

44.013
5749

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

PA-AAS-884
ISN 48203

Memorandum

17

TO : IT/ICD, Dr. Arthur F. Dymally
 THRU : IT/ICES, Mr. John F. Lippmann
 FROM : IT/ICES/S, Phillip Sperling
 DATE: March 15, 1972
 200175

John F. Lippmann

SUBJECT: Review of the Mid-Winter Community Seminars - 1971

The plans for the 1971 series of Mid-Winter Community Seminars in thirty (30) different centers in twenty-nine (29) different cities included two new features in addition to the usual objectives to provide AID participant trainees with diversified educational, social and cultural experiences. These were, "special themes" for participants in certain selected professions in nine of the seminars; and for all of the seminars, it was suggested that study, observation and possible participation as contributing volunteers in specific economic or social development projects which draw their support from the participation of a large number of the community's citizens may be included.

The Evaluation Data

This review is an attempt to "evaluate" the overall program in terms of the information that was made available. The data included:

- a. responses from the participants on a questionnaire which also provided opportunity to write in comments;
- b. responses from the sponsors on a questionnaire which also permitted opportunity for comments;
- c. responses from sponsors of the nine "special theme" seminars on a specially designed questionnaire;
- d. letters from sponsors to AID giving unsolicited comments about the seminars;
- e. letters from participants along the same lines;
- f. observer's checklists from AID visitors to several of the seminars.

*The entire Evaluation Staff was involved in this review for a period of 10-11 weeks. Planning, devising of the questionnaires and a share of the write-up was the responsibility of Mrs. Judith Shampain. Summarizing the data for the individual seminars was the responsibility of Miss Anne Bunkerell. The meticulous tallying of quantitative data and keeping track of all the documents was the responsibility of Mrs. Marie Moore. Miss Cindy Maguire was our excellent typist and chief clerk.

A.I.D.
 Reference Center
 Room 1656, NS

Buy U.S. Savings Bonds Regularly on the Payroll Savings Plan



While this is a wealth of information, it varies considerably in its accuracy and dependability. It should be remembered that not all participants returned completed questionnaires; not all sponsors returned theirs. Sponsors' reports were usually quite forthright and honest even about their own defects. The participants' reports tend to reflect their courtesy and appreciation more than straightforwardness. One seminar is pretty much a total unknown since neither the participants' questionnaires nor the sponsor's questionnaire were returned to AID.

The "Special Theme" Seminars

This evaluation study had no way of contrasting the relative success or failure of the nine (9) seminars which had the "special" themes against the twenty-one (21) seminars which maintained a "general" theme. For one thing, even those seminars with the so-called general themes were specialized in the sense that community development, democratic participation by the citizenry, American hospitality toward foreigners, and the focus on local historical and cultural resources were central to learning about all communities. If anything, the special theme seminars differed from the general ones only in the concentration of effort on some substantive topic and on the selection of participant attendees who were presumed to be more receptive to that topic. In effect, the special theme seminars had somewhat more homogeneous groups than the general theme seminars. AID Training Notice No. 107, dated September 21, 1971, Subject: "1971 Mid-Winter Community Seminars," set forth selection and assignment criteria for this program (para. IV.F.). Participants going to centers having a "general" program were assigned according to nationality, age and sex in order to provide a "balanced mix" of participants. Participants for the special theme seminars needed to be professionally qualified on the subject matter in addition to being interested in participating. If the participant questionnaire results from special theme cities are "lumped together" and contrasted with those from general theme cities, no group differences are noticeable. Where individual city responses are different from average responses they are different not because of the special or general theme, but because of some unique occurrence identifiable with that particular seminar.

If each of the "special theme" seminars is examined in terms of the goals which it set for itself, all but one were successful. The lack of success in that one was not attributable to whether or not it had a special theme. Disruptive influences entered in which so interfered with the plans of the sponsor and the expectations of the participants that rather negative results ensued. Of all the individual cases of the other eight special theme seminars however, each one may be considered to have met its goal. There are many suggestions from both sponsors and participants that would lead to improvements for next year, but by and large, these "improvements" are relatively minor refinements to programs that have already been successful.

Essentially the same might be said for the general theme seminars. All but one could be considered quite successful. One general theme seminar tried a rather specialized approach and generated a good many unfavorable

reactions among its participants. It was not really a failure in the sense that it did not meet its goals. But since its approach included changing its longer range goals in favor of immediate exploitation of some more contemporaneous targets as they appeared, their planning deteriorated each day into extemporaneous occurrences with little hanging-togetherness.

