

**Advancing Faculty Excellence Episode Five: Addressing Faculty Power Imbalances with Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa**

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

Welcome to Advancing Faculty Excellence, a podcast where we at the U of M ADVANCE Program talk about issues facing faculty and what we can do about it. I'm your host Mike Liemohn, a professor at the University of Michigan and an Associate Director of the U of M ADVANCE Program, an office focused on faculty excellence.

**Kelsey Arras:**

And I'm Kelsey Arras, podcast producer and a communications and project specialist at the ADVANCE program. I also project manage the RISE committee.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

So Kelsey?

**Kelsey Arras:**

Yes, Mike.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

We have a special guest for the podcast today.

**Kelsey Arras:**

We absolutely do.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

Today we have Professor Denise Sekaquaptewa, the Director of the University of Michigan's ADVANCE Program. She's also the chair of the RISE Committee and a University Diversity and Social Transformation Professor of Psychology.

**Kelsey Arras:**

It was really nice to have Denise in for this conversation on addressing faculty power imbalances because this overlaps with her area of research and she was able to offer deeper context into the relational dynamics discussed in this episode.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

The specific scenario was this: How to foster respect and inclusion in your unit when you are chairing a search committee and a senior faculty member is forceful about their opinions in a way that is intimidating to the earlier career committee members and shuts down discourse committee members seem uncomfortable. What can you do?

**Kelsey Arras:**

I like that this scenario is talking about faculty search committees. It's such a critical part of faculty life.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

Yes, absolutely. It's one that all faculty are involved with at some point, and one where there is a big decision involved. We hope that you enjoy the episode. Our guest today is Professor Denise Sekaquaptewa, the current Director of the University of Michigan's ADVANCE Program, the current chair of the RISE Committee, and a Professor of Psychology here at the University of Michigan. Denise, welcome to the show.

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

Oh, thanks a lot. I am super excited to be here to talk with you today.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

Yeah. Our topic for this episode is addressing faculty power imbalances. Before we get into the resources and our discussion, Denise, do you have any opening thoughts about this topic?

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

I was really interested in this from my experiences in academia. The situation that we're talking about today is probably more common than many might think because academia is really quite hierarchical. It has a lot of faculty in positions that vary in power. We do have ranks and the tenure track ranks are assistant professor, that's pre-tenure folks, associate professor who are tenured professors, and the highest rank is full professor. And after a full professor, some folks but not all, are bestowed with other honorary titles like Distinguished University Professor and that increases their status as well. Clinical and research faculty also have a similar hierarchical structure, and as in the scenario, this simple seniority can afford people greater status and prestige and power. So if a committee includes people from these varying positions, and most committees do, there are inherent power imbalances that can negatively affect the functioning of the committee as what happens in this scenario. And these power imbalances make it more difficult for those in lower status positions to speak up. And I think this is where a leader can step into intervene, but taking actions really not only limited the committee leader, we all really have potential roles to play.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

We are very hierarchical with our levels that we're at. And it's not like those levels come with suddenly you now have a big staff associated with you unless you become say, a director of something, but just moving up from assistant to associate. There's almost no change in your supervisor role day to day. Your title has changed.

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

Yes, I would agree. So it really is a matter of that label in that title.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

Yeah. One component of this topic is the microaggression. In fact, the additional resources for this climate case study specifically tackle this concept from a number of different angles. The first resource is a review published in American Psychologist by Derald Sue and colleagues from Columbia University. Denise, could you briefly summarize this?

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

So this paper I find is a really interesting review of research on the effects of instances of bias. And it's interesting to me because it takes into account the experiences of everyone present. That is, the target of the bias, the perpetrator of the bias, and also witnesses to the biased interaction. So the focus here is on more subtle bias rather than more blatant forms of prejudice or discrimination such as hate speech for example. And this is because the subtle forms of bias, which are also referred to as microaggressions as we've covered in other episodes, are actually more commonplace and sort of everyday experiences compared to these more explicit and blatant forms of bias. So in this review paper, I really appreciated how they focused on what can be done in the moment when people experience these acts of subtle bias. Often when we find ourselves witnessing behaviors that we see as unfair or unjust or biased, we're often just really surprised in the moment and we don't know what to do or we're afraid of saying anything about it, especially if the person doing the behavior is in a position of power. And that makes this reading really relevant to the scenario that we'll talk about today.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

Another similar resource was published by Kathryn Young and coworkers called Hierarchical Microaggressions in Higher Education and they coded the microaggressions by type with several subcategories within the larger group of microaggressions due to one or both people's hierarchy in the system. By far the largest type of hierarchical microaggression with just over half of the responses, was a valuing or devaluing based on credential. This includes being left out of meetings made to feel unimportant or treating those with different educational or status level differently, worse in the downward direction, but also better in the upward direction, which signals to people that there is a hierarchy.

