and matching has emerged as a crucial element for organisations that may be considering hosting student
volunteers. Host organisations will benefit from understanding the demands on university students and the potential for valuable contributions, as well as the challenges associated with fitting volunteering into already demanding student lives.

**What can volunteer referral services, on campus and off campus, do to help enhance the university student volunteer experience?**

A key aim of this project is to clarify the central focus of learning in any volunteering activity. Volunteer referral services, in the form of volunteer hubs and volunteer coordination services on campus, and volunteer resource centres and peak bodies off campus, can assist in the enhancement of university student volunteering by developing and communicating the importance of good communication and expectation formation and matching in the establishment of volunteering arrangements. This is in keeping with the *National Standards for Volunteer Involvement 2015*, which have recently been reviewed and were released in National Volunteer Week in 2015 (Volunteering Australia 2015b). The website, good practice guides, concept guides, companion guide and other resources are available via the project website, and will provide support for referral services and their stakeholders.

**How might future OLT projects benefit from this project?**

All indications in the data are that university student volunteering and associated activities, such as service learning and community participation, are dynamic and evolving activities occurring in many forms across Australian universities. The responses in the workshops and the data provided evidence that the levels of experience across the sector are varied, that there is turnover in key positions and that programs are changing rapidly. As with many other aspects of university life, activities in universities and host organisations are constrained by competing priorities, which place demands on time and resources. Similarly, students face constraints as well. Future work should consider measurement of the long-term impact of university student volunteering on all three parties, as well as on graduate employers, clients or beneficiaries of host organisations, and the community. Future OLT projects, in particular, might examine the retention and transfer of learning and its relationship to the three different types of volunteers: independent, facilitated and academic.

**Concluding comments**

The *Volunteering to Learn* project provides strong evidence that University Student Volunteering is a dynamic, complex and vibrant activity taking place across Australian university campuses. There are a variety of approaches to university student volunteering, and this project has identified three types of university student volunteers, four types of host organisations, and eight different models operating in Australian universities. It has also identified that the interest in university student volunteering is widespread. There is still work to be done to investigate further the learning that occurs and the impact of volunteering while at university on post-university propensity to volunteer. What is clear, however, is that university student volunteering offers students the opportunity to learn, and enables them to learn about volunteering. The project website, good practice guides and concept guides, and the companion guide provide evidence of the importance of university student volunteering and its contributions to both volunteering and learning.
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Date: 18 August 2015

Purpose of the Report
This is the final report of the evaluation of the Volunteering to Learn (VTL) project in response to reporting requirements of the Office for Learning and Teaching. This evaluation report addresses summative evaluation questions about the achievement of the outcomes of the Fellowship. It is based on meetings with the project leader and project team, feedback from stakeholders, and a review of a range of project documentation, including the draft final report prepared for the OLT.

Overview
The project has been well-managed within its timeline and budget, and has produced its planned deliverables. Existing connections with the Volunteering sector have been built on during the project, and there is a strong possibility that the outcomes of the project will impact on the university volunteering sector nationally.

Role of the Evaluation and Evaluator
Discussion between the project leader, project manager and the evaluator at the start of the project led to an agreement that there were two purposes of the evaluation: a largely formative process evaluation; and a largely summative outcomes evaluation.

This report focusses on the outcomes evaluation: investigating the extent to which the project accomplished its aims, met its outcomes and produced its deliverables. This includes making judgements about the merit and worth of the project.

The outcomes evaluation will conclude by addressing the question: To what degree can the work and achievements of the project be considered scalable, sustainable or transferable. A judgement will be made about OLT’s performance indicators for a project of this kind:

The potential to change curriculum development, learning and teaching practices and/or teaching management processes in one or more institutions outside those of the project teams.
The agreed role of the evaluator was to act as a critical friend and participant observer during the project, attending project group meetings where appropriate, reviewing drafts of plans and documents, and debriefing with team members at appropriate stages. Evaluator feedback on the draft of final project documents led to improvements in their clarity.

This summative evaluation report is based on meetings with the project leader, project manager and project team, and a review of a range of project documentation, including project feedback mechanisms from engagement with stakeholders. It also draws on self-reflection reports requested from project team members, and a survey of the reference group and critical friends. An open-ended survey was emailed to the nine team members, and a smaller open-ended survey was emailed to the 20 reference group members and critical friends. Nine and seven responses were received, respectively, although three members of the latter group felt they were unable to respond at that time.

Where appropriate, quotes from the surveys are provided to reinforce the outcomes of this evaluation.

**Background**

At the outset, this project was impacted by a suggestion from the OLT to expand the scope of the project by including Macquarie University as a project partner and widening the stakeholder group to include Volunteering Australia. Extra funding was provided to support this expansion, which was consistent with the OLT’s broader objectives.

However, this requirement presented challenges to the conduct of the project. In particular, the original project team consisted of people from four WA universities who were already working closely with each other through the Tertiary Engagement Committee of Volunteering WA. The inclusion of Macquarie University required the establishment of a shared understanding about the project with the Macquarie representative, and effective communication channels with the one external contributor. Both of these challenges were resolved effectively.

The project ran from August 2013 to August 2015. It was structured around six activities:

1. A literature review
2. A desk audit and subsequent mapping of the alternative models of student volunteering
3. Interviews with relevant stakeholders
4. Data analysis and synthesis to produce a range of draft ‘guides’
5. Validation of these documents through a cascading series of workshops, Australia-wide
6. A range of other dissemination activities

**Project Management**

A detailed plan and timeline for the project was developed and was amended where appropriate. The plan was followed closely, and, despite some unexpectedly busy periods, the project was completed on time and within budget.

As reported in the August 2014 interim evaluation report, the effectiveness of the project processes arose from the project leader’s ability to draw the team together and establish a shared vision of the project.

The final project report lists several factors which kept the project on track: an authorship agreement, a dissemination plan and publication plan, and a contact list. Other success
factors not noted in the final project report were: an explicit plan for team leave requirements over the summer break, so tasks were accommodated around leave periods; and a risk assessment plan. As noted in the final project report, changes in the project manager and in institutional team representatives, presented challenges which were successfully overcome by following the risk assessment plan.

The August 2014 interim evaluation report highlighted a risk that the volume of data gathered through the desk audit and stakeholder Interviews might cause delays in the data analysis phase. This turned out not to be the case, and the project remained on track. Similarly, the project leader and project manager were able to seamlessly schedule a complex series of workshops across several states.

Several members of the project team commented on the leadership of the project leader. For example:

*Megan showed a strong leadership and made sure all outcomes are delivered on time. We all worked together to produce the good practice guides, the report and materials for the website. Knowing the timeline and deliverables in advance helped us all to come together as a team and work on it.*

The evaluator concurs with another team member’s view “*I also think Megan has been very modest about her abilities at managing this project*”.

**Communication and Collaboration**

As noted in the 2014 Interim Evaluation Report, the sharing of responsibilities across the project team has been very strong in this project, both in the clear allocation of roles and the shared fulfilment of responsibilities. All team members contributed to the interviewing, data analysis and guide writing. They also shared the conduct of workshops (in pairs) across Australia.

*All team members were involved with the delivery of the roadshow which was held in all of the capital cities.*

*The collaboration was good and I believe it will continue to be strong as we work on writing academic papers together.*

However, this did not mean that all aspects of the project proceeded without tension. While the sharing of activities was relatively effective, not all tasks were completed on time, and not all team members could attend all meetings. This was particularly evident in the final months of the project, when numerous team members took unplanned leave. While this caused some stress for the project leader, it is not unusual in the final stages of a project, and project documents were completed on time.