In both of these seminars, the total responses on the participant questionnaires were quite different from those received from other seminars. Separate discussions were held with the sponsors of these two seminars to identify the contributing factors. After examining the information available, what comes through is that someone neglected to take into account the fact that there are at least four parties involved in these mid-winter community seminars: the U.S. government, the local sponsor, the participant and the participant's home country government. Each has a purpose or expectation in the training taking place. When all parties are not clear about the others' motives, the misunderstanding can quickly generate problems.

When data from the sponsor's questionnaires are compared, there is very little difference in replies from sponsors of the 9 special theme seminars and 18 general seminars. (Three sponsors of general programs did not complete the questionnaire.) Most of the participants expressed "high" or "medium" interest in the program according to the sponsors. In one special theme and three general seminars, low interest was reported for a few participants. In both types of program, there was little opportunity for actual participation of seminar attendees as community volunteers. The consensus of sponsors was that this was nearly impossible to arrange during Christmas week and, perhaps, neither desirable nor beneficial. At least two suggested longer, individually arranged internships for selected participants.

Nearly all seminars included American college students whose participation was called "very successful." In a few cases, the sponsors called the U.S. students only "medium successful." All except one sponsor wanted American students again next year.

On arranging home visits with families which shared the participant's professional or cultural interests, the sponsors reported 100% success in 5 seminars. (One of these was a special theme program.) In the majority of seminars, the sponsors reported success in the range of 30%-95%.

Nine sponsors answered five additional questions related to their "special theme" aspect. In 7 out of 9 programs, nearly all (90%-100%) participants were specialists in the fields related to the program theme. The 7 sponsors wrote they felt it important to have a homogeneous professional group.

Was this special theme program "better" than previous general seminars conducted by the same sponsor? Only two sponsors said "yes." Three said

this was their first experience so they could not judge. Two said they have always built their programs around special themes, but that this year's efforts were not as successful. In one case, it was because of a last minute change in the program. In the other, it was for reasons unrelated to the special theme. One preferred a general program; one didn't reply.

Volunteer Activity

Volunteerism, in the sense of actual service to the community offered by seminar participants was almost impossible to arrange during the Christmas season. Many sponsors reported that voluntary agency activities nearly come to a halt. Only in a few cities was volunteerism in this sense attempted. In one place, a few seminar attendees helped distribute Christmas gifts to poor families. One sponsor arranged for participants to stand on a corner ringing bells and collecting money for the Salvation Army. (They collected over \$1000!) Another got the participants to help distribute dinners to poor families. If the broader meaning of "volunteerism" is adopted, (defined in the Training Notice as "visiting neighborhood projects or attending city council meetings") then there was more participation as volunteers. In one place, participants interviewed private citizens on the community planning versus non-planning issues concerned with the development of the county as a resort area and wrote reports on the problems involved. The AID Training Notice called for this experience only in a suggestive, non-mandatory way.

The attempts to do something about "study, observation and possible participation as contributing volunteers" led to a wide variety of responses from both sponsor and participant. Part of this was due to the ambiguity of AID's definition of what was desired, and the many different interpretations by the sponsors of what they were to do. The ambiguity about what was meant by this "volunteerism" was probably further muddled by AID's two evaluation questionnaires - one for sponsors and one for participants. The items in each which had been designed to get at the "volunteer" feature were worded differently, and probably suggested one meaning to sponsors and another to participants. Even where sponsors stated that they did not provide an opportunity for participants to volunteer, many participants responded to the questionnaire item as if they had been given that opportunity. When that happened, only confusing and meaningless information was obtained. In effect, there was no real common basis for comparison among the different seminars.

The consensus of the sponsors was that actual volunteer service was difficult to arrange. Some program coordinators even wondered whether AID participants really wanted such involvement during their vacation break, but observation of volunteer activities could be included in the program without difficulty. With the wide discrepancies in perceptions and in the significance of these observations, what seems necessary is that a great deal more clarity in definition and specificity in plans need to be applied to this event.