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

I think that aligns well with the idea of academia having a hierarchical nature. And so people come in with titles that are known to others and therefore they become afforded these assumptions about the level of power that they have.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

The second most common hierarchical microaggression was actions related to role within the system. And so this is like ignoring, excluding, showing surprise at someone's knowledge or interrupting.

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

Oh yeah. Those are classic examples of microaggressions in the microaggression research literature. So in my own work we study those kinds of interactions and find that some groups, perhaps those that are lower in power, often experience instances of assumptions of inferiority. That is people assuming just because of the role they play or the title that they hold that they don't have the level of expertise of others. So people question in subtle ways, question their expertise in the area.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

Yeah, that assumption gets us into trouble. They have a really nice list of actions that supervisors can take to address hierarchical microaggressions. But I'd like to mention another resource for this climate case study that's also highlighted by the Young et al. paper, and that is the Inclusive Excellence Toolkit by Treviño et al. from the University of Denver. This is a lengthy questionnaire for assessment of an academic workplace across a number of different facets, and then they guide you through the formulation of an action plan to address that. I think it's a powerful tool for helping academic units move forward.

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

Seems like a worthy effort to undergo to really learn about your unit.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

The RISE Committee formulates a specific scenario to help focus the discussion of the larger topic. So for today, our scenario is this: How to foster respect and inclusion in your unit when you are chairing a search committee and a senior faculty member is forceful about their opinions in a way that is intimidating to the earlier career committee members and shuts down discourse. Committee members seem uncomfortable, what can you do? That's what we're talking about today. And the RISE Committee also uses Ron Ritchhart's concept of the Eight Levers of Action, adapting them for addressing challenges within group cultural dynamics. So Denise, are you ready to walk through the levers?

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

I am ready, yes.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

Awesome. Okay. We're going to start with a more systemic and policy oriented levers today. Our first lever is environment. Denise, could you define this lever for us?

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

The environment lever really refers to aspects of the physical environment, which can include objects, images, and even the physical location of people. And this can influence how they really experience that environment. This holds for virtual environments as well. We all know many meetings nowadays take place virtually and things like virtual backgrounds and how people present themselves online also influence our experience.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

And do you have an example or two of how this lever could be used to address this scenario?

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

Sure. I can talk about this both regarding in-person committee meetings as well as those that take place virtually.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

Yeah, that's both environment.

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

Yes. So in an in-person meeting, one could really assess the configuration of the furniture in the room as to whether it facilitates equal input from all committee members. So consider that seating arrangement. Is there a clear position of power like the head of the table? And do the senior level people tend to sit there more often than others?

You might think about whether a circle seating arrangement could create a better situation. In my home department, one of our departmental presentation rooms has a configuration that's an inner table with chairs around and then an outer circle of bench seating. It's around the perimeter of the room.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

Mine has that same arrangement. Yeah.

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

So we really fell into that routine of the faculty members sitting in the inner circle and the graduate students sat on the perimeter. Once we recognize that, we purposely acted to mix up the seating. And I think that kind of recognition and taking action could work for committee meetings as well. In a virtual meeting, one could encourage all the group members to leave their cameras on, not just the chair or to senior members of the committee because those who are not seen on video might be treated as just observers rather than equal status members of the committee. Encourage the use of those zoom backgrounds where you provide pictures to show in the background that ideally might be the same for all committee members, so there are not visible differences in backgrounds that could send a message about the status of the individual.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

I like that a lot. One lever is expectations. What do we mean by expectations as a lever?

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

Expectations here can refer to the specific behaviors that everyone agrees to engage in as we meet as a committee. When we engage in these expected behaviors over time, then they can lead to the development of situational norms, which are often more informal than explicitly stated expectations, yet they're really highly influential. In my own field of social psychology, research has revealed the power of social norms to drive our behavior, especially when we're new to a situation. So that's why when people go into a really fancy restaurant or a banquet for the first time, they look around to see what other people are doing and then take cues from them to figure out "what fork should I be using?", for example. So if we can develop norms for behavior in the workplace that are respectful and that promote equity, that can help any new incoming people to know what the behaviors are that are expected in that new situation.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

And could you give us an example of how to use this as a lever for addressing faculty power imbalances?

