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Membership:

Provide the most recent membership numbers.
Number of Members: 437

List any factors you think may be increasing or decreasing your Section membership.

Factors affecting Membership:

The numbers are down due to several factors the most important of which is the missing data provided by AAA due to a change in the AAA reporting process and the death of Richard Thomas. We learned that all sections are having the same membership data issues.

This chart shows the membership trends from July 2012 – October 2014. Note the missing data from March 2014 – August 2014. Because of this missing data, it appears that there is has been a steady downward trend in membership. However, we are unable to determine from these missing data if there were small spikes or increases in membership around the time of SfAAAs 2014, for example.

The trend from June 2012 to Oct. 2014 has been variable ranging from a high of 545 in April of 2013 to a current low of 437. In 2010, the November membership numbers were 545, and in 2011 we had 496 members in December and in April 2012 we had a yearly high of 534. but our average has been steady in the low 500’s and upper 400’s for the last several years. Membership numbers rose in 2010 due in part to a large influx from new members through the NAPA Occupational Therapy Field School which required its members and students to join NAPA prior to participating. This generated about 25 members, but in 2011 and in 2012 they had about half as many students.

In spite of an intensive campaign to reach out to practitioners, especially students, including a well-advertised networking event at the AAA meetings, a membership directory (in 2010), a Facebook page and other attempts, membership has fallen, from its historic high. A new member Welcome Letter was also created including benefits, areas of interest and likes to
the NAPA website and social media. A task force was created to look into the membership issue.

In addition, I think there are other factors at work, including the fact that there are a number of other sections that have applied anthropology colleagues in them, e.g., SMA and A&E and the fact that the current populations of students are not “joiners”. There is evidence on campus that students are not joining as many outside activities as in the past. We feel there is no specific reason for a loss of members. But we have found that some members are not renewing in spite of intensive recruitment efforts.

Despite the welcome atmosphere that the AAA leadership has made towards practicing members, there is still much reticence to overcome. We have promoted NAPA as a “home” but this has not made much of a difference. Our challenge is to create something that gets people going, the hiring of a past NAPA President and practicing anthropologist as the Executive Director clearly demonstrates to colleagues inside and outside NAPA that the future of the AAA must include practicing anthropologists.

Still, it is important to emphasize that things may not be as dire as the current data suggests. As we learned at the Section Assembly in Washington DC, these data may be under-reported. It was recommended that we wait until the Spring for updated data before our final analysis. In the meantime, our task force on membership is in the process of planning for improvements in membership numbers and services, regardless.

Finances:

Provide the most recent financial balances for Section budgets (and publication sponsored budgets).

Financial Balance: 130,217.29
Publication Sponsored budgets.
Factors affecting Finances:

- Our revenues continue to increase at a modest rate over our costs somewhat due to the successful enrollment of conferees in our workshops.
- There has been a significant reduction in the EPIC revenue again due to the change in percentage of revenue sharing this year which we felt again this year.
- The OT Field School continues to bring in a surplus, which does show on our bottom line. They are allowed to carry over surplus year to year for development purposes, so these funds are “theirs”.
- The changes underway in AAA publishing, which includes NAPA publications, is likely to increase our costs over time. These changes relate to the shift to digital publishing and away from "print and mail". This year, we put a provisional financial plan in place for AAP. Our costs so far have been modest but the uncertainties in these changes likely mean additional expenditures in the future.
- The NAPA treasurer researched the fiscal issues related to the proposed Lourdes Arizpe Award, with a report sent to the Executive Committee on October 28, 2014.
- The Governing Council has determined that NAPA should develop a strategic plan for its base of financial assets in order to serve the long-term interests of the organization.

3) List the titles of your Section’s AAA meeting invited sessions, co-sponsored

List any factors you think are affecting your Section's finances.

See above.

Sessions:

List the titles of your Section's AAA meeting invited sessions, co-sponsored sessions, and any special events your Section sponsored or in which it participated.