Home Hospitality

In a similar vein, the objective to provide home hospitality was interpreted somewhat differently from one place to another. Providing home hospitality has always been a "must" for these seminars. The Training Notice states the seminars "will provide" home hospitality. It does not, as with volunteer activities, merely suggest that the seminar "may include" it. Home hospitality was to have been "with families who shared some area of common interest with the participant, either on a professional or cultural basis." Here "cultural basis" is so broad, that a wide margin for interpretation existed. Unfortunately, the participant questionnaire item asks only whether the home stay was arranged with a family that shared "professional" interests, i.e., there was nothing asked them about sharing "cultural" interests.

Most of the sponsors tried to arrange home visits for seminar participants with families that shared their interests on a professional or cultural basis. The outcome was total success in a few cities, but only partial success in most. A few sponsors didn't even try because they were not convinced that arranging visits on this basis was important. In many communities, host families were occupied with hospitality for their own families and friends and would not accept foreign guests.

The length of visits varied from Christmas dinner invitations to overnight stays or visits lasting several days. In one program, participants spent a week in the homes of their American hosts, but for some this was too long. The limitations this placed on the freedom of a few of the foreign visitors made them unwilling guests. In one city, the sponsor asked whether the participants preferred dinner invitations only, or overnight visits. The majority preferred to sleep in a hotel. In another city, the sponsor reported she thought some participants were insulted because they were treated to dinner in a restaurant rather than the home. She thought better orientation about American customs would have avoided that. One sponsor stated that from her experience, interest in arranged visits with American families lessens after foreign students have been in the United States for over a year and have had time to make their own friends, but invitations are more gratefully received by more recent arrivals. At the average seminar, about 42% of the participants responded "yes" - (I had a home stay with a family with my professional interests). By piecing together other portions of the data, however, it can be estimated that another 28% or about 70% altogether had a home stay with a family with either professional or cultural interests (whatever that means) or both. Whatever the interpretation, the best indicator in all the statistics about home hospitality was that only 6% of all the participants at all seminars reported they "did not visit any homes." This means that of those responding to the questionnaire, 94% did. Of the participants at all seminars who did have home hospitality, 51% rated their experiences with American families "Good," and another 43% rated it "Excellent." Together, these two make up an indicator of 96%....

Suggestions for Improving the Seminars

A review of the many suggestions proffered by the participants in their comments indicates that some participants did not understand the purpose of attending a mid-winter community seminar. Others may have understood, but were not altogether willing to undertake the responsibilities or the obligations that went with the attendance. Nevertheless, the suggestions they made have pertinence for AID and for those sponsors planning future seminars. It may be possible to adapt plans to these suggestions while still meeting the fundamental purposes. Without providing statistics, the following list contains the participants' suggestions for improvement in the order of those mentioned most frequently by participants:

1. Scheduling

- Provide more free time.
- Don't start so early in the morning.
- Leave the evenings free.
- Leave part of the afternoons free.

2. Recreation

- Give out printed information on entertainment available in the area.
- Have traditional games, dances, songs.
- Obtain housing that has recreational facilities in it, or nearby.
- Let the group, itself, entertain (cultural exchange).

3. Group Composition

- Don't have too many from the same country in the group.
- Have people of the same education and experience (or in the same profession).

4. Preparation of Participant for Seminars

- Send advance notice about the seminar.
- Explain more about the purpose and what we will be doing.

5. Relevance to Training

- The topics discussed, the tour visits and the lectures should be relevant to participants' professional interests.
- Break group into sub-groups if necessary.

6. Sightseeing

- Include museums and historical sites.
- Don't just take us around on a bus (that's boring).
- Don't rush us so much.
- Leave program flexible enough so participants can assist in final plans of what to do and see.

7. Participation of American Youth

- Involve them more.
- Let them act as tour guides.
- Have them at parties.
- Let them be involved in all our activities.

8. Home Hospitality

- Should be sensitive to different cultures.
- This should be voluntary (some do not want it).

9. Arrange Contact with other Ethnic Groups

- We should get to meet more (Blacks, Hippies, lower middle class, poor and rural) people.

10. Timing of Seminars

- Have seminar in summer (i.e., not during Christmas week).
- Have it at a time when we do not have to study for exams.