Incomplete attendance at meetings led to the project leader summarising decisions and actions by email. While this was appreciated by team members, “*sometimes there was information overload, but we managed*”.

The project leader grappled with her natural tendency to be democratic and open to multiple points of view and the need to be directive during the final stages of the project.
Some team members would have preferred a more directive approach:

_I would have been happy with fewer emails requesting volunteers for different jobs and more direct instructions from Megan stating that she needed me to do X by a specific date._

A further collaboration challenge arose from the use of the Dropbox file sharing mechanism. Version control and disappearing documents were a concern for the project manager, in particular.

Finally, one respondent “would have liked to have had more time for substantive discussion at meetings”, but recognised but that was difficult to achieve with a large group and limited meeting time.

**Reference Group**

Some issues arose with the composition of the project Reference Group. The original reference group was the Tertiary Engagement Committee (TEC) of Volunteering WA, and the project team has been engaging continually with this body. However, two factors led to a review of reference group composition:

- The composition of the TEC changed such that there were no academic members in that reference group.
- The inclusion of Macquarie University and Volunteering Australia on the project posed challenges in involving them with a committee which met in person.

The solution reached was to retain the reference group _per se_, and engage a group of critical friends to provide academic guidance to the project. Both groups provided effective feedback to the project, and also acted as champions to promote the project on a broader scale, with evidence provided below.

**Proposed aims, outcomes and deliverables**

The outcomes set out in the original proposal were aspirational and not well defined. They were refined in consultation with the evaluator, as shown below. The original deliverables were also refined to resolve some overlaps between them.

**Proposed aims**

The original proposal set out these aims for this project:

- Address an under-researched area – learning in student volunteering
- Examine the experience of all three stakeholders: the student, the university and the host organisation
- Document approaches to university student volunteering
- Develop a good practice guide to enhance curriculum development and student learning.

**Proposed outcomes of the project**

The impact/outcomes being sought by this project fall into two categories:
1. Increased awareness and understanding across the university sector of university student volunteering in its many forms and models, and

2. Increased awareness and understanding across the university sector of good practices in the implementation of the various models to improve outcomes for all stakeholders. This latter outcome would also include awareness of obstacles and pitfalls, and of strategies to ameliorate these.

**Proposed deliverables of the project**

The following deliverables are proposed:

8. A comprehensive review of studies completed, and in progress, on student volunteering, globally, with particular attention to institutional and host organisation roles

9. A comprehensive map of the alternative models of student volunteering operating in Australian universities

10. Good practice guide including:
   - Principles and examples of university student volunteer programs (or models) which have been found to enhance learning, including a set of case studies
   - A set of materials for use in the establishment and operation of student volunteering projects and programs

11. A comprehensive website

12. A series of workshops to disseminate the outcomes with the materials for these to be made available via the website

13. Findings presented to the university and not-for-profit sectors via conferences and through publications as well as the website

14. A final report and discussion paper. The report will include the set of models for student volunteer programs that address the tensions outlined by Kezar and Hoads, and outline the dimension of the role of host organisations.

Deliverables 1-4 are discussed individually below. Deliverables 5-6 are discussed under dissemination. The seventh deliverable is achieved through the final project report and the companion guide produced under Deliverable 3.

**Deliverables**

All deliverables were produced as planned, or expanded upon.

**Literature review**

* A comprehensive review of studies completed, and in progress, on student volunteering, globally, with particular attention to institutional and host organisation roles.

A solid literature review was developed and has evolved over the course of the project. It can be found in Appendix B of the companion guide (see below). Outcomes of the literature review have been presented at the Australia and New Zealand Third Sector Research...
(ANZTSR) conference, and a scholarly paper has been derived from it and submitted to *Third Sector Review*.

**Map of models of student volunteering**

*A comprehensive map of the alternative models of student volunteering operating in Australian universities.*

Substantial work went into identifying and mapping models of practice across Australian universities. This was complicated by the ever-changing nature of the ‘landscape’, and the desk audit was drawn to a close in late 2013, to create a ‘snapshot’ of the landscape. The final project report discusses the models of volunteering briefly, but further detail can be found in Appendix C of the companion guide (see below). Members of the project team claimed that they were *unprepared for the complexity of the models in Australian universities and the number of models [was] too great to be useful.*

The models of practice have informed the various guides developed through this project. In the evaluator’s view, the models of practice will be of use to the sector. One of the critical friends, who has only seen the good practice guides, reinforced this view:

*Hopefully in the future the project may be able to provide examples on-line of all the types of volunteering they refer to in the guides.*

The models of student volunteering are currently hard to find, in an appendix of the companion guide. However, an abstract about this work has been accepted for the ARNOVA conference in 2016, with plans to submit a revised version to Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly. This publication is likely raise the profile of the information about models of practice, albeit three years after the data was gathered.

**Good practice guides**

*Good practice guide including:*

- *principles and examples of university student volunteer programs (or models) which have been found to enhance learning, including a set of case studies*
- *a set of materials for use in the establishment and operation of student volunteering projects and programs.*

While the initial plan was for a single good practice guide to be produced, as the project evolved, it became clear that a series of smaller good practice guides for different audiences would be more appropriate. Further, the data analysis highlighted significant variations in terminology around student volunteering, and a terminology concept guide was produced. Similarly, a learning concept guide was felt to be appropriate, and a good practice guide for employers also emerged from the data.

The good practice guides and concept guides, as produced, did not include any examples or case studies, which were important elements of the planned deliverables. Subsequently, the content of the good practice guides were combined into a companion guide which uses *vignettes* to illustrate elements of current practice.

Instead of a single good practice guide, the project produced five good practice guides, two concept guide, and one companion guide. A team member reported on the perceived innovation of this work in pulling together all the issues into one location.
Feedback from the reference group and critical friends was very positive, and indicated potential for impact (see below):

I think the good practice guides are great documents. I like the fact that they are brief, factual and answer most of the questions that are asked by the various parties; i.e. Host organisations, volunteers etc.

I think they’re useful – many individuals don’t know where to start when it comes to volunteering to learn.

I also like the fact they are written in community speak and steer away from university language.

I particularly like the guide for employers as it seems well pitched at the target audience. It speaks strongly to their interests and values.

Website

Initially, the project website was hosted by Volunteering WA (VWA), but it was problematic to update content, because this had to be done by VWA staff. A year into the project, the website was transferred to a server at Murdoch University. This enabled update of content to be more responsive, and to meet the OLT’s requirement for the website to remain available for at least five years.

The project website was then kept up to date with newsletters and other resources over the course of the project. The website has just been substantially revised for a new role as repository of project outputs, rather than informing on project progress.

Appendix I.3 summarises the outcomes of the recent website launch. Although little time was spent navigating the website, there was much interest in the project findings reported at the session. Participant feedback shows good promise of ongoing uptake.

At the conclusion of the presentation, the audience spontaneously split into small groups and started excitedly discussing aspects of the project – another indication of its relevance and timeliness.

A, perhaps minor, legal issue pertains to the availability of the good practice guides through the project website. The Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike license required by the OLT permits users of the materials (Guides, presentations, etc.) to remix, transform, or build upon the material. However, the downloadable documents are currently available only in the relatively uneditable PDF format. To adhere to this requirement, there needs to be a mechanism for people wanting to repurpose the documents to gain access to them in an editable format. This mechanism is currently not available. This does not mean that editable versions need to be available online, but there should be a mechanism for interested parties to request access.

Dissemination

A strength of this project has been the close connections that project team members have had with volunteering organisations.

The project leader and team are well connected in the volunteering sector and engaged with associated networks (eg. ACEN, Engagement Australia), which has
facilitated them connecting with stakeholders and spreading the word from early in the project.