Session Type: Volunteered


Special Events Special Topics and Events 1. Evaluation Interest Group business Meeting Eve. C. Pinsker 2. Ninth annual NAPA/AAA Careers Expo: exploring professional Careers Cathleen E. Crain 3. Sixth Annual National Association for the Practice of Anthropology (NAPA) Networking Event: producing connections through conversations Sabrina Nichelle Scott 4. NAPA/OT Field School Field Officers: Gelya Frank, PhD, Founding Director; Nancie Furgang, MA, OTR/L, Chief Financial Officer; Rachel Hall-Clifford, PhD, MPH, Co-Director The NAPA-OT (National Association for the Practice of Anthropology – Occupational Therapy) Field School Guatemala completed its sixth year working with students during the four-week session in June, 2014. The field school officers are pleased to have a renewed Memorandum of Agreement with NAPA, which provides for ongoing annual renewal. Faculty For the 2014 session, in-country faculty included: Rachel Hall-Clifford, PhD, MPH, as in-country director and representing medical anthropology and public health; Juliana Gutiérrez, OTR/L, MA, representing occupational therapy; Gari Clifford, Ph.D. representing biomedical engineering; and Ryan Lavalle, as field school coordinator and representing occupational therapy. Students The 2014 Field School cohort was comprised of twelve students from universities across the U.S., Canada, and Italy. One student was an anthropology graduate student, and one student was a public health graduate student. Two students were undergraduates in public health. One student was an anthropology graduate planning graduate training in occupational therapy. Six students were graduate students in occupational therapy, and one was a recent graduate in psychology with an occupational therapy minor. Curriculum The field school’s transdisciplinary curriculum focuses on health and occupation as human rights, and students engage with Guatemalan scholars, NGOs, and health care organizations to explore these concepts in the Guatemalan context. Field school faculty provide training in applied and medical anthropology, key principles in occupational science, and basics of public health epidemiology. Students learn about Guatemalan history and culture, the Guatemalan health system, and the impacts of civil war on contemporary life in Guatemala. A weekly guest speaker series brings in Guatemalan scholars who specifically address human rights issues in Guatemala, and a weekly field visit takes students out to see health facilities and organizations first-hand. The core curriculum is further supported by relevant readings selected for each topic. Focused Area Group Projects Three focused area group projects were offered in the 2014 session, through which faculty actively mentored students in the implementation of research and practice methods. The NGO Networks for Health: Primary Care Delivery group, led by Rachel Hall-Clifford, worked with NGO partner Common Hope to investigate the use of their clinical services for
affiliated families and strategies for program improvement. The NGO Networks group has produced white papers on their research, posted at https://sites.google.com/site/napaotfieldschoolguatemala/home/press. The Pediatric Practice: A Sensory Integration Approach to Nutrition, Feeding and Pediatric Development group, led by Juliana Gutiérrez, learned methods used to clinically intervene with children with severe nutritional and developmental delays in a pediatric nutritional recovery unit, focusing on sensory integration, and also examined local beliefs about child developmental milestones. The Sustainable Technology for Community Development: Surgical Referrals group conducted a pilot implementation and suitability study of a cell phone-based application for electronic medical records for short-term surgical missions, building on field school research in 2011 and 2013. This project was conducted in partnership with local NGOs HELPS and Wuku’ Kawoq; publication of this pilot data is forthcoming. Program Evaluation Results The results of our final program evaluation on the final day of the NAPA-OT Field School Guatemala 2014 session were very positive. A few key indicators included (averages of student responses on a 10-point scale, ranking 1 as lowest and 10 as highest): • The NAPA-OT Field School provided a worthwhile learning experience: 9.7 • The field school was appropriately concerned with my safety in Guatemala and offered adequate guidelines and support: 9.6 • During the field school, my understanding of Guatemala’s society, cultures, history, and politics has increased significantly: 9.7 • My understanding and knowledge of health as a human right has grown: 9.5 • My ability to analyze situations in terms of occupational justice has grown: 9.1 • I experienced positive mentorship through the faculty in my focused area group: 9.0 • The field school has had a positive influence on our career goals: 9.3 • I would rate the NAPA-OT Field School as a high-quality experience: 9.6 The field school was able to operate within the projected budget for the 2014 session and generated an additional projected carryover of $4,161.25 for future field school sessions. Workshops 1. Mixed Method Evaluations: Qualitative or Quantitative or What? – Mary Odell Butler 2. Software for Writing and Managing Field notes: FLEXDATA Notebook for PCs - James Tim M Wallace and Julie Green 3. The Ethnographic Field School: How to Organize and Manage One – James Tim Wallace and Julie Green 4. Consulting in Organizational Culture and Change – Elizabeth Briody 5. Market Research: Theory, Methods, Praxis – Maryann McCabe 6. Getting Anthropological Work Published – Mitch Allen 7. The Design Process: Thinking, Tools, Methods and Models – Christine Miller 8. What's Your Elevator Pitch? – Sabrina Nichelle Scott and Elizabeth Briody 9. The Personality of Conflict Resolution: A Professional Development Workshop Presenting a Different Way to Resolving Conflict – Katrina Patterson 10. Working In International Health: Skills For Anthropologists - Laurie Kriege 11. How to Create, Manage, and Sustain a Business in Business Anthropology – Bob Morais 12. Tips and Tools for Success in Job Hunting As a New Professional Anthropologist - Cathleen Crain and Niel Tashima

