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INTRODUCTION

Much of the core mission of the Committee on Practicing, Applied and Public Interest Anthropology (CoPAPIA) centers on strengthening the relationships between non-academic based anthropologists and the AAA, as well as improving training for students who will be working outside of the academy. To this end, CoPAPIA has conducted several studies and led roundtables and session discussions at the AAA’s annual meetings to generate recommendations for improving student training. Much of the feedback we received has focused on the need for students to learn from practitioners who are not primarily university based. There is recognition of the unique set of skills that practitioners of anthropology bring as well as the increasing need for students and the faculty who train future generations of anthropologists to hear their perspectives. While the incentive for students as well as faculty is very clear, the incentives for practicing anthropologists to participate in such discussions are less obvious. This observation was the starting point for CoPAPIA’s study of the nature of relationships between anthropological practitioners and academic departments. The goals of this study included:

1. To flesh out the range of current relationships between practicing anthropologists and academic units.
2. To identify the advantages and disadvantages of such partnerships.
3. To discover existing models of compensation and exchange.
4. To develop recommendations for improving practitioner-department relationships and offer information on models of compensation.

This project comprised two stages. Stage 1, which is the focus of this report, involved conducting interviews with practitioners. If CoPAPIA chooses to do Stage 2, it will focus on interviews with anthropologists located at academic institutions and their perceptions of the relationships they have with practicing anthropologists. The dataset we possess only allows for us to reflect on Goals 1, 3 and 4 of the broader study. To fully address Goal 2, we would need to hear perspectives from academic side of partnerships regarding perceived advantages and disadvantages. This report only includes the perspectives of practitioners.

The purpose of this brief report is threefold: (1) to share the findings of this small study with AAA membership; (2) to guide CoPAPIA in its decision on moving forward with the second set of
partnership interviews (exploring the academic side); and (3) to suggest some courses of action for the AAA to consider to improve practicing-academic relationships.

METHODS

The survey instrument was developed by a subcommittee in May 2013, tested in June, and then revised based on feedback from the test group. Interview topics included: understanding the kinds of work practitioners do for academic departments; the forms of compensation they receive; and the motivations and drawbacks of engaging with academic departments. Interviewees were also asked to identify the names of institutions and departments that they worked with; this information was promised to be kept confidential. The research team anticipated attempting to include identified departments in Stage 2 of the project.

Participants were recruited through various media, including the AAA website and Facebook page, listservs such as “Anthro-Design” and “E-ANTH” as well as various forums on LinkedIn, alumni lists available through the Consortium for Practicing and Applied Anthropology Programs (COPAA) and Local Practitioner Organizations, and through a direct e-mail to +/- 7000 anthropologists who are listed as practitioners on the AAA’s mailing list. Recruitment began in June 2013 and lasted through the end of December 2013. Those who replied to the initial call received a follow up message with further information on the study. This second e-mail contained information on the types of questions, as well as a statement that some of the questions might be sensitive and personal, since specific names of institutions and departments would be asked during the interview.

The research team received 79 initial responses. Once respondents received a follow-up communication, the participant pool dropped to 26. Seventeen (17) people did not qualify to participate (i.e., they were employed in full-time tenure stream positions within academic departments) and 48 people stopped communicating after they received the follow-up email, despite a reminder message. Twenty-six interviews were conducted over the course of 2013, or 27.8% of the initial responses. Seven interviews were removed from the study after it became clear that they also did not fit the profile (i.e., were employed in tenure-stream positions). All interviews were held over the phone from June-October 2013. The research team continued recruitment efforts through the end of the year, but did not receive any additional participation.

A total of 17 interviews were transcribed for analysis. Interviews were analyzed with the support of a research assistant from the University of Memphis. Respondent experiences were analyzed for distinctions by type of department (anthropology or otherwise), by degree program (PhD, MA, BA, Associate), whether a department was a member of COPAA, by career status of respondent (i.e., years since highest degree), and whether the respondent was an alum of the program with which they are affiliated.