A similar listing was made of the comments proffered by sponsors in their letters to AID or in their comments via the questionnaires they returned. Interestingly enough, a number of the problems raised and the suggestions made are similar for both participants and sponsors, although in a different order of importance. A noticeable difference between the comments of the participants and those of the sponsors, is that the latter tend to address much broader and less detailed aspects of the seminars. The items calling for suggestions were worded somewhat differently but the participants were addressing their day-to-day comforts and conveniences, and the sponsors were addressing higher level policies and program goals. There is no attempt to harness these paraphrased statements with statistical magnitudes. The suggestions are again listed in the order of those mentioned most frequently by sponsors:

1. Preparation of Participant for Seminars

- Participants should be thoroughly briefed on the seminar content beforehand.
- Participants should be informed about their responsibility to the sponsoring community and to the host families.
- Participants should be informed that their attendance is expected at all sessions and they are expected to participate in the activities.
- No one should be coerced into attending but once a participant has arrived, interest in the program and willingness on the part of the participant ought to be reasonable assumptions.

2. Pre-seminar Preparation of Sponsors

- Sponsors should have bio-data on participants in advance (including dietary instructions).
- Sponsors should have registration lists and travel information two weeks or more in advance.
- Exclude dependents or limit them to AID sponsored husbands or wives engaged in same profession as their spouse.

3. Timing of Seminar

- Better programs might be planned during summer recess periods than at Christmas.
- In-depth programming was difficult to arrange because resource people were not always available during the holiday season.
- Fewer host families were available in some communities during the Christmas holidays because of the hosts' own social obligations to family and friends.
- Volunteer programs come to a stand-still in some cities, making it difficult to arrange for active participation or even observation visits by foreigners.

4. Group Composition

- Size of group and its mix need more attention.
- Heterogeneity of professional interests made programming difficult.
- Individual programming needs to be built more around the participant's field of interest.
- There should be as wide a mix as possible with regard to age, sex and nationality.
- No more than four participants from the same country should be enrolled in each program.
- If homogeneity is unavoidable, meaningful activities can be planned for certain national groups, when sufficient advance notice is given.
- The small number of female participants should be equally divided among all cities.

5. Balance within Seminar Program

- The amount of time AID wants devoted to substantive aspects should be spelled out more carefully.
- Better balance between work and relaxation needs to be attained.
- Sponsors need guidance on proportion of program that should be allotted to free time, sightseeing and recreational activities.

6. Selection Criteria

- Home stays, social and recreational activities should be in terms of participant's cultural background and interests.
- Discussions of substantive topics need to be in terms of a group with common professional interests (especially seminars which have a special theme).

- Participants should not be invited to attend mid-winter community seminars every year.
- Alternative programs should be offered for those who have already experienced a mid-winter community seminar (e.g., short-term internships in community agencies).

7. Evaluation of the Seminars

- More meaningful data could be obtained than the way AID did this 1971 evaluation. ("Tabulations don't mean much unless you know who's making the judgment.")
- Plans for future evaluations should be discussed at COSERV conference.

Costs vs. Benefits

Part of the problem in evaluating these Mid-Winter Community Seminars is that there is just too much to look at. For a program designed to be complementary to a technical training program and which lasts only one week, there are multiple goals and multiple means for attaining the ends.

Whether there is something "different" about the 1025 participants who did attend these 30 seminars from another 1025 participants who did not attend, we shall never know. A "scientific" study to make that comparison was not planned.

A look at the financial costs to the U.S. government indicates that the average participant costs about \$67.00; that the average seminar costs about \$2300; and that the overall week of seminars ran less than \$70,000. The financial and other costs to the sponsors just are not available. They should undoubtedly be counted as very large contributions in the cause of international relations. As to benefits, there are undoubtedly myriad and beneficial impacts these programs have had on the participants who attended, to say nothing of the American families who also participated. At least 27 of these 30 sponsors (90%) had conducted seminars before and none said they would not do this again.

If we let the participants speak for themselves in response to the question "Did you find this program beneficial?" 95% of the participants reported "yes." What more need be said?

Conclusions

1. Communication was inadequate. This evaluative review did not sift through the voluminous records of correspondence, telephone calls and conversations between and among AID officials, Development Training Specialists, their participants, the sponsors, their host families and their community's resource persons. During the planning stages there was undoubtedly a great deal of this. But the problems, difficulties or issues reported by sponsors and participants reflect a large proportion of misunderstanding that could possibly have been avoided by more precise descriptions of what AID wanted, what the local planning organization planned to do and what the participant expected.

