



Report on Results of Joint IAWG-Alliance Private Sector Survey

In collaboration with the [Alliance for International Educational and Cultural Exchange](#), an association of nonprofit organizations comprising the international educational and cultural exchange community in the United States, the IAWG developed a survey instrument and then distributed it to over 400 private sector organizations. (The Alliance distributed the survey to its 62 members and to 42 members of the [International Education and Training Coalition \(IETC\)](#) (who are not members of the Alliance); the IAWG passed the survey along to over 100 federal program managers for distribution to their nongovernmental partners, and also sent the form via e-mail to some 190 additional nongovernmental organizations.) The IAWG received a total of 33 surveys from 28 private sector organizations that collaborate on 40 federal international exchanges and training programs. Eleven survey respondent organizations are Alliance and/or IETC affiliates.

Although the survey yield was small, IAWG data continues to show that many of our non-USG partners are involved to varying degrees in planning, developing, administering, and cost-sharing international exchanges and training programs and activities.

The following reviews the survey questions and examines the responses:

Types of Partnerships and Programs

Question 1: What USG-sponsored programs does your organization administer? Please indicate partner agency for each program.

Private sector survey respondents identified 12 federal departments and agencies as their partners in support of 40 federal programs (which represents about 23 percent of total IAWG-reported programming). For FY 2000, 14 Cabinet-

level departments and 26 independent agencies reported 175 international exchanges and training programs to the IAWG. And several of these, most notably those submitted by the State Department's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (ECA), the Department of Energy, and the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), reflect aggregates of numerous smaller programs and activities.

Federal entities identified as partners included:

- Department of Commerce
- Department of Defense
- Department of Education
- Department of Energy
- Department of State
- Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission
- National Aeronautics and Space Administration
- National Endowment for the Arts
- National Endowment for the Humanities
- National Science Foundation
- Peace Corps
- U.S. Agency for International Development

It is important to note that we had a small survey sample with 70 percent of the federal programs identified by survey respondents representing partnerships with the Department of State (22 aggregated programs as reported in the IAWG's annual *Inventory of Programs*) and with USAID (its 6 comprehensive programming areas as reported in the IAWG's annual *Inventory of Programs*).

Contributions to Programs by Organization

Question 2: Please identify your organization's contributions to each program.

The survey requested figures on the cost-sharing and in-kind contributions that each organization brings to the table which help leverage federal programs and federal dollars. In-kind contributions typically include estimated values of such goods and services as airline tickets, tuition waivers, housing, meals and incidentals, equipment, books, materials, staff services, and honoraria.

(The USG leveraged approximately \$630 million from various non-USG sources in FY 2000. This amounted to \$1 for every \$1.70 of USG funds spent. However, the IAWG notes that this is not the definitive figure because nearly half of the federal organizations submitting annual inventory data to the IAWG do not track or report information on non-USG contributions to their programs.)

Our survey respondents submitted only a partial accounting. Nineteen respondent organizations (70 percent) provided best-faith estimates. One organization, which did not provide a specific dollar amount, said that 5 percent of its direct costs are cost-shared and 30 percent are in-kind contributions. Another organization reported that in addition to its own cost-sharing and in-kind contributions, it drew considerable cost-shared monies from other private sector institutions to support its federal programming.

Nine organizations (30 percent) did not report any cost-sharing or in-kind contributions for a variety of reasons. Two organizations had no federal government partnerships at the time and therefore no cost-sharing or in-kind support to report. Survey follow-up revealed that other respondent organizations left the question blank because they lacked an easily accessible repository from which to obtain the requested information. Others lacked resources and/or time to gather all the information requested in a timely fashion. Some preferred to skip the question entirely because they were unsure about estimating contributions and dollar values for in-kind support. One organization responded that although it did not calculate its cost-sharing, its share of federal programming is leveraged by many private sector organizations which contribute their time and expertise - and, in many cases, host groups of exchange program participants - at no cost to the federal government.

The total cost-shared funding reported by respondent organizations was over \$11.6 million; in-kind contributions were nearly twice that amount at more than \$21.3 million, for a grand total of over \$33 million. It is important to note, however, that approximately 18 percent of the total cost-shared monies and 94 percent of the total in-kind contributions reported to the IAWG came from one organization.

Program Partners

Question 3: Do you work with other U.S.-based nongovernmental organizations in

administering program(s)?