Awards

List awards presented this year on behalf of your Section.
None

Meetings

Did your section request a meeting registration waiver or community engagement grant?
No
If granted, who/what was it/they used for?
Incomplete

List spring meeting activities
NAPA normally conducts a governing council meeting in the spring, usually at the SfAA meeting. This year (March 2014) we had a meeting at the Spring SfAA meeting in Albuquerque, NM. The Spring meeting included semi-annual reports from GC committee chairs and planning for upcoming activities.

Mentorship:
Mentorship efforts (at or beyond the AAA meetings) to any of the following (e.g., special activities, funding, awards, guidance/advising on professional matters, etc.)
Undergraduate and/or graduate students.
The Mentor Committee took on two key initiatives in 2014: First they offered ongoing feedback between Summer 2014 - Oct. 2014 on the work of the AAA Mentoring Working Group which was convened to define a framework for mentoring useful for the AAA and Sections; describe mentoring activities within the AAA and Sections; and to make recommendations to improve connections, interactions, and information sharing among anthropologists and anthropologists in training through mentoring. Second, members of the NAPA Mentor Committed worked with the Univ. of North Texas to test an evaluation protocol that can be used to evaluate the NAPA Mentor Program.

Highlights for 2014

Note: This report adopts the 2013 report’s format, updating the numbers to reflect the 2014 year. Comparing 2014 with 2013 the numbers show modest growth, and a fairly similar level and distribution of mentoring activity over all.

In 2014 NAPA’s Mentor-Match program reached 112 individuals. The program generated 294 e-mail messages from mentees and 313 replies from myself (Greaves), plus an additional 48 emails involved in setting up mentors other than Greaves, for a total of 655 e-mails (the corresponding e-mail total for 2013 was 537). The program served 6 more mentees in 2014 than in 2013 (112 vs. 106).

The distribution of mentees by level of education was 75% undergraduate and 25% graduate student and practicing professionals. Continuing a familiar pattern, 42% of the 112 did not persist after receiving a reply to their initial inquiry that requested a resume and personal data. The corresponding figure for 2013 was 39%, so the increase in total e-mails (537 to 655) was in part generated by the additional one-time inquirers. In 2014 about 38% engaged in short-term mentoring entailing 2 to 4 exchanges, and 20% continued for 5 to as many as 17 exchanges.
As in previous years, in 2014 Greaves himself handled the mentees who were undergraduates and those graduate students who were in the earlier, general phase of study, a total of 90% of all mentees. Eleven others were practicing professionals (MA and PhD), or masters and PhD graduate students in the later stages of study; these were placed with mentors who could best address their professional goals.