A related strength has been the mix of communication and engagement. Stakeholders (peak bodies, interviewees and workshop participants) have, from the outset, been involved in providing information to the project, and have also been informed about the project. These factors will increase the potential impact of project outcomes and deliverables.

Ongoing dissemination activities have occurred, and a substantial listing is provided in Appendix E of the final project report. Activities have derived from the dissemination plan developed in 2014, and have included regular updates, media coverage, newsletters, participation in seminars and conferences and key events in the volunteering calendar together.

An important element was a contact list built on emails and casual contact at events. This was facilitated by personalised project business cards that were provided to interested parties. The contact list had 108 members in August 2014, but this increased steadily to 320 by the time the fifth newsletter was sent out in May 2015. Similarly, the workshops to validate and promote the good practice guides touched 163 people from 68 organisations.

**Publications**

Appendix F of the final project report outlines a substantial publication plan for project outputs. To date the focus has been on conference presentations, to raise awareness about the project. The number of conference papers was greater than originally intended, as opportunities have been grasped during the course of the project.

One scholarly paper is currently under review, and a further 14 are planned. These will not only report on specific aspects of the project, but draw more deeply on the body of data available. A risk exists that not all of these papers will be submitted, because enthusiasm may wane as the project recedes and other academic work impinges. Nevertheless, the allocation of lead authorship in Appendix F, and the Authorship agreements in place from the outset mitigate this risk.

The critical reflections of a team member (section: Communication and Collaboration) also indicate some good will towards continuing work on the publication plan.

**Outcomes and Impact**

This section explores the extent to which the project achieved its outcomes, and its current and potential impact on the university volunteering sector.

**Planned Outcomes**

The production of the suite of deliverables and the comprehensive dissemination activities provide convincing evidence that both the planned project outcomes have been achieved. As one critical friend reported:

*The value of these documents lies in the evidence-based support they provide for what we already do.*

**Unexpected Outcomes**

Several unexpected outcomes also arose from the project, as reported by team members:
• Recognition of the potential role peak bodies could play in university volunteering
• Increased understanding about the relationship between service learning and volunteering
• A workshop in Darwin which was not included in the original plans but was added in response to feedback that few such events are held in Darwin
• New knowledge of myths and controversies around volunteering
• A variety of uses of terminology.

These outcomes are directly linked to the project and will contribute to its impact.

Impact
Despite ‘impact’ not being an OLT priority at the time funds were granted, the project team has tried to address impact in its report. This was facilitated by the Dissemination plan, based on the D-cubed framework, which addresses similar issues to the IMPEL Framework. Nevertheless, it is extremely difficult to provide evidence of adoption at broader levels close to the completion date of a project based on developing deliverables, such as this one. It is more appropriate to address potential adoption.

Evidence presented in the final project report and in this report indicates that impact on team members and through ‘spreading the word’ has been strong. Impact on ‘immediate students’ has been limited, because the final project deliverables are only just available, and uptake by individuals and institutions is required before they can have an impact on students. However, the student section of Chapter 6 of the final project report provides concrete evidence of how this project can benefit students.

The evidence is quite compelling that the project impacted across the university student volunteering sector in Australia. One team member reported:

_The discussion on university student volunteering appears to have increased and we have received contact from a wide range of people. Awareness has also been raised about the complexities of university student volunteering, and about the use of terminology – and the variations in interpretation._

Workshops in various locations brought together people in the volunteering sector who had never met before, and facilitated conversations between them, for example, in the ACT, South Australia and the Northern Territory.

One team member highlighted the value of awareness raising in host organisations, “as many did not realise the ways that their interaction with students might be increased or improved, and some appeared to be operating with unrealistic expectations about what they might get from hosting students”.

The final project report addresses the four opportunistic and systemic aspects of adoption.

**Narrow adoption**
The final project report provides a range of evidence of potential narrow adoption. Feedback from the project team, reference group and critical friends provides additional evidence of impact and potential impact. The following quotes exemplify some elements of potential narrow adoption.
I would hope these resources improve the approach to student volunteering at this institution.

I am very likely to make use of them. In fact, I am eagerly waiting for them to be published.

The resources make a useful reference if setting up a new volunteer agency.

At the dissemination workshops, ... people were already working out how they would use the good practice guides, so I do think they will be used.

We keep getting enquiries as to when [the good practice guides] will be ready.

At the Canberra workshop the draft good practice guides were taken by a staff member to use for discussions with their DVC(A) in the development of a program.

**Broad adoption**

The final project report provides some evidence of intention to adopt. This evaluation found that perceptions of potential for broad adoption were mixed amongst the respondents.

Some felt that the potential was “very high, especially as we sought affiliations with and disseminated our findings via peak bodies (and thus through many volunteering organisations including not-for-profits who normally would not hear from universities) and all universities via ACEN”.

Another felt that the breadth of the awareness-raising and engagement activities “which brought together people who would not normally have come together ... will lead to broad impacts”.

Others were more cautious, recognizing the need for buy-in from senior leadership and peak bodies.

*This depends on the leadership of the relevant organisations being serious about or committed to the outcomes.*

*I think this will depend on the support we get from peak bodies. They are the people who institutions turn to for advice in this area.*

One of the critical friends shared that:

*The resources will have value as a resource to provide to a range of stakeholders and also has relevance beyond educational/student volunteers.*

**Budget**

Funds appear to have been spent wisely, and according to budget. Compared to other projects, there was a surprisingly close correspondence between budgeted and actual expenditure across all line items.

Approximately 1 per cent of funds remain uncommitted. It would be sensible to allocate these funds to support the ongoing dissemination efforts of the project team.

**Conclusion**

Compared to other projects, this project involved a relatively straightforward set of project activities, which were largely foreseeable before the project started. Notwithstanding
various challenges, the nature of the project contributed to its successful completion. However, a more important factor in the success of the project was the leadership of the project leader. Her organisational skills, attention to detail and ability to bring the project team along with her were exemplary throughout.

This evaluation concludes by addressing the question: To what degree can the work and achievements of the project be considered scalable, sustainable or transferable?

The evaluator had to make a judgement about one of the OLT’s performance indicators for a project of this kind:

“The potential to change curriculum development, learning and teaching practices and/or teaching management processes in one or more institutions outside those of the project teams.”

A strength of this project has been the way that it engaged with the national volunteering sector at all levels. Both the quality and fitness-for-purpose of the materials developed, and the breadth of the awareness-raising activities, lead to a strong potential to improve practice in university volunteering nation-wide. The work and achievements of the project are likely to be scalable, sustainable and transferable. For example, one team member believes that:

The matrix will be useful to program managers and peak bodies; the [companion guide] to researchers and perhaps to university decision-makers; the [good practice guides] will be useful if they are directed to the relevant stakeholders.

However, one concern from a team member detracts from the overall positivity of the outcomes:

perhaps learning hasn’t been as central to our project as it could have been...

However, this realisation was not part of the original project, but emerged during the project. It was addressed in part through the learning concept guide, and further work is proposed in the publication plan.

In conclusion, let us return to the overarching question of this evaluation: “To what extent was the Volunteering to Learn project successful at meeting its stated outcomes and producing its deliverables?” The answer to this question is a resounding YES, and it has been completed on time and within budget. These results were achieved through the ongoing commitment and professionalism of all members of the project team.

In the evaluator’s view, the final project report understates the potential of the project to inform university volunteering practice into the future. The sector engagement and quality of outputs are stronger than they have been portrayed in the final project report.

18 August 2015
Appendix C: Reference group and critical friends

C1: Project reference group
The project reference group was the Tertiary Community Engagement Committee at Volunteering Western Australia.