Thirteen respondent organizations (46 percent) reported that one or more U.S.-based nongovernmental organizations partners with them. Six organizations cited three or more partners; some listed pages of collaborating organizations. For example, one survey respondent reported that his organization works with “650 colleges and universities, and other nonprofit exchange and development organizations” in administering programs. Some respondents listed the World Bank and other international developmental groups in this category as well.

Question 4: Do you work with foreign-based nongovernmental organizations in administering programs?

Sixteen respondent organizations (57 percent) reported that they have foreign-based nongovernmental organizations as partners. Twelve respondent organizations cited three or more partners; again, several organizations cited dozens of collaborating organizations. Nongovernmental organizations included such institutions as foreign universities, local language studies associations, private overseas foundations, and multinational corporations. One organization listed the Fulbright Commissions overseas, although technically the IAWG would classify them as binational governmental bodies with substantial funding received from USG and other sources.

Question 5: Do you work with foreign governmental organizations in administering programs?

Nine respondent organizations (32 percent) reported one or more foreign governmental organizations as partners. Foreign government ministries were frequently cited as partners. One organization listed “10-15 foreign government ministries of education, energy, and environment.”

Extent of Partnership

Question 6: To what extent is your organization a partner with your USG sponsors in planning and policy matters for the exchange program?

_____ *Full partner*

_____ *Involved to a significant extent*

_____ *Involved somewhat*

_____ *Not involved*

The level to which an organization is involved in planning, creating, and implementing policy with its USG sponsor provides some insight into the degree of partnership that exists between them.

Being a *full partner* implies that the organization believes it has equal involvement with its USG sponsors. The partners may pursue jointly determined and mutually agreed upon objectives and plan a course of action in programming. Ten organizations (36 percent) believe that they are *full partners* in their relations with USG sponsors. (Interestingly, eight of these ten organizations had leveraged the federal dollars they received with over \$7.7 million in cost-shared and over \$420,000 in in-kind monies for a total of over \$8 million - about 23 percent of the total monies reported by all surveyed organizations.)

Involved to a significant extent suggests an active, though less than full, partnership. Four organizations (14 percent) characterized their partnerships in this manner. Three of these organizations leverage their funds and reported over \$2.6 million in cost-sharing and over \$20 million in in-kind contributions for a total of over \$22.6 million - nearly 70 percent of the total monies reported by all surveyed organizations.

Involved somewhat may indicate a less-than-ideally-defined partnership. Four survey organizations (14 percent) listed their entities as *involved somewhat*. Some organizations have minimal involvement, as is the case with entities that partner to receive visa assistance for their own non-USG sponsored exchanges and training participant programs. These organizations all leveraged their federal programs and reported more than \$1.08 million in cost-shared and over \$330,000 in in-kind contributions for a total of over \$1.4 million - about 4 percent of the total monies reported by all organizations.

Two organizations (7 percent) gave mixed reviews of their partnership experiences. One organization indicated it was *involved to a significant extent* in two of its federal partnerships and *involved somewhat* in two other programs. Another organization had one program in which they were *involved somewhat*

and another in which they were *not involved*. These two organizations represented over \$185,000 in cost-shared and over \$950,000 in in-kind monies for a total of over \$1.1 million (about 3 percent of the total monies reported by all organizations).

Two organizations (7 percent) left the question blank as they had no federal partnerships at the time. Six organizations cited *not involved*, implying that the interaction between the organization and its federal partner may be nonexistent or a rather loose association. No cost-shared or in-kind contributions were reported in this category.

In sum, the majority (71 percent) of respondent private sector entities reported that their organizations have a role in planning, creating, and implementing policy for USG-sponsored international exchanges and training programs and they have managed to leverage their federal dollars quite well.

Challenges to Partnerships

Question 7: What problems have you encountered in dealing with your USG partner(s)? Check as many as apply. If more than one problem area, please rank (i.e., 1 for most problematic).

- _____ *micromanagement*
- _____ *lack of NGO participation in key decisions*
- _____ *lack of transparency in grant/contract process*
- _____ *inattentiveness on the part of government*
- _____ *other (please specify)*

Fifteen organizations (54 percent) reported no challenges in their relationship with the federal government. One organization commented that they have had “quite effective working relationships.”

Of the remaining 13 survey respondents (46 percent) who said they had experienced some difficulties, four selected only one problem area. Many who checked off more than one problem area did not rank their choices. The most commonly reported challenge was the first one listed on the survey - *micromanagement*, followed (in the same order as listed above) by *lack of NGO*

participation in key decisions, lack of transparency in grant/contract process, and inattentiveness on the part of government.