SAMPLE

A total of seventeen individuals were interviewed, 14 of whom were women and 3 were men. The majority (82%) of respondents held PhDs (n=14); 3 held MA degrees (18%). Participants ranged significantly in the amount of years since attaining their highest degree, from 3 to 40 years. The average time out was 15.3 years and the medium was 11.5 years.
The majority of respondents (n=9) were employed in full-time research or administrative positions in major national health institutes, finance or technology companies. A handful (n=4) worked for owned ethnographic consulting firms. Two (n=2) individuals worked full time in social services delivery or nonprofit social science research, and two (n=2) individuals worked as adjunct or visiting scholars.

We asked respondents whether or not they sought academic employment after receiving their highest degrees. Of the 15 responses we received to this question, 11 individuals (65%) did seek academic employment, 3 did not, and 1 was still pursuing a doctorate at the time of our interview. Two of those who sought academic employment received a job offer. Two of the 15 respondents who held doctorate degrees were looking for academic employment at the time of the interview; 13 were not.

**TYPES OF RELATIONSHIPS**

Of the seventeen individuals were interviewed, 16 had relationships to academic departments. These 16 respondents were associated with a total of 33 departments. This does not mean that respondents each identified 2 departments; rather, the high number of total departments is due to the fact that a handful of respondents identified with 4-6 distinct units.

Respondents were linked to a wide range of academic units, including business and law schools, food and agriculture institutes, public health, computer science, and anthropology departments. There was also variation in highest degree offered by collaborating academic units. Of the 33 departments, 17 were PhD-granting departments, 6 had MA programs, 5 only offered BA degrees, and 5 offered Associate degrees (community colleges). Twenty-one were anthropology departments and 12 were of another discipline (e.g., business school, engineering, medical school). The majority of respondents (n=14) were affiliated with at least one PhD program. Five respondents were affiliated with an MA program, 4 respondents with a BA program, and 2 respondents with a community college.

Of the 21 anthropology departments represented in our sample, 10 were members of the Consortium for Practicing and Applied Anthropology Programs (COPAA), and according to those we interviewed, these departments were three times more likely than non-COPAA departments to initiate contact with practicing anthropologists.
The below grid reflects the types of positions and ties that our sample held, followed by some brief observations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Off-Campus Researchers (F/T employed)</th>
<th>Visiting Lecturer or Adjunct</th>
<th>Guest Lecturer</th>
<th>Student Supervisory Committees or advising</th>
<th>Research Collaborators</th>
<th>Peer Counsellors</th>
<th>Supervise interns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Visiting Scholar titles at Private universities</td>
<td>✓ Large range of universities; usually offer travel and honorarium</td>
<td>✓ Largely unpaid committee work at private universities</td>
<td>✓ Large range of institutions represented</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ These respondents hire interns from a large range of institutions (from ivy to public institutions)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Off-Campus Admin or Advocacy (F/T employed)</th>
<th>Visiting Lecturer or Adjunct</th>
<th>Guest Lecturer</th>
<th>Student Supervisory Committees or advising</th>
<th>Research Collaborators</th>
<th>Peer Counsellors</th>
<th>Supervise interns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Public universities; unpaid service</td>
<td>✓ Public universities; unpaid service</td>
<td>✓ Range of institutions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ These respondents hire interns from a large range of institutions (from elite to public institutions)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Consultants</th>
<th>Visiting Lecturer or Adjunct</th>
<th>Guest Lecturer</th>
<th>Student Supervisory Committees or advising</th>
<th>Research Collaborators</th>
<th>Peer Counsellors</th>
<th>Supervise interns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Only big state schools mentioned; lecturers not paid</td>
<td>✓ Only big state schools mentioned</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Respondents maintaining relationships with their alma mater for continuing mentoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Un- and under-employed</th>
<th>Visiting Lecturer or Adjunct</th>
<th>Guest Lecturer</th>
<th>Student Supervisory Committees or advising</th>
<th>Research Collaborators</th>
<th>Peer Counsellors</th>
<th>Supervise interns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Private and state schools</td>
<td>✓ Private and state institutions, unpaid service</td>
<td>✓ Unionized state school provides pay for this service</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Research Partnerships:** Of the 16 respondents, 11 had held a research partnership with an academic unit at some point over the course of their careers; less than half (n=4) received pay for their research with academic units. The types of academic units with which anthropologists partner for research are quite variable, and include Ivy League and public institutions. Most (9 of 11) of the individuals who had research partnerships did so with departments that housed doctoral programs. Only anthropologists employed in full-time research or administrative positions reported holding research collaborations with departments.
• **Adjunct Position:** Five (of 16) respondents held adjunct appointments at some point during the course of their careers. Adjunct teaching was spread across degree programs, with individuals teaching in departments with PhD programs, MA programs, BA programs, and at community colleges.