Individuals who were members or attended meetings over the course of the project were:

Traci Gamblin (Volunteering Western Australia);
Ian Fairnie (Volunteering Western Australia and Curtin University);
Aden Date (The University of Western Australia – Volunteer Hub);
Donna Tempra (The University of Notre Dame);
Adnan Visram (The University of Western Australia – student representative);
Marc Phillips (Curtin University – Curtin Volunteers!);
Carly Thompson (Curtin University – Curtin Volunteers!);
Katie O’Halloran (Murdoch University – Guild Volunteer Hub);
Sharee Hogg (Edith Cowan University);
Krishan Shah Curtin University – Curtin Volunteers!);
Alyson Chin (Curtin University – Curtin Volunteers!, student);
Claire Duffy (The University of Western Australia – Volunteer Hub);
Emma Nicoletti (Murdoch University – Guild Volunteer Hub);
Matthew Maxted (Volunteering Western Australia);
Jessica Frost (Murdoch University – Guild Volunteer Hub);
Jodie Koh (The University of Western Australia – The Guild);
Michelle Moss (Edith Cowan University);
Sophie Greer (The University of Western Australia – The Guild);
Marg Hall (Edith Cowan University).

C2: Critical friends
The following individuals agreed to review the first draft of the good practice guides as critical friends of the project.

Caroline Allen – University of Western Sydney
Sally Paulin – Donnelly River Village
Carol-joy Patrick – Griffith University
Rommie Maserei – The University of Notre Dame
Lindie Clarke – Macquarie University
Nola Wellington – Activ Foundation
Wendy Stanley - City of Armadale
Chelsea Little – Murdoch University
Gary Hepworth – Curtin University
Glenda Cain – The University of Notre Dame
Susan Beltman – Curtin University
Mark Creyton – Volunteering Queensland
Appendix D: Authorship agreement

Volunteering to Learn – Publication and authorship principles

The research team agrees the principles of authorship early in the project, and reviews decisions periodically.

The research team develops a list of potential publications. Details of each publication are to be described and agreed (purpose & content including data to be used, form of publication, proposed principal author, authors and roles, proposed publication destination, timeline). The list and details are reviewed periodically and decisions are recorded as part of the record of team meetings.

A team member may propose a publication (title, abstract, data to be used, proposed authors and roles, proposed publication destination) to the team for consideration.

All research team members are offered the opportunity to lead a publication as principal author, and may suggest a publication topic and content and volunteer to develop it as principal author. Publications will be agreed on in principle before development by the team.

All team members are offered appropriate opportunities to meet the criteria of authorship.

For a specific publication, authorship is based on each researcher’s substantial creative or scholarly intellectual contribution to the work and must be attributed to all researchers who meet at least one of the following criteria:

- conception and design of the project;
- analysis and interpretation of research data; and
- drafting, contributing to or critically revising significant parts of the work so as to contribute to the final output or interpretation [Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research, p. 5.1].

This means that authors need to have made an intellectual contribution to the relevant publication in terms of substantive discussion at meetings, data analysis and interpretations, and/or writing. It does not depend on whether the contribution was paid for or voluntary.

Each team member has the responsibility to record and update their statement of contribution to each publication. These records will be kept by the project manager for the duration of the project and by the lead author thereafter.

Authorship and principal authorship of a publication is agreed by the research team and reviewed periodically. A researcher who qualifies as an author for a specific publication must not be included or excluded as an author without their written permission.

For each publication, the order of authorship would normally represent level of contribution:

the principal author be the first author followed by other authors in rotating order; and

if one or two authors have made more substantial contribution/s than other authors, they should be named immediately after the principal author, followed by other authors in rotating order.
The agreed principal author of each publication takes responsibility for managing contributions to the publication, the progress of writing, reporting regularly to the research team on progress (including proposed authorship and order of authors), managing submission to journal etc.

Others who contribute to a publication (other than as an author as described above) should be offered acknowledgement, and must accept or decline in writing. This includes contributions such as technical, research or administrative assistance where there is no scholarly intellectual input.

If a situation arises where agreement on authorship and/or publication cannot be reached, then the process outlined in the Murdoch Authorship Attribution and Dispute Resolution Procedure should be followed to achieve a resolution.

Agreed by team members November 2013

ALL TEAM MEMBERS SIGNED THIS AGREEMENT
## Appendix E: Dissemination

### Table E1: Chronology of dissemination activities

The table below provides a summary of the main activities, the audience, and when events and activities took place. The project team all had project business cards which they were able to provide to interested parties, and included a link to the project on their email signature. A contact list was built based on emails and contacts received from casual contact and events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Participants/Audience</th>
<th>No.s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/2013</td>
<td>Meeting with Directors interested in student volunteering project at Curtin</td>
<td>Gary Hepworth, Linley Lord, Curtin Volunteers representatives</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/2013</td>
<td>Sunday Times– page 33 article</td>
<td>Story picked up by 6 other newspapers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/2013</td>
<td>Establishment of the interim website</td>
<td>All stakeholders and other interested parties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/7/13</td>
<td>Melville Times, Perth</td>
<td>Article on project receiving funding</td>
<td>Circ 34,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/2013</td>
<td>Reference Group meeting/briefing</td>
<td>Reference group members</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/2013</td>
<td>Workshop at Volunteering WA</td>
<td>Megan and Kirsten facilitate W/S audio recorded and transcribed</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/2013</td>
<td>Meetings with key stakeholder groups</td>
<td>Student advisors, Program Coordinators and managers at participating universities</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/2013</td>
<td>Workshop at the National Volunteering Conference – Adelaide</td>
<td>Conference delegates including host organisation representatives</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2013</td>
<td>Meeting with Pam Struthers representing ACEN Executive Board</td>
<td>Discussion about working with ACEN</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/2013</td>
<td>Poster for School Open Day event and the WAND (WA network for dissemination) event.</td>
<td>Students and staff from other universities</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2014</td>
<td>Delivery of pilot report to WA Department of Local Government and Communities</td>
<td>Department representatives</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2014</td>
<td>Progress report to Tertiary Engagement committee meeting</td>
<td>Reference Group</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2014</td>
<td>Release of 1st e-newsletter</td>
<td>Project reference group &amp; visitors to the Volunteering WA website, contact list.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/2014</td>
<td>Progress report to Tertiary Engagement committee meeting</td>
<td>Reference Group</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/2014</td>
<td>Matrix discussed with Reference Group</td>
<td>Reference Group and wider stakeholder group</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/2014</td>
<td>Progress report to Tertiary</td>
<td>Reference Group</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Recipients/Details</td>
<td>Attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/2014</td>
<td>Distribution of project brief to potential stakeholders</td>
<td>Potential stakeholders</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/2014</td>
<td>Letters to potential stakeholders</td>
<td>State Volunteering Peak Bodies, ACEN, Engagement Australia</td>
<td>8 plus boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/2014</td>
<td>Second e-newsletter</td>
<td>Project Reference Group &amp; visitors to the Volunteering WA website, contact list.</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/2014</td>
<td>National Student Volunteer week</td>
<td>Megan attended HUB event tree planting Lake Claremont, distributed 100 flyers.</td>
<td>5 plus 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/2014</td>
<td>Staff news Murdoch University</td>
<td>Articles on interview data to be presented at IAVE conference</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/2014</td>
<td>Conference presentation – International Association for Volunteer Effort (IAVE)</td>
<td>Conference delegates from around the world.</td>
<td>80+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2014</td>
<td>ACEN National Conference 2014</td>
<td>Gold Coast Rowena Scott attended Networking and promoting project</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2014</td>
<td>WAND poster presentation at Curtin</td>
<td>Curtin staff and WAND members</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/2014</td>
<td>ACEN WA hosted Workshop</td>
<td>Curtin University Follow up email to participants</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/2014</td>
<td>WAND and E Culture presentation</td>
<td>Edith Cowan University</td>
<td>140+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/2014</td>
<td>Reference Group workshop on GPGs</td>
<td>Reference Group</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/2014</td>
<td>Conference presentation – Australia and New Zealand Third Sector Research (ANZTSR)</td>
<td>Conference delegates from Australia and New Zealand, academic and practitioner audience, as well as international delegates</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2014</td>
<td>2nd annual Student experience conference</td>
<td>Invited Presentation by Megan Paull</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2014</td>
<td>ACEN Newsletter article on project</td>
<td>Circulated to ACEN list</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2014</td>
<td>Third e-newsletter</td>
<td>Project Reference Group &amp; visitors to the Volunteering WA website and project website, contact list.</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2015</td>
<td>Final report and flyer for DLGC</td>
<td>Report and flyer approved for DLGC website</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2015</td>
<td>Teaching and Learning Forum 2015 – The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Conference delegates, including from interstate</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/2015</td>
<td>Progress report to Tertiary Engagement committee meeting</td>
<td>Reference Group</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/2015</td>
<td>Presentation to Murdoch Teaching and Learning Forum Recapped</td>
<td>Murdoch University</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/2015</td>
<td>Fourth e-newsletter</td>
<td>Project Reference Group &amp; visitors to the Volunteering WA website</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2015</td>
<td>Presentation at Festival of Learning: Innovative Ways of Enhancing Graduate Employability Curtin University.</td>
<td>Curtin University</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2015</td>
<td>ACEN advertises road show on their website</td>
<td>ACEN members</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4/2015</td>
<td>National road show in all Australian capital cities (Sydney 23, Melbourne 37, Brisbane 30, Canberra 25, Hobart 21, Adelaide 20 and Darwin 7) to seek feedback on the Good Practice Guides</td>
<td>Main Stakeholder groups</td>
<td>163 people representing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contact list, University and Peak body representatives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representatives of partner organisations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/2015</td>
<td>Road show presentation uploaded to project website</td>
<td>Visitors to website</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/2015</td>
<td>Progress report to Tertiary Engagement committee meeting</td>
<td>Reference Group</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/2015</td>
<td>Presentation and workshop in WA to seek feedback on the Good Practice Guides</td>
<td>Main Stakeholder groups</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reference Group, Representatives of partner organisations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/2015</td>
<td>Fifth e-newsletter</td>
<td>Project Reference Group &amp; visitors to the Volunteering WA website and project website, contact list.</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/2015</td>
<td>Progress report to Tertiary Engagement committee meeting</td>
<td>Reference Group</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/2015</td>
<td>Website launch</td>
<td>Invited guests and contact list in WA</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/2015</td>
<td>5th e-newsletter</td>
<td>Contact list</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure E1: Dissemination and engagement strategies