Over all, Mentor-Match correspondence in 2014 slightly increased in volume compared with 2013, the increase partly due to more one-time inquiries that did not continue.

Two important new steps were taken in 2014:

First, Greaves began to experiment with including others to share the load he carries of direct mentoring of (primarily BA-level and undergraduate) mentees. He approached two colleagues who declined, and one, Dr. Elizabeth Briody, who agreed to try it out. To date Dr. Briody has mentored one such mentee on a trial basis.

Second, Prof. Susan Squires of the University of North Texas agreed to supervise a group of NTU masters students in evaluating the Mentor-Match program. More on the evaluation is provided below.

How the Program Works:

Note, the paragraphs in this section are repeated from last year’s annual report.

1. NAPA’s Mentor-Match Program is active and heavily trafficked. Mentor-Match is, so far as we are aware, is the most active and largest anthropology mentoring program serving the anthropology profession. No other program that pairs mentor and mentee for one-on-one counseling, for any branch of anthropology, even comes close.

2. The program’s mentoring relationship is initiated when a visitor to NAPA’s website visits the Careers section and decides to contact Mentor-Match by filling out a brief form and electronically submitting it.

3. The form is received by Tom Greaves, Mentor-Match Coordinator.
4. Greaves responds, introducing himself and usually asking for a resume and other personal information from the mentee helpful in framing the advice. Greaves’ reply is almost always within 24 hours of receipt of the initial form. [2014 note: in one case a mentee was referred to Dr. Briody, as an experiment in sharing this function.]

5. The mentee’s subsequent correspondence continues in inquiry-reply pairs. The reply is almost always within 24 hours of receipt of the inquiry. In the event that a response will be delayed (e.g. when Greaves is traveling), the inquiry is acknowledged quickly with an estimate of when a full reply may be expected.

6. To maintain an efficient, rapid-response program Greaves himself handles the large majority of inquiries (90%) who are students ranging from high school to students enrolled in the first years of graduate study. For the remainder (i.e. practicing professionals with PhDs or MA, graduate students nearing the award of their professional degree and looking ahead to professional employment, and inquiries where the mentee, regardless of degree level, needs specialized professional information) Greaves seeks a mentor with appropriate expertise. This is done by sending an e-mail to NAPA’s leadership group describing the mentee’s need and requesting names of potential mentors. One of these is selected, approached by Greaves, and, when consent to mentor is received, Greaves links up the mentee with the mentor, who handles the mentoring from then on.

7. All mentoring in NAPA’s Mentor-Match program is freshly composed personally to each mentee, although for the initial reply to the form submitted, a few pre-written paragraphs are frequently inserted and then personalized to the inquirer’s situation. The tone in all replies is encouraging and welcoming. Too, in almost all cases the reply contains a recommendation to consult NAPA’s Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs).

Statistics and Patterns, 2014

During the 12-month period Jan. 1, 2014 to Dec. 31st 2014:

- A total of 112 separate individuals participated as mentees. Of them 97 made their
first contact with Mentor-Match during 2014 with the rest continuing from before 2014 began.

- The 112 individuals sent 294 messages (in this report each message from a mentee is termed an “inquiry”) to Mentor Match, eliciting 313 replies from Greaves. (The greater number of replies is mainly due to sending “can’t reply just now because I’m traveling; will reply next week” interim messages.) Thus Mentor Match entailed 607 mentoring messages during 2014, up from 491 in 2013.