• **Supervision of Interns:** Half of our respondents (n=8) have supervised, or currently supervise, interns. Only 1 of the 8 individuals was paid for this service. Much more commonly, the practitioner is paying out through the hire of interns from an academic program.

• **Graduate Committee Service:** Six of the 16 respondents have served on graduate committees; five of the 6 served on PhD committees. Two of these individuals were paid for their service. Unionized institutions provide pay.

• **Guest Lecturing:** Eleven of 16 respondents give guest lectures for academic units. Just one of these 11 individuals was paid for lecturing, although most universities offered travel and honorarium for established anthropologists to speak (which several declined). Nine of 11 lectured for departments with PhD programs.

• **Departmental Decision-Making:** Two of the 16 respondents are or have been involved in departmental decision-making at some point. Both reported that they were involved because they wanted to be involved. Most respondents did not have an interest in being involved in departmental decision-making.

• **Health Insurance:** Three respondents received health insurance from universities; none of these institutions were members of COPAA.

• **Other Relationships:** Our respondents reported that they dedicate a good deal of their time to mentoring students. This takes many forms including helping students to design research projects, providing career counselling and advice, or providing volunteer opportunities with local non-profits. All of this service is unpaid.

**COMPENSATION AND THE COSTS AND BENEFITS OF PRACTITIONER DEPARTMENT RELATIONSHIPS**

Of the 15 individuals who shared perspectives on whether or not they were adequately compensated for their work with academic departments, 8 felt they were, 5 reported they were not, and 2 provided mixed reviews.

Those who felt they were adequately compensated employed a broader definition of compensation than an exchange of money for services. As one respondent shared, “The relationship is far more reciprocal than a paycheck and some work.” Some felt there was no need for financial compensation because their relationships were of an informal or volunteer nature. Others stated that they would not want to be financially compensated because they feel the services they provide for the department are met in value by what they get in return (e.g., intellectual exchanges and research partnerships with colleagues and friends, student labor,
access to library services). One respondent noted, “I recognize that other people who don’t have a full time salaried position would depend on this compensation for their, to meet their household needs. But I have always been in the fortunate position of having this full time job and so the money was just an extra bonus.” And in fact, this person shared “I would have done it for free if they would have paid for my parking.” Significantly, those who felt they were adequately compensated were not reliant on the income (if any) that they received from academic institutions. These individuals had full-time practicing careers with stable salaries.

Five respondents felt that they were not adequately compensated for the services they provide to academic departments. Notably, based on their responses, all of these respondents appear to have employed a narrow definition of compensation (i.e., monetary exchange). Further, the respondents in this category appear to be more financially reliant on their university relationships for making ends meet.

Despite the small sample size, we are still able to reflect on career statuses that may make practitioners more vulnerable and dependent on income from academic departments. These include retirees who remain engaged with the discipline and departments, adjunct instructors, and early career professionals.

**Themes Related to Compensation**

Analysis of the interviews revealed the following important issues related to the amount of financial compensation received; we illustrate these with selective quotes.

1. **Pay Remains Stagnant:** One person in our sample has been engaged for decades as an in-residence scholar. This comes with a set of benefits, but the financial compensation is minimal. In the past, when the individual was employed full-time elsewhere, the amount of financial compensation was not important. However, as this person’s income declined, compensation became a more critical issue.

   “Financially it has become really burdensome because I don’t have the same income as I had ten years ago, and I would like to have more income and the income does not grow at all. In fact, at one point a few years ago I raised the issue and had looked up my files, and in twenty years my income had grown $120. . . . it was after that that I began to be paid actually $180 a month for my extra activities as an in-residence appointee.”

2. **Undervalued Teaching or Other Work:** Respondents were mixed regarding the kind of work they felt should be paid. Some reported that they did not mind teaching full classes for free, while others desired a stipend (even if at a discounted rate) for guest lectures. Respondents generally felt that adjunct pay was too low, and some stated they would not agree to teach a course again because the pay they received ($3000 total) was inadequate.