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

At the first meeting, one could develop a set of communication expectations that the group will follow.

And when people have the opportunity that is the people in the committee are given the opportunity to contribute to the development of those expectations, they may be more likely to follow them.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

That's really powerful. I like the co-creation

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

Yeah, the co-creation of how we're going to communicate with each other. These expectations might be tailored to your specific situation. So if you're meeting online, you might say, we're going to use the raise hand function in zoom, whereas in in-person meetings, people can raise their actual hands. It's just important to communicate that's how we're going to signal that we have input to provide. We also might think about what are the expectations about voicing dissenting opinions? How are we going to be sure that people have that equal opportunity to do that? Will we go around the room to give each person equal time to express their views to be sure all voices are heard? At least when I've tried developing communication expectations with committees, I've been really happy to see that people are typically eager to provide this kind of input and they have lots of ideas about improving communication. That might be because I tend to work with faculty members a lot and many have created their own classroom discussion expectations and so they have some experience with that. But generally, I think people really like the idea of having some say in setting, helping to set those expectations.

And once they're developed, you can even bring printouts of those expectations to meetings, maybe throw them into a zoom chat and they can become a really positive feature of the physical environment like we just discussed. So when these expectations then become followed consistently, those desired communication behaviors can become norms.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

I really like dropping that into the zoom chat.

**Kelsey Arras:**

If you have a standing agenda, have it linked at the top at all times, so then it's there for any quick access.

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

Then in some events we've made little kind of table tents with the expectation guidelines and they're there for everyone to see as we talk.

**Kelsey Arras:**

So Denise, I had a question about expectations in terms of staff involvement. So I've heard that there are a lot of times where there will be a staff member involved in a faculty search to varying degrees and responsibilities. How can a leader think about expectations for that member of the committee as well?

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

That's a really great question and an important issue because I think people really need to recognize the vitally important role of supporting staff members to a search committee. I mean, they really keep things running with the group, and I think that that could be definitely part of one's set of expectations for behavior and communication expectations, being clear that the expectations that are set apply to everyone on the committee, which includes the support staff. So they also need to have the same level of respect and equity as any other member of the group. I also think this ties in with our avoidance of subtle bias based on titles and roles and being aware of that can help us avoid making those assumptions about others that might be based on those titles and roles in an unfair way.

**Kelsey Arras:**

Yeah. Thank you, Denise. Whenever I work with other staff on campus and me being a staff member, I always feel appreciated when whomever's leading whatever kind of room set up that there's acknowledgement about my role and contributions and then I do also like setting those expectations early I think just gets everyone off on the right foot.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

Opportunities is one of my favorite levers to discuss. Could you define this lever for us, Denise?

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

An opportunity arises when you find yourself in a circumstance where you could achieve a desired or hoped for action or outcome or change. So in the scenario we're discussing where the behavior of a more powerfully positioned committee member is experienced as intimidating to others, that could be a really great opportunity to take action to make a change.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

And how would that look for this specific situation?

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

I think that there are opportunities here to do things that are reactive to the moment, but also opportunities to be proactive to avoid this undesired behavior in the future.

Today I'll focus on an action that a little bit of both. So in this scenario, seeing these behavioral dynamics happening in the committee might be an opportunity to take what we call an integrity pause. An integrity pause is a concept developed in another U-M ADVANCE initiative called the STRIDE Committee. The STRIDE Committee develops evidence-based approaches and strategies to promote fair and successful faculty hiring. The STRIDE Committee introduced the idea of the integrity pause, which in this scenario would be an intentional periodic pause in the work of the committee to take stock of how things are going. So the group can pause and ask themselves "is our group functioning well and is it functioning in a manner that facilitates us maintaining integrity and achieving the goals of the committee?". This would also be a great time for the committee to review the communication expectations document that they developed earlier.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

I like the opportunity as the "Uhoh something bad is happening". We can go down the spiral of getting mad at each other or we can use it as an opportunity for doing better.

**Kelsey Arras:**

I love the integrity pause feature because you can even use it in the context of something doesn't quite feel right. You get that little kind of spidey sense that you're like, "I don't know if something bad in particular is happening, but something doesn't feel good." So I think that's also a great opportunity in the conversation to at least voice that "something feels off, how do we approach this?"

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

And this provides that, provides room for that. It says "this is the time and place where those can be brought up." One could develop ways of collecting feedback from the group in ways that feel safe and equitable, which can bring light to any problems. I think having these integrity pauses at regular intervals can also be proactive as these check-ins could identify process changes to be made that would improve the integrity of the committee's functioning as they complete their work. These new improved processes then can be used to inform expectations set for future committees.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

Our next systemic oriented lever is routines and structures. Two parts to this one. Denise, how are these terms being used here?