2. In spite of inadequate communication, what did take place was in almost all cases, highly successful. Even with ambiguities existing, the efforts and energies of the sponsoring organizations' staff seemed to carry the day. The goals of the individual seminars and AID's overall objectives in providing diversified educational, social and cultural experiences were indeed met.
3. Numerous problems still exist. Most of the difficulties related to "mix" of the group, (heterogeneity of nationalities, of cultures and homogeneity of professional interest); season of the year to hold the seminars; motivations of the participants, etc., have been identified. They are not insurmountable. They call for more careful planning.
4. The suggestions for improvement from both participants and sponsors contain a wealth of innovative ideas. They should be given most earnest consideration.
5. The benefits which accrue to the participants are at a relatively low cost to the U.S. government. If one recalls that the program was initiated some few years back primarily to take care of lonely foreign students on a vacant college campus, it has made enormous and constructive strides since. It still has great potential as training peripheral and complementary to technical training. This program should be continued.

374.013
5749
Suppl
- 1 -
UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

TO : IT/PPES, Mr. John F. Lippmann
THRU : IT/PPES/E, Philip Sperling
FROM : IT/PPES/E, Judith Shampain

DATE: MAR 23 1972

SUBJECT: Supplementary Report on 1971 Mid-Winter Community Seminars - Problems, Issues and Recommendations

Data on the 1971 Mid-Winter Community Seminars was collected by questionnaires designed for the participants and for the sponsors, from observers' checklists, from trip reports and from correspondence between AID officials and the sponsors. The review of the thirty seminars held in twenty-nine different cities was reported in the memo dated March 15, 1972, subject: "Review of the Mid-Winter Community Seminars - 1971." It indicates that some of the problems, issues and difficulties reported by participants who attended earlier seminars are still with us.

Data are available from almost 1500 participants who had attended a Mid-Winter Community Seminar in either 1967, 1968, 1969 or 1970 and who subsequently had gone through the Development Education and Training Research Institute of the American University for an exit interview. They had responded to a questionnaire concerning their interest in or difficulties with different aspects of those seminars and their overall rating of their satisfaction with the seminar. Of those 1499 participants responding to this item, only 1.5% stated they were "not at all satisfied, Mid-Winter Community Seminar could not have been worse." The vast majority (76%) were anywhere from satisfied to extremely satisfied.

In the earlier seminars, which have undoubtedly since been changed, the aspects of most interest were 1st: seeing a different part of the United States; 2nd: meeting international visitors from other cultures; and 3rd: making visits to museums and places of historic interest. It should be noted that these aspects are not necessarily specific to learning about American communities. Aspects such as "visits to city government and civic organizations"; "learning about the role of volunteers"; "visiting with American families" ran 4th, 5th and 6th. The main reason ostensibly for holding the seminar, "Participating in seminars on local community affairs" ran last in interest, with "making overnight visits with American families" next to last.

The exit questionnaire provides an opportunity to indicate some eight identifiable difficulties participants may have had with these earlier Mid-Winter Community Seminars or to write in some other difficulties.



By and large, the "lack of American Students" was the difficulty indicated most often (74%). The next most frequently reported difficulty (52%) was "group members too different in cultural backgrounds." If group members were "too much alike in cultural backgrounds," this was not considered a difficulty. Unfortunately, no question was designed to get at difficulties caused by heterogeneity or homogeneity of professional backgrounds. All other difficulties mentioned had 2/3 or more saying it was not a difficulty, the other items mentioned were:

- 3rd - too many planned group activities;
- 4th - group was too large;
- 5th - too few field trips;
- 6th - too few visits with American families;
- 7th - too little discussion;
- 8th - group members too much alike in cultural backgrounds.

The following issues are the ones distilled from the data on the 1971 seminars. They should be considered in planning next year's programs. Briefly, they are:

A. Substantive Content

Have the seminars become too academic? Since the introduction of Title IX elements in 1967, some programs have not achieved a balanced mixture of substantive content - an exposure of foreign visitors to U.S. community action programs and the home stays, cultural and recreational activities that were the substance of the programs before 1967.

B. Size of Groups

Should the groups be limited in size? To 30 participants? What is optimal? Some were as large as 47 this year and sponsors complained that undifferentiated programming was impossible for non-homogeneous groups of that size.

C. Mix

Should there be homogeneity by profession but heterogeneity by age, sex and national origin? The sponsors of special theme seminars found it easier to plan programs for groups with the same professional interests. On the other hand, many sponsors complained about the large numbers of attendees from one country or a single region. One asked that no more than four from the same country be enrolled in any program. What is the best mix, - for what purpose? (We have no test of the effectiveness although homogeneous professions and homogeneous nationalities might produce optimal conditions for learning.)