   “There is a lot of prep work and I was compensated just a little bit over 3000 dollars for the course. And I found that... I mean I was obviously teaching the course to benefit myself which was why I decided to do it, but I would not do that again unless it would be a direct benefit to me because the payment is so low.”
The one respondent who reported that their adjunct pay was sufficient in terms of being “a livelihood,” was still hesitant to state it was fair compensation.

“I don’t like complaining about my [income] because like I said I could be making less, and I also have some global perspective which means I am of the most privileged people on the planet, but given my degree and my intelligence and my experience I don’t think I am appropriately compensated. If I had not gone to graduate school and I’d stayed with the federal government, I would be making probably 3 to 4 times what I am making now… I make less than what I made with my Bachelor’s degree. But at the same time, again, I definitely recognize that I have benefits, there is, I have a lot of flexibility and I could be making less.”

While the above individual was grateful for her position, she felt a high level of instability, reporting that often, things fall together at the very last minute. Further, she worries about the long-term security of her job, expressing concern that age discrimination will mean she is offered less teaching opportunities into the future, further threatening her ability to eventually retire.

Finally, there is a question of whether or not universities recognize classes co-taught by non-university employees. The one individual we spoke to who co-taught stated that there was no official record of her co-teaching. Such documentation would have been beneficial and allowed her to list the experience on her resume and be recognized within her own place of employment for this service to the discipline.

While this next individual reported that they did not mind teaching for little to no financial compensation, they were not pleased with requests for research support without fair compensation. For instance,

“... things like reviewing grants and helping with that, I do not expect to get paid for... you know... read someone’s grant and give them suggestions. But it would be nice if colleagues saw a greater role for me in the work that they are doing, and [how] I have provided assistance in some various levels of research at different times. For example, there was one colleague at the universities who wanted me to review a grant proposal and wanted to include me in the grant proposal, you know, wanted to put my name on it, that I was part of the project. And they wanted to include like $1000, in in a humongous grant that is over a million dollars, and wanted to include $1000 for me to do this huge amount of work... and that was probably the first time, at least in a few years, where I just said no (laughs) that's ridiculous to want me to do all these things, and want me to compensate me with this small amount of money that is not really adequate from what you are expecting of me. ...I am not sure what it is but people do not seem to see the value of...of these types of things I have been mentioning; logistics, introductions, and things like that.”

When asked what adequate compensation would look like, this person replied, “Including myself or people like myself in their grant as an actual core investigator at whatever rate that I am getting paid at my organization or that other core investigators are getting paid.”

3. **Practitioners Paid Less Than Academics:** One person reported that they were not compensated despite providing the same types of services as two other colleagues working in the same position in the department. The distinction was that this individual worked throughout her life in practice, while the other two had past experience in academia.
“I found that . . . the other two [similar appointees] had already been receiving payment but I did not, because I did not have an academic background. And despite the fact that I had published more and I had an extra degree that no one else had - in other words two Master's degrees and a doctorate - I was the only one that was not paid. And I think that was very discriminatory.”

While we heard of this only once in our interviews, we are concerned it may be more widespread as we learned that other established practicing anthropologists faced the same discriminatory practices from participants in a 2014 SfAA roundtable discussion dedicated to this broader study.

4. **Unequal Exchange (University benefits more):** Even respondents who are comfortable with the level of compensation that they receive expressed a concern that the exchange was unbalanced. For instance, “I am adequately compensated given my interest, but I do not think I am adequately compensated. I certainly think what I provide them is far more than what they provide me.”

5. **Limiting Employment Opportunities for Other Job-Seekers:** When practicing anthropologists with established careers beyond the academy are brought in to teach or provide other services to departments for free or for a discounted rate, this removes opportunities for paid work for unemployed or underemployed anthropologists.

   “I am concerned that I would be taking that teaching position that should, would otherwise be open to somebody else who would be compensated. So, it does concern me that I am occupying a slot, that that should be a paid job for somebody else. That is one of the reasons why I haven’t been doing more when it comes to teaching.”

