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WHAT ARE WE DOING?

• How does non-traditional volunteering contribute to community resilience throughout the phases of EM?

• How can the EM sector support non-traditional volunteering?

• What models or approaches will enable EM agencies to maximise opportunities for engaging non-traditional volunteers, while minimising risks?
WHY ARE WE DOING IT?
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WHAT DO WE WANT TO ACHIEVE?

• Identify pros and cons of engaging non-traditional volunteers in EM.

• Provide guidance for end users on engaging non-traditional volunteers and volunteering organisations.

• Provide guidance for non-traditional volunteers on engaging with EM organisations.

• Develop new approaches and models for engaging non-traditional volunteers and volunteering organisations in EM.

• Assess the legal implications of alternative approaches and models.
WHAT HAVE WE DONE SO FAR?

• A ‘global’ review of literature on non-traditional volunteering.

• A review of trends influencing emergency volunteering in Australia.

• A workshop for end users and researchers in Melbourne.

• Journal papers (one submitted, one in prep.) and conference presentations.

• Began a series of case studies of non-traditional volunteering.
WHAT HAVE WE FOUND OUT?

• ‘Ordinary’ citizens are usually first on the scene in an emergency or disaster.

• Often have ‘real-time’, ‘on-the-ground’ views of problems, draw on local networks and resources, and configure themselves to meet local needs.

• Non-traditional volunteering takes many forms – e.g. extending, emergent, digital.

• Health and safety risks associated with untrained vols.

• Barriers include culture of EM, organisational risks and liabilities.
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1) Transformation of modern life and work
   - Episodic volunteering

2) Private sector involvement growing
   - Corporate/ business and skills-based volunteering

3) Revolution in communication technology
   - Digital volunteering

4) Government demands on voluntary sector growing
   - Rise of social enterprises
   - More informal, grassroots initiatives
ADAPTING TO THE NEW LANDSCAPE

1) Working with a wider range of more diverse players
   a) More diverse and flexible management approaches
   b) New forms of long-term, multi-sectoral partnerships
   c) Formal collaboration with digital volunteers
   d) Growth of bridging/matching organisations
   e) Culture change in EMOs to make space for community-led initiatives
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Earthquake Recovery in Japan: Entrepreneurs to the Rescue
by Hannah Miller on Monday, Oct 22nd, 2012

“Disaster relief” usually brings to mind images of tents, food and water convoys, and emergency medicine. But since 2011’s earthquake, tsunami, and reactor meltdown in the Tōhoku region of Japan, a Tokyo-based social entrepreneurship group called ETIC has added a whole new dimension: an entrepreneurial recovery effort.

Through its fellowship for young business leaders, called the “Disaster Recovery Leadership Development Project,” the group is enlisting 200 fellows from some of the biggest corporations in Japan to move to the recovering region for 3 to 12 months and help run temporary housing units, put companies back together, and rebuild the transportation system.

WHAT NEXT?

• 6-8 case studies of non-traditional emergency volunteering.

• Experiences of non-traditional volunteering in different contexts, at different scales and from different perspectives.

• Mixed methods of data collection (interviews, focus groups, documentary evidence).

• Not just bushfire!
CASE STUDY SELECTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Case is an example of at least one of the key emerging modes/types of volunteering</td>
<td>Emergent groups, extending groups, digital volunteering, episodic and spontaneous volunteering, corporate volunteering, social enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Case is sufficiently substantial and accessible to be able to generate appropriate data</td>
<td>Number of interviewees, duration of volunteer activity, secondary material available, openness of key people to participating in the project etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Range of emergency management phases are represented amongst cases</td>
<td>Prevention, preparedness, response, recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Range of hazards and emergencies are represented</td>
<td>Bushfire, flood, storm, drought, technological/industrial/transport, all hazards/mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Range of organisational types are represented</td>
<td>Formal/hierarchical, collaborative/partnerships, loose/informal, established, newly forming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Range of jurisdictions are represented</td>
<td>Across Australian states and territories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Range of geographic settings and scales are represented</td>
<td>Peri urban, rural, urban, remote; local, regional, national in scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Range of volunteer socio-demographic groups and settings are represented</td>
<td>CALD, social disadvantage, indigenous, youth, elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Range of recipients/purposes are represented</td>
<td>Self-help groups in at-risk areas, external help groups, animal help groups etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We welcome suggestions for case studies...
END USER FEEDBACK

Lucas van Rijswijk (TFS)
DISCUSSION: IMPLICATIONS

Depends on our aim –

**To make them part of the formal system**: trained, complying with ASQA OH&S etc, credentialed, controlled, serving agency priorities; [likely to be response focused;]

**To have them coordinate with agencies**: No credentials, could serve different priorities, poss OH&S issues, [some specialist skills, digital vols can be anywhere, ]

**To make them go away**: (see above)