- Project Team: MQ, ECU, MU, CU, UWA
- Regular meetings
- 2 days F2F analysis

Communication Strategies:
- Engagement Letter to key stakeholders: VA, VWA, Engagement Aust
- Newsletter Updates: Volunteering WA website page, Project website page
- Conference presentations: ACEN, ANZTSR, IAVE
- Regular reporting to Reference Group
- Tertiary Engagement Committee
- Reciprocal linking of final website to VA and VWA
- Interview contact: host organisations, university staff and students and student organisations - collect stories
- Press Releases: eg HERDSA, Higher Edu Supplement, Exchange & other media at funding of project and release resources
- Publications and Discussion papers, Journals articles See Plan

Engagement with WIL, Service Learning programs

Networking across the sector via peak bodies

REFINEMENT OF GOOD PRACTICE GUIDES
BUILD OWNERSHIP WITH POTENTIAL ADOPTERS

Outputs for Dissemination
- Branding, contacts list, events calendar, Project Briefing, poster, VWA webpage, Website & Dropbox
- Good Practice Guides and Concept Guides Distribution direct to stakeholders, university, host & student organisation contacts
- Project Report and Companion Guide on Project website

- WA workshops held at VWA and funded by Dept of Local Govt and Communities
- Workshop at National Volunteering Conference Adelaide, ACEN workshop, Curtin University
- Online feedback from Critical Friends Group recruited as additional source of advice and feedback
- Workshops in identified universities and state volunteer centres across Australia Refinement of Good Practice Guides
- Reference Group workshops/meetings Refinement of Good Practice Guides
- Iterative process of refinement of draft guides incorporates feedback from workshops

Networking across the sector via peak bodies

Engagement with WIL, Service Learning programs

REFINEMENT OF GOOD PRACTICE GUIDES
BUILD OWNERSHIP WITH POTENTIAL ADOPTERS

Outputs for Dissemination
- Branding, contacts list, events calendar, Project Briefing, poster, VWA webpage, Website & Dropbox
- Good Practice Guides and Concept Guides Distribution direct to stakeholders, university, host & student organisation contacts
- Project Report and Companion Guide on Project website

- WA workshops held at VWA and funded by Dept of Local Govt and Communities
- Workshop at National Volunteering Conference Adelaide, ACEN workshop, Curtin University
- Online feedback from Critical Friends Group recruited as additional source of advice and feedback
- Workshops in identified universities and state volunteer centres across Australia Refinement of Good Practice Guides
- Reference Group workshops/meetings Refinement of Good Practice Guides
- Iterative process of refinement of draft guides incorporates feedback from workshops
Table E2: Future dissemination events planned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Participants/Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/2015</td>
<td>Conversation presentation</td>
<td>Murdoch staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/2015</td>
<td>BERA conference***</td>
<td>International Education conference participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2015</td>
<td>ACEN webinar</td>
<td>Registrations currently underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/2015</td>
<td>AARE conference***</td>
<td>Australian Education conference participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2015</td>
<td>ARNOVA conference***</td>
<td>International/US voluntary sector academic conference participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2015</td>
<td>ANZAM conference**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2016</td>
<td>TLF**</td>
<td>Western Australian teaching and learning forum conference participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/2016</td>
<td>VA conference**</td>
<td>Voluntary sector, government sector, academic and private sector organisations interested in volunteering activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/2016</td>
<td>ISTR conference**</td>
<td>International/European voluntary sector academic conference participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Workshop Materials to VWA and VA as well as website</td>
<td>Materials made available to VWA and VA to promote USV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/2015</td>
<td>ACEN webinar</td>
<td>ACEN participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2015</td>
<td>Service learning summit****</td>
<td>Summit participants (postponed from 2015)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**** Invited participation; *** Abstract or paper accepted; ** Subject to abstract or paper being accepted.
Appendix F: Publication plan

Table F1 below outlines the publication plan agreed by the team at the September 2014 stage of data analysis and reviewed at the conclusion of the project. Table F2 outlines brainstorm of future papers. Table F3 outlines papers presented at conference, and Table F4 outlines abstracts accepted for conferences to come.