**Themes Related to Other Benefits**

The above discussion suggests that there is more to practitioner-department relationships than an exchange of service for pay. Our sample suggests four main non-monetary ways in which practicing anthropologists benefit from relationships with academic units: (1) staying current on the discipline; (2) library access; (3) access to and training of students; (4) partnering with a close colleague. Respondents also felt that the last two were mutually beneficial, since departmental collaborations with practitioners resulted in student exposure to practicing anthropology and expanded research networks.

1. **Staying Current:** Several respondents described their partnerships as beneficial because they are intellectually stimulating, and they felt that partnering with academic institutions helps them to “stay current” on developments in the field. For instance, these two individuals stated:

   “...Having a relationship with them definitely keeps me on my toes and keeps me thinking, when we are talking about the theory...”

   “...for me in very personal terms, it provides me... a chance to think through the kind of work that I am doing, from a standpoint, you know, from a kind of longer lasting standpoint - than the day job affords. You know, more deeply, what is the impact, what is the significance,
where does it fit in broader histories of anthropological theory and practice. So that is a benefit that it provides the different outlets for intellectual creative work."

2. **Library Access**: Library access is of central importance. Some of our respondents reported having library access, while others have developed relationships where they feel comfortable asking someone in the department to find an article for them. Those who do not have library access desire it, as does this respondent:

   "Nope. I would love it if I did [had library access]! Because working in corporate I am very restricted on library access. . . . that was one of the reasons I asked about having an adjunct status at the [names a university]. (laughs) [I was] figuring that that might give me creds to like log in to their systems."

3. **Access to Students**: Students are a central reason for why full-time practitioners maintain relationships with academic units. Some even use these partnerships as a way to scout bright students who could intern or work for their companies. The following quotes are illustrative:

   "I work in a corporate R&D which means I work around technologists. I am a one-woman show as far as the supply in anthropology goes, so working with the university is a great way to get more research done."

   ".. at the end of the semester, when students are presenting their practicums ... they invite people to watch live, and I have done it a couple of times, with the intention of, not only learning about what students are doing, because it’s always great to see nice research – no matter what the field is – but it’s also now that I am working in with this consultancy group who, you know, it’s all ethnographers, it’s kind of always hunting for somebody who can keep up with what we are doing...”

   Respondents also reported that they believed departments liked being able to place their students with a company or nonprofit, giving the students a practical experience and increasing students’ networks. Respondents also recognized the value of these placements as providing mentorship and advising for students from the perspective of a fully employed, non-academic based practicing anthropologist.

4. **Research Partnerships**: Respondents enjoy partnering with colleagues who are based in academic departments. The research partnerships that our sample reported appear to have been driven by individuals, not departments at large. While the development of these partnerships may be individually motivated, academic departments also benefit through the discovery of new knowledge being produced in the world of practice, as well as by extending their networks and research access in the broader community.

   Practitioner respondents stated that in addition to simply enjoying the opportunity to collaborate with specific colleagues who are based in the academy, university partnerships increase their research capabilities.
PREPARATION OF STUDENTS

We asked respondents to share their thoughts on whether or not the departments they work with equip their students well for employment outside of academia. In large part our sample did not feel students were well-prepared. This lack of preparedness was sometimes credited to the lack of experience with or knowledge of practicing careers among faculty, who end up preparing their students for the career path with which they are familiar (academia). However, some programs were specifically mentioned by name as doing very good jobs in preparing their students. All of those mentioned were COPAA member departments.

Some respondents felt that while anthropology departments did a good job of training students in anthropological theory and methods, they were not sure that this training was being translated into jobs. Recommendations to improve training included increasing internship opportunities to give students real world experience or, more frequently, providing classes that teach students to market their skills, how to function in a company, prepare a resume, and to deal with ethical dilemmas that they are likely to face once they begin practicing anthropology.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Given the very low response rate, we are hesitant to draw any conclusions from this study. We speculate that the low response rate, despite intensive advertising, could reflect weak ties between the AAA and practitioners. It is also possible that there is simply a very low percentage of practitioners who have relationships with academic departments. However, it is also quite possible that full-time employed practitioners are less able to dedicate their time to participate in in-depth interviews.