Seven survey respondents (25 percent) checked *other* only; several of these cited specific funding issues, such as “insecure or inconsistent funding support.” One organization said one of their challenges was that they had received “no increase in funding” from the federal government in the nine years of their program participation.

Aspects of policy and decision making were also noted as obstacles: Respondents cited “burdensome” application and reporting requirements; “delays in contract decisions”; and “delays in processing grant proposals.” One organization wrote that “interpreting the government regulations in programs can be difficult.” Problems associated with a “lack of communication of policies and inconsistent, unequal implementation of policy” with “greater decentralization of decisions regarding program policies and procedures” also were reported.

Benefits of Partnerships

Question 8: What are the most positive elements of your relationship with your USG partner(s)? Check as many as apply. Please rank them (i.e., 1 for most important element).

- _____ *collegial relationship*
- _____ *participation in program planning*
- _____ *shared vision for program*
- _____ *transparency in procurement*
- _____ *effective administrative support*
- _____ *other (please specify)*

Again, most organizations failed to rank their selections. In addition, several organizations did not answer this question. However, the most common positive element reported (by 75 percent of respondents) was a *collegial relationship* with their USG sponsors. Sixty-eight percent of organizations selected the benefit *participation in program planning* and 57 percent noted *effective administrative support*. Closely behind at 53 percent was *shared vision for the program*. The least attributed specific element was *transparency in procurement*, chosen by

only 35 percent of the organizations.

Three organizations marked *other* only and included additional comment. Responses varied. One organization stated that the “folk I work with for questions and clarification regarding participant training are extremely helpful and responsive.” Another organization cited that an organization's level of partnership with the federal government is evident when it “helps our Fellows obtain J-1 visas” and, for the third organization, when it “provides IAPs without too much questioning or delay.”

Type of Organization

Question 9: Is your organization organized on a for-profit or nonprofit basis?

Of all the surveys received, only one represented the for-profit corporate sector. Thus, it is important to note that any conclusions drawn from this survey, including benefits, challenges, and best practices of programs, illustrate aspects of USG partnerships with nonprofit entities.

Organizational Mission

Question 10: Is your organization (a) primarily devoted to exchanges and training programs? (b) use exchanges to support a different organizational mission (e.g., environmental protection, medical research)? (c) other – please specify.

Organizations that partner with a USG sponsor have varying missions. For the purposes of this survey, we focused on the three areas above. Private sector organizations were well represented in all of them. Eleven organizations identified themselves as primarily exchanges and training oriented, eight use exchanges and/or training to support a different organizational goal, and seven specified other missions. Although *other* was not always defined, some of the missions listed by organizations included public policy interests, development assistance, and other broader cultural initiatives. One organization did not answer the question.

Direct and Indirect Job Creation as a Result of Programs

Question 11: How many jobs in your organization directly result from

administration of all your exchange/training programs? USG-sponsored programs?

Question 12: How many jobs in your organization indirectly result from administration of all your exchange/training programs? USG-sponsored programs?

From the 26 organizations that provided data, we determined that 1,260 jobs directly resulted from administration of all surveyed organizations' programs, with 416 jobs (one-third) created specifically for their USG-sponsored programs.

Please note that 94 percent (1,176) of the jobs directly resulting from administration of all surveyed organizations' programs and 93 percent (385) of the jobs created specifically for its USG-sponsored programs came from the combined survey data of just four organizations. (The remaining 22 organizations had 6 percent of the jobs for all programs and 7 percent of jobs created for USG programming.)

Two organizations did not answer question 12. Eleven organizations did not report any indirect employment opportunities resulting from the administration of all programs. We determined that 200 jobs were indirectly created as a result of all organizations' programs, with 165 of these positions (83 percent) created indirectly in the administration of USG-sponsored programs. Please note that five organizations had 84 percent of the total positions indirectly linked to the administration of federal programs.

Although based on a small sample, federal partnerships in international exchanges and training led to the creation of 581 positions, representing about half the total positions recorded within the respondent organizations.

Use of Program Volunteers

Question 13: If you use volunteers in the United States, how many volunteers do you have? How many are involved in USG-sponsored programs?

Volunteers play an important role in helping to carry out all exchanges and training programs. A total of 5,551 volunteers assisted the respondent

organizations in carrying out their work, with 5,207 (94 percent) of them engaged in activities that support federally sponsored programs.

Program Travel Expenses

Question 14: How much money (from all sources) does your organization spend annually on travel for all exchange participants? How much for USG-sponsored participants?