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

Well, routines and structures refer to the way things are done within organizations, both informally in the case of routines, and also more formally as in the case of structures. I see routines and structures as related to expectations and norms, but they're less about interpersonal behaviors and more about policies and practices.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

Okay, and do you have an example or two for us?

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

I think it's very important for an organization such as an academic school or department to have routines and structures in place regarding how problematic behaviors or inequities will be addressed. Because without some process for this, people struggle to know what to do and who to turn to when they experience these kinds of situations. So within our committee scenario, the leader could provide a routine mechanism for committee members to bring concerns to the chair privately at a broad level such as within a school or department. Examples of routine and structures to promote respect and fairness could include having programs in place to educate people about the resources available for people with concerns to have them addressed. To really be the most successful and effective, these structures should be transparent, they should be easily accessible and known to all, and one shouldn't have to really effortfully dig to find out what to do buried somewhere on a website.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

And the known, the informal routines, those are learned.

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

I also think that the use of these structures to address problems like this should also be de-stigmatized. That is they should be offered and described to people in a way that makes people feel comfortable about using them. Making it clear where to start if one is having these experiences is helpful. Is there a single entity that one should contact first like an ombuds or a workplace climate lead? That's the first step in the process.

It should be easy and safe for people to utilize policies and procedures designed to improve respect and fairness in the workplace.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

Knowing that path for addressing the issue is useful because a lot of times you're like, "Okay, something happened, but..."

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

What do I do?

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

What do I do?

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

Yeah. I think it's important for leaders to really be upfront about that and recognizing these things happen and this is the way that we will handle them. This is how you do it. This is the first step.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

Time is the next lever for this scenario. How is time a lever?

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

In considering time as a lever we can think about how the use of time can be seen to reflect what people really value and also what they don't value. So that's why if people raise a concern in a meeting and are told "We don't have time to talk about that today", they can feel like their concerns just not important to other people.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

That yep, we didn't make time. And do you have an example of using time as a lever?

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

I think generally we really want to be careful that our use of time does not signal value in ways that we don't want and may not intend. And in our scenario about the committee, it may be that the senior level committee members experienced as intimidating because they're taking up a lot of time in the meetings, right?

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

Yeah.

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

This naturally results in other committee members having less time to contribute to the discussion. And it also signals that the senior level person's opinions are the ones that are the most valuable. So to address the situation, setting expectations and structures for equal talk time. For example, every committee member has two minutes to speak without interruption. That can help to equalize the perceived value that's placed on each committee member's contributions to the discussion. Another idea for using the time lever would be to be sure that committee meeting agendas are just not so packed, that if a discussion starts to go off track, there's no room to address it and get back on course. So it's good to leave a little open space in that agenda to provide time to explicitly ask for input from members who may have lost speaking time because others spoke too long.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

And agenda items, especially when we're allocating five minutes here, ten minutes there, we feel like we have to fill

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

Yeah

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

The whole meeting interval. Otherwise people will think, "what are we going to do?"

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

Maybe time could be held by putting in something like integrity pause time, or just sort of check-in time on the agenda, just to see if there's something that people want to address just about the way the meeting's going. Leaving time for it can help at any issues arising get addressed.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

So now we'll move on to the more "in the moment" levers. In the next two levers, interactions and language are strongly related and we can discuss them together. So what are these levers?

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

Well, I see the levers of interactions and language as being really related because interactions often contain language and both of these are influential to how human beings experience each other. Interactions involve the behavioral dynamics that take place between people and language refers to the words people choose to use and the tone in which they're delivered. Of course, people also communicate non-verbally through facial expressions and body language.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

And so what is an example of using interaction or the choice of our language to address this issue?

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

So in our scenario, the committee leader might start by acknowledging that a domineering committee member does have good intent before going on to identify how that person's behavior is violating behavioral expectations that everyone agreed upon. So I'll try to model this and you can let me know how I do.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

Awesome. Alright,

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

Here we go. So one could say, "Hey, let's hold up for a minute here. I hear you voicing your perspective, which is based on your years of experience in academia, and I really appreciate your input. But I also see that other people here bring very valuable perspectives from their experiences as our new colleagues in the field. And I want to be sure we spend equal time listening to all types of input." All right, so how did I do?