Despite the low participation, we did generate some interesting and important data that speaks to the range of relationships practicing anthropologists maintain with academic units, and the value that they find in those partnerships. At the start of this study we hypothesized that the compensation offered and the stability of the relationships may depend on the type of academic unit. This appears to be true, with elite and Ivy League institutions able to offer financial incentives above what public institutions can provide. Public universities that are unionized may be more likely to provide financial incentives. While there appears to be some support for our initial hypothesis, we also learned that personal relationships play a tremendous role in the reasons for collaboration. Research relationships are developed between colleagues who share similar interests, and practitioners may be more likely to provide guest lecture services or host interns for the home departments where their academic friends are employed or for their alma maters.

While we cannot draw any finite conclusions from this study, we do have a series of recommendations that emerged from the interviews. We asked respondents to provide us with suggestions for ways the AAA could help improve and support practitioner/academic relationships. Recommendations clustered into four categories: (1) recommendations to promote practice within the AAA; (2) recommendations to increase the visibility of practicing anthropology within the public realm; (3) support to academic units; and, (4) tools for individuals. The following are suggestions provided by the members of our sample.
Promoting Practicing Careers within the AAA

1. Promoting Practicing Careers: The AAA should continue to improve publicity of practicing work through showcasing career stories and research (e.g., Webinars) and facilitating job listings beyond the academic market.

2. Increase Sessions and Activities Focused on Practice at Annual Meetings: While some note a recent improvement, several respondents still felt the AAA meetings were not very welcoming of practitioners and suggest continued work to increase sessions with an applied emphasis.

3. Enhance Social Networking Opportunities: Respondents appreciate existing networks and would like even more online networking opportunities where new practitioners can engage their peers as well as more experienced practicing anthropologists. Doing so keeps practitioners from de-identifying with the discipline.

4. Transform AAA Leadership: All sections and committees should be required to include a mixture of practitioners and academics among their leadership.

Promoting Practice to the Public

5. Sponsor a Congressional Fellow: The presence of an anthropologist working as a legislative expert in Congress would increase the visibility of our discipline.

6. Create a Popular Magazine: Creating a popular magazine would bring the relevance of the work that anthropologists do to the public interest.

Support to Academic Units

7. Help Academic Units with Community and Alumni Relationships: Provide support for academic departments to engage their alumni networks and guidance on how to establish relationships and partnerships with surrounding communities.

8. Encourage Departments to Hire Practitioners: Faculty with experience as practitioners enhance the training of the next generation of practicing anthropologists. One respondent suggested that the AAA might conduct a survey to discover the percentage of faculty who come from a practicing background. This information might be captured in the upcoming AAA Survey of Departments.

Tools and Resources for Anthropologists

9. Provide Support of Adjuncts: Facilitate communication between departments and adjuncts, as well as provide advocacy support to improve the position of contingent laborers.

10. Expand Anthrosource Beyond Anthropology: Practitioners need access to journals in cognate fields, such as economics or business. The AAA might explore the possibility of reciprocal sharing with other professional organizations.
11. **Create Guidelines for Adequate Compensation:** Recent graduates who intend to work in practice often do not have a clear sense of what they should expect in terms of compensation for their work. This is especially true for those who are trained in departments that focus on academic careers. One respondent suggested the creation of salary range document that specifics employment type, years of experience, and geographic location. Such a document could also include average consulting rates.

The authors are aware that several of the above recommendations are already underway or fall best under the mandate of other committees and sections. CoPAPIA might consider taking on recommendation #7, possibly in collaboration with COPAA and recommendation #11, possibility in collaboration with NAPA or the AAA Career Center. The committee might also consider the following as next steps:

- Generate a short survey that could be answered in less than 5 minutes to assess the prevalence of practitioners working with academic institutions, and types of relationships.
- Conduct a short survey with academic units (Department or Program Chairs) to assess the frequency of, and rationale for, practitioner partnerships.
- Conduct a series of short ‘how-to’ interviews with departments known to be successful in collaborating with communities or alumni (Recommendation #7) and post a “tip-sheet” online for academic units and/or host a workshop at the annual meetings.
- Interview the partnering departments identified in Stage 1 interviews for their perspectives on the value of relationships with practicing anthropologists (initial Stage 2 plan for this project; see introduction for details).

Finally, we learned during our interviews that some people are not aware of several programs and services that the AAA already provides (e.g., health insurance, journal access, webinars). We recommend CoPAPIA work with relevant committees and sections to better publicize programming and services.