D. Timing

Is Christmas week the best time to arrange a program? Many sponsors found it difficult to find appropriate resource people or arrange for observation or participation in volunteer activities during Christmas week. Some suggested that the summer would be a better time.

E. Volunteer Activity

Should foreign participants serve as contributing volunteers or should they just observe activities performed by U.S. community volunteers? One sponsor felt there was no value in "token" service of 2-3 days and that only longer in-depth experiences should be arranged for those who requested such service.

F. Advance Briefing of Participants

Who should do this? Both AID and the sponsor? Many sponsors felt their groups had not been properly oriented on the responsibilities of the participants, - their obligation to attend seminar sessions and to participate actively. They also felt the participants did not understand the sponsor's role and the participant's obligations to the community and to the host families. There is a related issue here that has to do with participants' responsibilities and obligations and how far AID can go in making (adult) participants do something that is highly dependent on interest.

G. Home Hospitality

This has been an activity in past programs which IT has expected to have arranged for everybody. Should it be? Some participants balked this past Christmas. Participants who have been here for a year or more are not as eager as new arrivals to accept invitations. Some deliberately avoided participating. Is it important to place a participant with a family that shares his professional interests? Cultural interests? This year, some sponsors thought this meant placing the participant with a family that had lived in the participant's country. This needs clarification and the benefits need to be weighed again.

H. Attendance at Successive Mid-Winter Community Seminars

For how many successive years should a participant be enrolled in Christmas programs? Should this be limited to one seminar? The sponsors feel that interest lags after attending similar programs. Should alternative programs be developed for those who have attended one or two seminars? Two sponsors suggested longer-term individually programmed internships in community organizations for those with previous seminar experience.

I. Special Theme vs. General Programs

This year, the advantage which the nine special theme seminars had over the twenty-one general theme seminars was that the special theme programs had people selected for them to make a homogeneous professional group. This made it easier for sponsors to plan in-depth programs built around common professional interests. Otherwise, there was little actual difference in program content. Some of the programs called "general" were also based on special themes, i.e., community programs for the poor, the handicapped and minority groups, but their groups were not specifically selected to be receptive to the topic.

J. Participation of American College Students

Of the 27 sponsors who answered the questionnaire, 24 said that American students had participated in their programs. In 18 programs, their participation was considered "very successful"; in 5, only "medium successful." Twenty-five of the 27 sponsors said they wanted American students to join the foreign students next year.

Recommendations for IT

A. The above ten issues should be resolved before program guidance is distributed to the sponsoring communities in August or September of 1972. The training notice should be written as clearly as possible to avoid ambiguity which might exist (e.g., the meaning of "volunteer" experience or the criteria which sponsors should use in pairing participants with host families.

B. Advance program summaries furnished by sponsors should be written in more detail and studied more carefully in IT. At the moment they are the only descriptive materials that give the participant, the DTS, or other IT officials any inkling of what the program is to be.

C. A more definitive evaluation should be designed next year, with the assistance of seminar coordinators in drafting and administering questionnaires. New programs should be monitored by IT observers. If a "first try" proves unsuccessful, we should have the on-the-spot impressions of a trained IT observer to help us reach a decision on whether a new sponsor should be used again, if considered unsuccessful the first time.

D. Participants should be thoroughly briefed by AID on the content and purpose of the Mid-Winter Community Seminars and given a choice of accepting or rejecting the invitation to attend. A complete prospectus of several programs offered in the vicinity of the participant's training location should be provided with the invitation, so the participant can indicate his first, second and third choice. (In 1971, this choice of seminar was left to programming officers and did not always please the participants.)

E. Alternative programs should be planned for 1972 and offered to those with previous seminar experience. These programs could provide individually arranged internships for participants in community organizations, in addition to home stays, cultural and recreational activities. (The sponsors in Minneapolis and Denver suggested this.)

F. IT should advise sponsors that sightseeing, cultural and recreational activities are an important part of the program, but they should not make a program too full. Adequate free time should be allowed, including time for those who have to study for final exams scheduled after their Christmas break. Substantive activities should be confined to mornings. Afternoons and evenings should be reserved for scheduled recreation and free time.

cc: TSD/UCR, J. Bell