Table F1: Publication plan for journal publications over 2015-17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Topic/title</th>
<th>Lead author(s)</th>
<th>Possible outlet</th>
<th>Aim for</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Volunteering/citizenship/SL and the curriculum</td>
<td>Judith MacCallum &amp; Rowena Scott</td>
<td>Studies in Higher Education (A/A*)</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Abstract accepted for AARE conference (F4.3(^2)). To be developed following conference, with a focus on student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Typology, models based on the matrix</td>
<td>Kirsten Holmes (with Gabrielle)</td>
<td>Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly (A)</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Abstract accepted for ARNOVA conference. (F4.2). Following conference, paper will be revised and submitted to journal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Benefits of student volunteering</td>
<td>Susan Young &amp; Debbie Haski-Leventhal</td>
<td>Voluntas (B)</td>
<td>Mid 2016</td>
<td>Will include elements from Companion Guide Literature Review as well as from data. The article will examine the multi-dimensional positive impact of student volunteering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Hosting university student volunteers – making it work for both parties</td>
<td>Megan Paull &amp; Maryam Omari</td>
<td>Nonprofit Management and Leadership (B)</td>
<td>Mid 2016</td>
<td>ANZAM conference paper on expectations is currently under review and will form the basis of this publication. (Opt out option selected - abstract only in conference proceedings.). Feedback from presentation at ANZAM to be included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Terminology – systematic review of terminology in the literature</td>
<td>Megan Paull</td>
<td>Third Sector Review (B)</td>
<td>UNDER REVIEW</td>
<td>Presented at ANZTSR conference (F3.3). Refined and submitted to Third Sector Review March 31 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Changing nature of universities approach to volunteering in relation to curriculum</td>
<td>Judith MacCallum &amp; Rowena Scott</td>
<td>Higher Education Research and Development (A)</td>
<td>Early 2016</td>
<td>Abstract accepted for BERA conference (F4.1). To be developed once presented at BERA and submitted to education journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Myths and mysteries</td>
<td>Megan Paull</td>
<td>To be decided based on focus which</td>
<td>Oct 2016</td>
<td>Abstract submitted to Volunteering Australia Conference under review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) Refers to entry in Table F4 below
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Topic/title</th>
<th>Lead author(s)</th>
<th>Possible outlet</th>
<th>Aim for</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Volunteering and employability</td>
<td>Debbie Haski-Leventhal and Susan Young</td>
<td>Journal of Education and Work (A)</td>
<td>Mid 2016</td>
<td>Will include elements from Companion Guide Literature Review as well as from data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Terminology based on our data from interviews</td>
<td>Rowena Scott</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Mid 2016</td>
<td>To be developed following acceptance of systematic review or revised if systematic review paper is not accepted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Experience and learning or exploitation and imposition</td>
<td>Megan Paull</td>
<td>Education &amp; Training or Journal of Vocational Education and Training (A*/A)</td>
<td>Dec 2016</td>
<td>Will need to wait until after Myths and mysteries paper is developed to ensure no overlap. Chapter included in Companion Guide. Journal may need to be reconsidered once paper developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Institutional aspect of SL, life process (evolution)</td>
<td>Kirsten Holmes</td>
<td>Journal of Youth Studies (2014 Impact Factor: 0.805 5-Year Impact Factor: 1.140) OR Journal of Academic Ethics (no IM, not on ABDC)</td>
<td>ON HOLD</td>
<td>May overlap with some of the other papers so put on hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Developing awareness of volunteering/good citizenship</td>
<td>Megan Paull</td>
<td>To be decided after other papers published.</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Link to United Nations Sustainable Development Goals Be careful about link to student papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Program level management of volunteering – within universities</td>
<td>Maryam Omari</td>
<td>Higher Education (Springer) (IM 1.151)</td>
<td>Late 2016</td>
<td>Will compare with host organisation management of student volunteers. Will need to wait until after Hosts paper. Related to E-culture paper (F3.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Tutoring and mentoring in student volunteering</td>
<td>Judith MacCallum</td>
<td>Mentoring and Tutoring</td>
<td>Late 2016</td>
<td>To be developed based on revisiting data once other papers are complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>History and context of university volunteering</td>
<td>Judith MacCallum</td>
<td>Mind, Culture and Activity</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>To be developed once other papers are complete to assess overlap</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Topic/title</th>
<th>Lead author(s)</th>
<th>Possible outlet</th>
<th>Aim for</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Volunteering to learn or learning to volunteer</td>
<td>Megan Paull</td>
<td>SEE NOTE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation at IAVE conference (F3.1). Elements included in Companion Report Aspects will be incorporated in other papers such as Benefits of student volunteering and Volunteering/citizenship etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Cross-cultural issues in student volunteering</td>
<td>Maryam Omari</td>
<td>SEE NOTE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient data for stand-alone paper. Notes prepared and uploaded to Dropbox for incorporation in other student focused papers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table F2: Brainstorm of publication ideas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Proposed in brainstorm but not yet allocated or in development Query not enough data. (Rowena Scott)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online service learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding management: Impact on student volunteering</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed in brainstorm but not yet in development May overlap with impact on policies paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of volunteering on university policies and procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed in brainstorm but not yet in development May overlap with funding paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring learning in university student volunteering</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed as follow up to this project and relates to outcomes of mentoring and other similar activities (Judith MacCallum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial volunteering</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed in brainstorm but not yet in development. May link to ISVs starting own organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering and engagement at first year</td>
<td></td>
<td>Links to Keithia Wilson’s research on FYE (Rowena Scott)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal impact of USV</td>
<td></td>
<td>Raised as issue by TCEC. Link to Hill and Stevens IVR report Dec 2010 (Megan Paull)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table F3: Conference papers completed

Volunteering to Learn

Table F4: Abstracts accepted

Appendix G: Interview guides

The interviews conducted for this project used the guides below. The questions in these guides were to provide a framework for interviewers so that a level of consistency was achieved between interviewers and overlapping content was explored with stakeholders. Interviewers were free to pursue stories and to probe further if particular issues associated with student volunteering and learning emerged during the interview. All interviewees were briefed on the project and asked to provide informed consent before proceeding with the interviews, all of which were recorded and transcribed.

G1: Interview guide – student volunteers

Terminology

• What do you understand by the term university student volunteering?

Experience

• When did you start volunteering and in what capacity?
• How often do you volunteer/how many hours have you volunteered in the last year?
• What do/did you do as volunteer? Tell us about your volunteering story.

Motivations

• Why did you join this program?
• What did you perceive as the benefits before joining?

Benefits

• What are the most important benefits you have gained in this program?
• What are the benefits to students who participate in this program?
• What are the benefits for the recipients/community?
• Who else benefits from this?
• What learning do you think takes place when students volunteer?

Challenges

• What were the first challenges you encountered when you started volunteering?
• How did you overcome them?
• What other challenges did you have along the way?
• What/who helped you to address these challenges, if at all?

Impact

• What do you think this program is aimed to do?
• What are its most important achievements?
• Who does it impact the most and how?
• Any negative impacts?

G2: Interview guide – host organisations

Terminology

• What do you understand by the term university student volunteering?
Involvement

- When did you become involved in the program and how?

Expectations and motivations

- Why did your organisation become involved in this program?
- What did org hope to gain from hosting student volunteers?
- What were/ are you expectations of student volunteers?
- Does the university have any expectations from your involvement in the program?

Benefits

- What are the main benefits for the organisation?
- What are the main benefits for the clients/the community?
- What are the benefits for the students?
- Any unexpected benefits?
- What learning do you think takes place for students who volunteer with your organisation?

Challenges

- What were the first challenges you encountered when you commenced?
- How did you overcome them?
- What changes have you made, if any, to accommodate the student volunteers?
- What are the costs (not just financial) to your organisation of hosting the student volunteers?

Impact

- What impact do student volunteers have on your organisation, services and clients?
- Do you receive any feedback from the students or university about the impact of the program?
- Do you receive any feedback from the clients about the students?

G3: Interview guide – university program manager

Terminology

- What do you understand by the term university student volunteering?