- The academic level of the 2014 mentees is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PhD in hand</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-PhD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA in hand</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-MA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BS in hand</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre BA/BS</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre AA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Many mentees (36%) are undergraduates. The volume of mentoring traffic is, not surprisingly, visibly influenced by the college schedule. The peak volume is August-September (planning for the academic year), and especially October-February and March-May (students planning for post-graduation or planning for summer).

- The number of inquiry-reply pairs per individual has this distribution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Thus a large group (N=47, 42%) do not continue after receiving their first reply. (In 2013 the number not continuing after the first exchange was 39%.) My guess is that when they send in their form they typically are curious regarding what mentoring will entail. When they receive, in my reply, my request for a resume, personal information, and the expectation that we will have a continuing, high disclosure, ongoing relationship, this group drops out. Too, now that my initial reply usually points out the FAQ resource, some find NAPA’s FAQs a sufficient avenue.

- A smaller group (N=43, 38%) broke off after 2 to 4 exchanges. It is apparent from the content of their correspondence that they are seeking information rather than mentoring guidance. When they have the information they wanted, they don’t continue, though they are invited to do so.

- The remaining group (N=21; 19%) engages in a mentoring relationship that goes on for at least 5 and up to 17 iterations.

- Occasional inquiries come from outside the U.S.: Canada, Spain, Canary Islands, and India for example.

- Mentor-Match in 2014 entailed an additional 48 messages involved in seeking and arranging mentors other than Greaves for 11 mentees (In 2013 there were also 11). These are practicing professionals with PhD or MA, or advanced graduate students with intended practice areas already defined. Obtaining the mentors is done by sending an e-mail to the NAPA leadership, describing the expertise/experience needed and requesting the names and e-mail addresses of individuals they would recommend.

- From the nominations Greaves researches the mentors for additional details, chooses a close match, and then sends an e-mail to that individual inviting her/him to serve as mentor. If the individual agrees, he then shares with the mentor the vita and past correspondence with the mentee, obtains final consent to proceed, and then set up the mentoring relationship between the two, stating the ground rules for the mentoring process. After confirmation that the mentor-mentee relationship is underway, Greaves has no further involvement.
As Coordinator I heartily thank the following colleagues for undertaking the mentoring of one or more of these advanced students or early-stage professionals in 2014: Kelly Alleen-Williams, Cathleen Crain, Elizabeth Briody, Ken Erickson, Donna Keren, Robert Morais, Susan Squires, and David Stephenson. I thank NAPA’s leadership group for responding to my requests, nominating well-matched mentors for the mentees. Too, I have come to rely on the strong and steadfast support of certain NAPA colleagues without whose help Mentor-Match could not continue to function. To them a very special thanks.

**Principles Guiding NAPA’s Mentor-Match Program**

- Always seek to answer an inquiry within 24 hours.
- In every reply invite further correspondence from the mentee.
- Always encourage the mentee to seek advice from many sources, including ours, and to make his/her own informed choices.
- Because personal information is requested of the mentee reciprocal information on Greaves is provided.
- While some of the wording of Greaves’ comments is largely repeated from one inquirer to another (notably the paragraph on his background and the request to consult the FAQs), most of the content of mentoring replies is unique.
- We do not recommend or discourage particular programs or schools; it is up to the mentee to find her/his best match.

**Evaluation of the Mentor-Match Program**

In 2014 a group of masters students at the University of North Texas, advised and led by former NAPA president Dr. Susan Squires, volunteered to conduct an evaluative study of the Mentor-Match program, reporting to the NAPA Mentoring Committee chaired by Dr. Niel Tashima.

Committee received the results of the study in December, 2014, and is currently discussing the findings and action recommendations. The Committee will report its conclusions to the NAPA Board in 2015.
Speaking for myself (Tom Greaves) I am grateful for the NTU student teams’ hard work and the many insights and useful recommendations the students produced. The project was well done and speaks to the good work which graduate students in our profession are capable of when led by a colleague such as Dr. Squires.