Obviously, travel to the United States and other world regions is a crucial aspect of the development and implementation of international exchanges and training programs. Private sector survey respondents reported that funds (from all sources) spent on exchange participants totaled \$12,138,184 for FY 2000. Of those total expenses, 73 percent (\$8,765,870) represented funding for USG-sponsored participants. Of the 18 organizations that reported travel fund information, three-fourths of them listed USG program related-travel funds as comprising more than one-half of their travel fund expenditures.

Insurance Expenses

Question 15: How much money (from all sources) does your organization spend annually on insurance for all exchange and training participants? How much for USG-sponsored participants?

Hand in hand with travel funds, insurance expenses¹ constitute a necessary part of participant exchange and training programs.

In FY 2000, 10 organizations spent a total of \$822,158 (from all sources) on insurance for all exchange and training participants. For USG-sponsored participants, eight organizations spent a total of \$485,515, representing 59 percent of total monies spent on insurance for all exchange and training participants from surveyed organizations.

Identification of Best Practices in Partnership

Question 16: In your exchange partnership with the U.S. Government, are there particularly successful practices that might be emulated by other programs? Please specify.

Question 17: In your nongovernmental exchange partnerships, are there any particularly successful practices that might be emulated by others in government? Please specify.

About half of the respondent organizations believed that some aspect of their federal partnering featured a best practice from which other USG departments and agencies could benefit. In addition, several respondent organizations included similar best practice suggestions concerning nongovernmental organizations.

Snapshots of Self-Selected Best Practices of Private Sector-USG Partnerships

In the private sector survey, a number of organizations commented on what they consider to be aspects of best practices emanating from their partnerships with USG and other organizations. The following is a listing of those private sector organizations, which includes a brief description of each entity, a list of their partners/programs, and their comments on best practices:

[Academic and Professional Programs for the Americas \(LASPAU\)](#): LASPAU is a nonprofit organization affiliated with Harvard University and governed by an independent inter-American board of trustees. LASPAU designs and implements academic professional programs tailored to meet the social, political, and economic challenges facing the Americas.

U.S. Government Partners:

- Fulbright Faculty Development Program for Latin America and the Caribbean – Department of State/ECA
- Amazon Basin Scholarship Program – Department of State/ECA
- Caribbean and Central American Ecology Program – Department of State/ECA
- Latin American Binational Fulbright Commissions in Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Brazil, Mexico, Peru, and Uruguay
- Public Affairs Sections of U.S. Embassies in the Caribbean and Venezuela

U.S. Nongovernmental Partners:

- Amazon Basin Scholarship Program – Ford Foundation

Foreign Nongovernmental Partners:

- Many foundations and corporations in the Caribbean and Latin America, such as Air Caribbean, BP Amoco, Arco, Bechtel, Multimedios America, Chevron Latinoamerica, and Fundacion Andes, among others
- Universities in Mexico, Central and South America, and the Caribbean

Foreign Government Partners:

- Various ministries of culture, education, energy, and mining in the Latin American region

Comments from LASPAU: “Cost-share partnerships [with the USG and NGOs] allow for an expansion of access to the Fulbright Program Distance Learning Technology to enhance workshops.”²

"The success of the Faculty Development Program has encouraged other associations between the Fulbright Program and LASPAU, including the Central American Program of Undergraduate Scholarships (CAMPUS); the Fulbright-OAS Ecology Initiative; cost-sharing initiatives by Fulbright commissions and Public Affairs offices; and a series of workshops and seminars offered to Fulbright grantees and alumni both in the United States and abroad."

American-Scandinavian Foundation: This publicly supported, nonprofit organization promotes international understanding through educational and cultural exchange activities between the United States and Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden. These activities include the awarding of fellowships and grants to individual students, scholars, professionals, and artists for projects abroad, practical training opportunities in the United States and Scandinavia, cultural programming, public project grants, training and publishing of the *Scandinavian Review*.

U.S. Government Partners

- Department of State/ECA

Foreign Government Partners:

- [International Employment Office](#), Arbetsformedlingen Utland, Boras, Sweden
- [Centre for International Mobility \(CIMO\)](#), Helsinki, Finland

Foreign Nongovernmental Partners:

- [The Denmark-America Foundation](#)
- [The League of Finnish-American Societies](#)
- [The Icelandic-American Society](#)
- [The Norway-America Association](#)

Comments from American-Scandinavian Foundation: “The Exchange Visitor Program is quite special in allowing NGOs the responsibility to sponsor foreign visitors to the U.S. for a variety of objectives. [The Foundation] explains to cooperating offices overseas and to participants that it is truly a unique collaboration and one which we appreciate very much.”