Experience

- Please describe the program and what it aims to do.
- How did you become involved in the program?
- What are your responsibilities as coordinator?
- How long have you been involved in the capacity of coordinator? Have there been changes in the program over that time? In what ways?

Expectations

- How are student volunteers selected or recruited for the program?
- What are your expectations of the student volunteers?
- What are your expectations of the host organisations?
- Of any other groups?
Preparation and support

- What preparation/support is provided/encouraged for student volunteers?
- What preparation/support is provided/encouraged for host organisations?
- What feedback have you received from volunteers? Organisations? Others?

Benefits

- What do you see as the benefits of the program - for the university?
- What are the most important benefits to students who participate in this program?
- What learning do you think takes place for student volunteers?
- What are the benefits for the recipients/community?
- What have been the benefits to you?
- Who else benefits from this program?
- Anything unexpected?

Challenges

- What were the first challenges you encountered when you commenced?
- How did you overcome them?
- What other challenges did you have along the way?
- What/who helped you to address these challenges, if at all?

Impact

- Do you think the program achieves its aims? In what way?
- What are its most important achievements?
- Who does it impact the most and how?
- Any negative impacts?
- If another university/faculty was starting a program like this what suggestions/recommendations would you make?

G4: Interview guide – institutional representatives

Terminology

- What do you understand by the term university student volunteering?
- How do students in your university get to know about potential volunteering opportunities?
- How do students in your university find potential volunteering opportunities?
- How does your university assist students to volunteer?
- How does your university record and report on student volunteering?
- How are students given credit for volunteering? E.g. on transcript; assessment, part of course or unit
- Is this different in different schools and/or faculties?
- How do you (or your university) know this? About your university’s student volunteering?

How many?

- How many students in your university (that you know of) do volunteering?
- Is this different in different schools and/or faculties?
• How do you (or your university) know this? About the number of your university’s students volunteering?

When?
• When do students prefer to volunteer throughout the year? e.g. during semester, between semesters, summer break
• When do students volunteer throughout the year? e.g. during semester, between semesters, summer break
• Is this different in different schools and/or faculties?
• How do you (or your university) know this? About your university’s student volunteering?

Where?
• Where does this university provide information to students about volunteering?
• Where do students in your university volunteer?
• Where do students in your university volunteer (with regard to geography)? e.g. close to their home, close to uni, regional, rural, interstate, overseas
• Where do students in your university volunteer? Big organisations, small businesses, potential employment sites, on campus, within their school of study,
• Where do students in your university go to find out about volunteering?
• Is this different in different schools and/or faculties?
• How do you (or your university) know this? About your university’s student volunteering?

With whom?
• With whom do students in your university volunteer? What types of organisations e.g. related to their discipline of study, emergency services,
• With whom do students in your university volunteer? e.g. with seniors, with children, with people who may offer references and/or employment,

Why?
• Why does this university promote volunteering? E.g. have a volunteering program, hub, information news, noticeboard.
• Why do students in your university (that you know of) do volunteering?
• Is this different in different schools and/or faculties?
• How do you (or your university) know this? About your university’s student volunteering?
• What learning do you think takes place in university student volunteering?
Appendix H: Feedback from consultation processes

H1: Feedback from reference group on first draft of good practice guides

The feedback from the reference group on the first draft of good practice guides involved a round table discussion with members of the reference group working with the project team members. The workshop was adjacent to a Tertiary Community Engagement Committee meeting held on campus at Murdoch University, and was catered to create an informal atmosphere.

Members of the reference group and members of the project team made notes all over the draft guides, and general discussion was held about tone, audience, level of detail and intention. One of the notes made at the time was that language needed to be broad enough to cater for all stakeholders.

The reference group debated and discussed terminology, the various models across the universities and the need for the guides to both overlap and stand alone. Generally feedback about content was good, but recommendations were made which included for example a recommendation that sections on debunking myths needed to be carefully handled, but that this was important content.

Important to remind students always consider the time of year or assignments – timeliness and stress on the volunteering organisation and the role of the volunteer hub is to dig them out of a hole. (NOTES FROM WORKSHOP – GW).

H2: Feedback from ACEN workshop on first draft of good practice guides

ACEN hosted a workshop for the project team in November of 2014. The workshop involved a presentation of the project followed by round table discussions between workshop participants about the draft guides. This session included students, host organisations and program level managers from universities. Participants were asked to make notes on the draft guides, to fill out a short survey and to respond to an online post event questionnaire about the event. The same sorts of concerns about language and audience arose from this workshop as from the reference group.

Important feedback about legal considerations emerged from discussions from this group which had not been highlighted in the data to date. There was recognition that the legal framework for volunteering and related activities was not static, but issues such as insurance could be affected by failure to recognise the importance of agreements and protection for students, organisations and universities. The ACEN workshop participants also highlighted a recent WIL and Internships decision of Fair Work Australia, which could be seen to affect volunteering should organisers not be made aware of it. A return to the data with specific attention to legal considerations led to incorporation of legal considerations into many of the guides. The project team felt unable, however, to provide legal advice,
especially as this would be subject to change, and would require tailoring to particular circumstances.

**H3: Feedback from critical friends**

Critical friends were asked for feedback on the guides as they were presented in December of 2014.

For each of the guides, the friends were asked the following questions:

How would you rate each of these in this guide?

- Scope
- Level of Detail
- Value to Target Group
- Language
- Layout
- Length

The rating scale applied to each of these was: Excellent, Good Average, Below Average and Terrible

Friends were also asked:

- Is there anything missing?
- Any suggestions for improvement to this guide
- Would you recommend this guide to other? To whom? Why or why not?

Space was also provided for critical friends to provide comment.

The variety of feedback represented the variety of backgrounds of critical friends, and the diversity of interest.

- Some common areas where feedback was consistent included layout and language. Simplification of language was recommended and this was undertaken before the road show in April of 2015.
- Layout and appeal were revised from the draft version sent to critical friends in December 2015. This had already been identified by the reference group and the ACEN workshop as being important.

One critical friend requested more evidence be included in the guides, and while this was increased in the future guides, the inclusion of quotes and vignettes in the companion guide was also designed to add to this.
Appendix I: Feedback from roadshow workshops and website launch

I1: Feedback from roadshow workshops

Feedback was collected from the roadshow workshops in three ways:

1. By way of interaction between the workshop facilitators and participants on the road;
2. Through notes made on draft guides by participants at the workshops; and
3. By an online follow up survey.

Feedback from the interaction between facilitators and participants was collated and passed around the team. This included observations about such things as the name of the guide which was eventually referred to as the good practice guide for university program managers. The earlier version was for managers and co-ordinators but some workshop participants confused the audience - thinking this might refer to managers and co-ordinators in host organisations.

Notes on drafts guides by participants alerted the team to some inconsistencies between guides, including use of the term placement.

The online survey asked the following:

Which of the guides are you most interested in?

Respondents were asked to rate each of the guides on:
- Appearance
- Content
- Level of detail
- Likelihood that you will use it
- Likelihood that you will refer others
- And
- Relevance

Of 148 attendees at the Roadshow workshops, 40 attendees responded to our on-line survey to provide feedback. Three quarters of respondents were most interested in the student guide. More than half respondents were interested in the good practice guides for the host organisation and senior university staff. All good practice guides were rated very highly for their appearance. Most people liked the level of detail, though some wanted more information and on-line versions so they were glad to know that more data and the good practice guides will be available via the website.

For example one participant responded: “all aspects of volunteering are addressed: i.e. legalities, good practice, why do it etc. all of this is very helpful in enhancing opportunity in
volunteering for students, university staff and host organisations - The guides assist in providing reason and benefits to sell the idea and practice, and importantly to provide community connection and growth. The guides assist in outlining university's responsibility in preparing students and getting students together, to assist in advising students on what employers expect etc.”