**Early career scholars.**
see above

**Independent scholars.**
see above

**Outreach:**
Additional outreach efforts (at or beyond the AAA meetings) to other sections, interest groups, and scholarly societies, government agencies, public education/community engagement, and underrepresented minorities.

Working with the Medical anthropology section on the Ebola Initiative

Continue with the Evaluation Anthropology Interest Group

Developing a Business Anthropology Interest Group

Continue to work with CoPapia

**Communications:**
Status and use of Section internal communications such as a website, list serve, or newsletter (if applicable): Please list internal communication tools you use and what they are used for.

The NAPA communications committee had many accomplishments in 2014:

Social Media usuership increased:
- Twitter: 5,066 in March; 6,141 now
- Facebook: 200 in March; 1,249 now
- LinkedIn: 3,044 in March; 3,325 now
- Website: 1,736 users in May; 2,030 now

Bi-monthly interview series continued on blog into Sept.

Launched "AnthroCurrents" blog every second Friday

Published two NAPA Notes newsletters

Podcasts downloaded 548 times since spring and have been live streamed 243 times
Governance:
Changes in bylaws or governance structure.
"not applicable"

Initiatives:
What Initiatives does your Section have underway or planned for the coming year: membership, publication annual meeting, mentorship, other?

- Our new NAPA Mentoring Committee has been implementing changes and improvements to our mentoring program. The mentoring committee introduced a set of FAQ. Some aspects of our website were revised to make this happen. The committee taped into COPAA and CoPAPIA to see include questions that hadn’t been mentioned. Next year will be the 25th year for the NAPA Mentoring Program – a celebration will be planned.
- We are in the planning phase of a new award to honor outstanding contributions to the field of practicing anthropology.
- We are working on developing a series of webinars connected to the workshop presentations.
- The editors of the Annals of Anthropological Practice along with the Publications Committee are making progress toward a digital journal that will be a hybrid journal including themed papers along with submitted papers.
- A task force was created to look into the membership issue.
- We have established a partnership with the Society for Medical Anthropology for the development of a Task Force to support and network anthropologists who are responding to the Ebola crisis in West Africa. The goal is to provide a structure to bring anthropologists together working in the field, and to ensure that anthropologists are fully engaged with the work of medical professional, local and national governance, NGOs, and the international aid communities. Our liaison, Peter Van Arsdale has been appointed to the board of this important partnership with SMA.

Ask AAA:
Please tell us what your chief concerns and issues are, especially if they are not previously noted.
What issues would you like raised or recommendations would you like to make to the Section Assembly Executive Committee (SAEC)? Please be specific.
"not applicable"
What issues would you like raised or recommendations would you like to make to the AAA Executive Board? Please be specific.
We continue to be very concerned about how to raise the numbers of members. Targeting graduate students is useful, but not always as valuable as expected. Graduate students do not typically pay membership dues except when they are going to present, and so recent graduates are a more important potential source of membership. Recent graduates need resources (licenses to Atlas.ti, SPSS, to libraries). If they could get access to licenses through their NAPA membership then they would stay a NAPA member. We should promote NAPA as a way to move forward in their careers. NAPA (and the AAA) needs to demonstrate that we provide a real benefit to members.

We are pleased that the AAA Annual meeting will be held at larger venues like convention centers, because the hotels are too crowded and difficult to navigate.

We also want to state that the EB decision to move toward digital publications is a positive move and we will try very hard to comply as soon as possible.

We are concerned that the new format for workshops will not benefit NAPA members since they can rarely come to the meetings early. We are concerned that this will further hurt our membership levels since the NAPA Workshops have been a draw for membership. Workshops are a key issue for our membership.

**What issues would you like raised or recommendations would you like to make to the AAA Staff? Please be specific.**

Request that AAA provide expo hall table space annually for up to 5 sections free of charge on a first come first serve basis.