[American Studies Association \(ASA\)](#): The ASA is concerned with American culture; teachers and other professionals whose interests extend beyond their specialty; faculty and students associated with American Studies programs in universities, colleges, and secondary schools; museum directors and librarians interested in all segments of American life; public officials; and educators concerned with the broadest aspects of education.

U.S. Government Partners:

- Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission (in developing thematic project U.S. Dialogues Across the Pacific: Globalization and American Studies – “U.S.-Asian Relations: Politics, Economy, Culture”)

- Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission, U.S. Embassy Tokyo, Department of State/ECA (in developing thematic project Japan-U.S. Dialogues Across the Pacific: Globalization and American Studies – “Transnationalism, Globalism, and American Studies”)

Foreign Nongovernmental Partners:

- The Japanese Association for American Studies (JAAS), University of Tokyo

Comments from American Studies Association: “JAAS delegates to the ASA conference and to other engagements in the United States will receive the support of the ASA in Japan, which has helped to fund the travel of Japanese scholars to the ASA.”

“The president of ASA receives the support of the Department of State and the U.S. Embassy in Tokyo, which have [in collaboration with the JAAS for the past decade] arranged a two or more week speaking tour for the ASA president to coincide with the annual conference of the JAAS.”

“The projects expand both the quality and equality of the decade-old exchange by structuring ways for JAAS delegates to be given speaking, research, and seminar opportunities in the United States equal to what ASA delegates visiting Japan have been given....”

“Since 1990, every one of [the ASA participants] was given such magnificent hospitality by their JAAS hosts overseas that many delegates have remarked afterward that their visit was ‘life changing.’”

CEC International Partners: CEC International builds partnerships across the cultural divide, bringing together citizens of diverse nations. By sponsoring the development of human resources and excellence in the arts, the organization aims to build a stronger union between the people of the former Soviet Union and the United States to the benefit of both sides.

U.S. Government Partners:

- ArtsLink Program - National Endowment for the Arts

U.S. Nongovernmental Partners:

- [Trust for Mutual Understanding](#)
- [Ohio Arts Council](#)
- [The Howard Gilman Foundation](#)
- [Kettering Foundation](#)

Comments from CEC International Partners: “The selection process, programming in the U.S. for foreigners, and U.S. network of resources and hosts” have all been examples of best practices with their USG partnerships.

[Dante B. Fascell North-South Center](#): Working in partnership with the Department of State and with institutions in the United States and the rest of the hemisphere, the nonprofit Center develops policy-relevant research and outreach projects.

U.S. Government Partners:

- Department of State/ECA

Comments from Dante B. Fascell North-South Center: Best practices include “sharing strategic goals, balanced oversight, consistent engagement, and an ongoing dialogue with federal government partner.”

Successful practices with other NGO partnerships include “cost-leveraging on projects, building capacity of foreign institutions, [and] involving partners in program activity.”

[German American Partnership Program \(GAPP\)](#): The main goal of GAPP is to give high school students from the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany an opportunity to interact with one another and, in doing so, to improve fluency in their target language. By opening channels of communication, students gain valuable insight into the way of life of the host country. Moreover, GAAP students experience in a foreign land what they have been learning at home.

U.S. Government Partners:

- Short-term, ongoing secondary school link exchanges – Department of State/ECA
- Semester/Academic year exchanges – Department of State/ECA

U.S. Nongovernmental Partners:

- [Goethe-Institutes \(German Cultural Centers in the United States\)](#)

Foreign Nongovernmental Partners:

- [Goethe-Institut Munich](#)

Foreign Governmental Partners:

- Paedagogischer Austauschdienst, (PAD) (Pedagogical Exchange Service), Bonn, Germany

Comments from German American Partnership Program: “The most notable practice is [USG] support of diversity.”

[Iowa Resource for International Service, Inc. \(IRIS\)](#): IRIS utilizes rural Iowa as an educational resource for international professionals and helps Iowans increase their global awareness. IRIS conducts both study tour and internship exchange programs for professionals from many countries.

U.S. Government Partners:

- Community Connections Program – Department of State/ECA
- Great Lakes Reconciliation Project – Department of State/ECA
- Partners in Education – Department of State/ECA

U.S. Nongovernmental Partners:

- [Sister Cities Operation](#)
- [Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy](#)

- [IREX](#)
- [ACTR-ACCELS](#)

Comments from IRIS: “A USG partnership helps to carry out the programs as well as administration of them.”