While some respondents perceived that the guides were “well written, succinct, and practical”, others commented that “there are sections where the "voice" is quite "academic". Feedback assisted the research team as they revised and refined the good practice guide content and format.

Another participant responded: “Learning concept guide is really important because it provides a really good overview of student development and co-curricular learning outcomes. By making explicit the learning that occurs outside of the classroom the learning concept guide legitimises co-curricular activity and student engagement in that space. I liked the overlapping content in the guides, too, and their potential usefulness for the different stakeholders (managers, employers, students) who will be involved in volunteering.”

Many will refer the good practice guides to others mostly students but also including senior management and host organisations. When asked how you or your organisation might use the guides, most participants mentioned educating students and staff while one stated “Research into employability of graduates”. Another responded “To enlighten management” and another wrote “To enlighten management” while another responded “To make sure we are addressing all the information for students to make informed decisions about Volunteering”.

The roadshow in Hobart was held on 23 March, the ones in Brisbane, Sydney, Melbourne, Adelaide, Darwin and Canberra were held on 8 and 10 April, and the one in Perth on 22 April, 2015. As a result there were opportunities to draw on the feedback from Hobart before the cluster of capital city workshops, and then again on the travelling roadshow workshops in time for the Perth workshop. Analysis of the feedback from the roadshow online survey indicates, for example that elements which were amended, such as typographical errors and terminology improved due to these amendments.

Two unsolicited emails were received following the roadshow. One was from an active critical friend who was concerned to clarify some elements, particularly with respect to terminology, and another was from a workshop participant who had taken the draft guides to a network meeting in the health sector. This latter email highlighted a number of issues associated with difficulties faced by host organisations. Interestingly one element of feedback which was received in this email indicated that a volunteer manager at a particular organisation had never heard of the project. While we were unable to directly respond to this information, we did have some organisations that declined to participate in data collection. The information in these unsolicited emails was considered in the final review of the guides.
I2: Organisations represented at the National Roadshow

Abbottsford Convent  
Australian Collaborative Education Network  
The University of Adelaide  
Agewell  
ANU Students Association  
ANU Postgraduate & Research Students’ Association  
Ardoch Youth Foundation  
Austin Health  
Australian Catholic University  
The Australian National University  
Camp Quality  
Campus Village Life  
Canberra Region Cancer Centre  
Canberra Institute of Technology Student Association (CITSA)  
Charles Darwin University  
City of Armadale  
Central Queensland University, Victoria  
College of Law  
Curtin University  
Deakin University  
Department for Education and Child Development South Australia  
Edith Cowan University  
Fitzroy Legal  
Flinders University  
Griffith University  
Girl Guides Australia  
Girl Guides Western Australia  
Guild Volunteering (The University of Western Australia)  
Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia (HERDSA) Victoria branch  
Ignite Mentoring  
Inclusion Melbourne  
La Trobe University

Macquarie University  
Melville Cares  
Monash University  
Murdoch University  
Murdoch University Student Guild  
Volunteering  
Parks Victoria  
Queensland University of Technology  
Red Cross  
RMIT University  
Royal Agricultural Society of Victoria  
Salvation Army  
Scouts Australia  
Southern Cross University  
Southern Health  
Swinburne University of Technology  
The Australian Hearing Hub  
The Centre for Volunteering  
The College of Law  
The Education Department Western Australia  
The University of Sydney  
The University of Western Australia  
University of Wollongong  
The University of Melbourne  
The University of Notre Dame  
The University of Queensland  
University of South Australia  
University of Tasmania  
University of Western Sydney  
Victoria University  
Volunteer Task Force  
Volunteering ACT  
Volunteering Australia  
Volunteering Queensland  
Volunteering SA-NT  
Volunteering Tasmania  
Volunteering Victoria  
Volunteering Western Australia

I3: Feedback from the website launch

The website launch was held on August 14th 2015. Over forty people were in attendance of whom 23 provided feedback.

All respondents indicated that they are likely (9) or very likely (14) to use the good practice and concept guides, with those who responded indicating that they were most interested in the guide for students (17), host organisation (11) and employer (11) guides, with six (6)
indicating interest in all of the guides. All respondents also indicated that they are likely (6) or very likely (17) to refer the guides to others.

Most respondents are likely (5) or very likely (15) to use the website (with 3 uncertain at this stage), and similarly most are likely (4) or very likely (18) to refer others to the site (with 1 uncertain). Four respondents took up the opportunity to provide additional comments:

*I think the guides offer some interesting practical points as to how students can help themselves to stand out. I recruit students for a postgrad program and pay particular attention to candidates volunteer work prior to interviewing for a place.*

*Very good for those that need information on volunteering.*

*Great project, good to see all of this being brought together in such an easy to use way, great stuff!!!*

*All useful for my role. Incredibly interesting. Thank-you for the presentation, it answered questions and opened my mind to new possibilities! Love the hub video too!*

The final comment referred to the video played at the launch which had been prepared by the Murdoch Volunteering Hub with whom the project has formed a good working relationship. The video is a collation of short videos prepared by student volunteers at Murdoch University.

Other feedback received at the launch included from representatives of a host organisation who indicated that our messages contained in the good practice guides echo those which their organisation is trying to promote and that they were glad to see reinforcement of the same messages.

The networking at the event was also productive with the regional manager of a student centred volunteering organisation connecting with the manager of the Murdoch Hub, senior university staff from Murdoch University, Edith Cowan University and The University of Western Australia being in attendance and joining the conversations with staff in volunteering, careers, WIL and teaching staff from discipline areas. Similar to a comment heard at another event (2015 Teaching and Learning Forum), there was an observation made by one program level staff member that it was good for senior university staff to hear about activities at the program level, in particular the grey areas identified by the project.
### Appendix J: Achievement of deliverables

#### Table J1: Achievement of deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Deliverable</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A comprehensive review of studies completed, and in progress, on student volunteering, globally, with particular attention to institutional and host organisation roles. | Literature review included with companion guide  
Literature review material included in articles prepared for submission for peer review |
| A comprehensive map of the alternative models of student volunteering operating in Australian universities. | Mapping proves difficult due to volume of information and dynamic nature of student volunteering in universities.  
Cut-off date of December 2013 imposed.  
Outcomes and distilled matrix included with companion guide. |
| Interim website.                                                                     | Interim website now links to final website                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| **Good practice guide including:**                                                   | Modified to include set of good practice guides and concept guides rather than one guide  
Types/models included in companion guide.  
De-identified vignettes included in companion guide to provide examples of practice. |
| principles and examples of university student volunteer programs (or models) which have been found to enhance learning, including a set of case studies. | Types/models included in companion guide.  
De-identified vignettes included in companion guide to provide examples of practice. |
| a set of materials for use in the establishment and operation of student volunteering projects and programs. | Good practice guides include suggestions about operational matters. |
| Comprehensive website                                                                | Launched 14th August 2015  
Includes links to good practice guides, concept guides, companion guide, and other resources.                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| A series of workshops to disseminate the outcomes with the materials for these to be made available via the website. | Conducted March/April 2015 as part of development of guides and feedback incorporated into final guides and report.                                                                                                                                                          |
| Findings presented to the university and nonprofit sectors via conferences and through publications as well as the website. | See dissemination and publication activities and plans.                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| A final report and discussion paper. The report will include the set of models for    | See companion guide on website.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| student volunteer programs that address the tensions outlined by Kezar and Rhoads, and outline the dimension of the role of the host organisations. | It is anticipated that project team members will also develop publications based on the project to further disseminate the findings of this project. | See publication plan |