**Kelsey Arras:**

I really like how you phrase that, Denise. When you talk about new colleagues, I think about that as very equalizing language to use because in that space you are all peers and I think that that's something really important to highlight as you're talking to the senior member in the conversation.

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

Yeah, sure.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

And at the end you use the word "equal time." Again, emphasizing that hopeful norm that the crew has set that we take space but also make space for everybody else.

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

As you can tell, using this disarming language is not always easy. But I think if we try these approaches, there's the possibility of making change. If, for example, the person here recognizes and changes their behavior on the committee in the future. But even if not, you yourself have served as a positive role model for all the members of the committee.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

And you put it in nice polite words to them, so hopefully that's receptive.

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

Yeah. Helps them accept the message.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

The final lever is modeling. So I used to glue together model airplanes when I was young and then wet and paste on the little decals to make it look cool. But that's not the modeling that we're talking about here. Denise, can you explain our definition of modeling?

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

It's a bit different from what you just described. Modeling here as a lever refers to the fact that the behaviors we engage in have an influence other people who witness them. This happens even whether or not we're intending to influence other people. So the effect of modeling behavior can be particularly influential when the model holds a position of power or when the role model is seen as relatable to or similar to the observers of the behavior, which can be the case when a committee is composed of people from the same department or school, right? Or even in the same profession.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

And as faculty with this hierarchy, somebody is always watching.

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

Yeah, that's right.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

And taking you as a role model of how to behave in that environment.

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

Exactly.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

So do you have an example of using modeling as a lever?

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

In the scenario, the committee chair is a person in a position of power could very effectively role model the desired behaviors. This could happen by the person saying, for example, "Okay, we've all agreed that each person should speak for two minutes, so I am going to watch my time very carefully and not go over." The person could also acknowledge when they notice themselves speaking too much and say something like, "Oh wait, I don't want to monopolize the conversation and not leave time for someone else to talk. So let's move on and let's hear from someone else."

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

Oh, I like that. Acknowledging your own error.

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

Yeah, your own wavering into deviating from the expectations.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

That equalizes everybody in the room like, oh, okay, you're the chair.

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

And we're all free to do that. Yes. In my work as a social psychologist, I've conducted experiments demonstrating how seeing another group model egalitarian behavior can promote more equitable communication among small groups. In these studies, we had groups of science and engineering undergraduates watch a video showing a group of students that were similar to themselves engaging in a group discussion. And in that group discussion, men spoke a lot longer than women did. In another version of the video, the men and women group members they saw spoke an equal amount of time, and that was the egalitarian version of the video. Those student groups in our lab who saw the latter video, that is the egalitarian group role model, later engaged in their own group task. And we saw that the men and women in those groups actually showed equal talking times, compared to those who saw the first role model video in which men spoke more than women. So I think that work suggests that people are influenced not only by the behavior of one other individual, like a committee chair, but they're also influenced by just the way the group interacts with each other. So when positive and respectful and equitable interactions are the norm in the group, they're observed by everybody who then may engage in behaviors similar to those that they see being modeled by others.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

How about that? We are social creatures and we interact with each other.

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

Yes.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

And follow each other's examples and models.

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

Yes.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

We made it. Denise, that was a wonderful conversation on a fairly heavy topic. Do you have any final words on the subject?

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

I think that we've discussed these levers separately, but they do intersect and some actions taken can pull more than one lever. So therefore the levers here can work together and the actions that you take can therefore have a multiplied effect in promoting a more respectful workplace.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

That was Professor Denise Sekaquaptewa, the current Director of the University of Michigan's ADVANCE Program and a Professor of Psychology here at the University of Michigan. Thank you so much for joining us today.

**Dr. Denise Sekaquaptewa:**

Thank you. Thanks for having me.

**Dr. Mike Liemohn:**

This has been an episode of the Advancing Faculty Excellence Podcast, a product of U of M's ADVANCE Program. The views expressed in this episode are those of the guests and hosts and do not reflect official positions of the University of Michigan. I'm Mike Liehmon, the host of this episode. This podcast was produced and edited by Kelsey Arras of U of M ADVANCE. Please join me extending to her a huge thank you. This podcast would not exist without her. We want to give a special thanks to our musical crew composition by WP Norton and performed by So Say We All with WP Norton on lead guitar and University of Michigan, professors Alaina Lemon on Rhythm guitar, and Denise Sekaquaptewa on bass guitar. We also thank the Shapiro Library Design Lab team for production support, including usage of their sound studios. Please rate, review, and subscribe to this podcast. Thank you all for listening.