[Mobility International, USA \(MIUSA\)](#): MIUSA is a nonprofit organization that provides short-term international educational exchange and leadership development opportunities for people with and without disabilities. In addition, MIUSA has developed several publications and videos on international exchange, people with disabilities, and leadership development.

U.S. Government Partners:

- National Clearinghouse on Disability and Exchange – Department of State/ECA
- International Leadership Exchange for Women with Disabilities – Department of State/ECA
- U.S.-Vietnam Disability Professional Exchange – Department of State/ECA

Comments from Mobility International, USA: The “inclusion of people with disabilities in all programs, staff and volunteers” has been an important element of USG and NGO partnerships.

[National Council for Eurasian and Eastern European Research](#): This organization is the largest provider of support for American scholars seeking to undertake postdoctoral research in the humanities and social sciences in countries of the former Soviet Union (known as Eurasia) and in Central Eastern Europe (CEE). Grants are provided for collaborative research with scholars from Eurasia and CEE, field research projects for Americans in the region, and field research projects for Eurasian scholars in the United States.

U.S. Government Partners:

- Title VIII Program - Department of State/Bureau of Intelligence

and Research (INR)

- Regional Scholars Exchange Program – Department of State/ECA
- Collaborative Research Program – National Endowment for the Humanities

U.S. Nongovernmental Partners:

- [ACTR-ACCELS](#)

Foreign Nongovernmental Partners:

- Higher education institutions and academic centers in Eurasia and Eastern Europe

Foreign Government Partners:

- Ministries of education, science, and culture in Eurasia and Eastern Europe

Comments from National Council for Eurasian and Eastern European Research: USG partnerships have provided “strong commitment to transparency and careful consideration of proposals.”

Nongovernmental partnerships represent “strong mutual commitment to programmatic missions and transparency in staff relationships, budgets, and the preparation of proposals.”

[National Research Council \(NRC\)](#): A nonprofit agency of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering, NRC provides services to the government, the public, and the scientific and engineering communities.

U.S. Government Partners:

- Collaboration in Basic Science - National Science Foundation
- Twinning Program - National Science Foundation

Comments from National Research Council: “We find it very useful to contact past participants about one year after their visits to obtain information about results (publications, grants, etc.). This helps to document program impact.”

Social Science Research Council (SSRC): The SSRC is an independent, nonprofit organization composed of social and behavioral scientists and humanists from all over the world. The SSRC encourages scholars in different disciplines to work together on topical, conceptual, and methodological issues that can benefit from interdisciplinary and international collaboration.

U.S. Government Partners:

- Soviet-Eastern European Research and Training Grant – Department of State/INR
- UMERTA Postdoctoral Program – Department of State/ECA
- Predoctoral Graduate Research Program – Department of State/ECA
- Predoctoral Research Program – Department of State/ECA
- Advanced Grants for Research on Japan – Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission

Comments from the Social Science Research Council: Characteristics of successful practices for SSRC with USG partnerships include “open dialogue [and] interlocking consultation with scholars/leaders in oversight positions.”

World Learning, Inc.: World Learning is an international educational services and development organization whose programs enable participants - individuals and institutions – to develop the leadership capabilities and cross-cultural competence needed to function effectively in the global arena. Through its projects division, World Learning is a private voluntary organization administering social and economic development activities under U.S. Government and international contracts.

U.S. Government Partners:

- Global Training in Development Projects – USAID
- In-Service/Pre-Service Training – Peace Corps

Comments from World Learning: Projects in International Development and Training: “[We have] a complete team approach to program management – we all have a vested interest in having successful and efficient programs.”

¹See [J Visa Insurance Requirements](#). These regulations set forth standards to which both public and private entities must adhere to be “designated” as exchange sponsor organizations. There are set minimum standards for insurance coverage required for all J visa holders. The required levels of coverage are \$50,000 per accident or illness, \$7,500 coverage for the repatriation of remains, and \$10,000 coverage for medical evacuation. A nongovernmental sponsor may elect to self-insure or to accept full financial responsibility for the above requirements, but could do so only with the Agency’s permission. Insurance coverage is required during the period of time that an exchange visitor is expected to actively participate in the sponsor’s exchange visitor program, as indicated by the begin and end dates shown on the IAP-66 Form.

²See Chapter V, “Distance Learning,” IAWG *FY 2000 Annual Report*.