With great pleasure I present to you the fourth issue of AHEAD, the research magazine of the University of Michigan School of Social Work. This issue introduces a feature familiar to many of you, but new to AHEAD: an impressive listing of recent publications by our faculty and PhD students. Publications used to be listed in the School’s alumni magazine, Ongoing, but with the establishment of AHEAD in recent years, we thought it made sense now to celebrate our faculty’s exceptional productivity in these pages.

Our listing looks back at the past year, and we note that faculty and student output will continue unabated in 2020. Our faculty and students presented 98 abstracts at the annual conference of the Society for Social Work and Research (SSWR), January 15-19 in Washington, D.C. SSWR was founded in 1994 as an independent organization to help advance social work research. Our School’s abiding presence at the SSWR conference has demonstrated how our rigorous research has impressed and influenced thousands of our colleagues who attend SSWR presentations. You can review the list of our faculty and student 2020 abstracts online at https://ssw.umich.edu/events/sswr-2020.

Our faculty’s publications demonstrate a commitment to creating knowledge grounded in sound theory and methods. The diverse issues we address and our focus on vulnerable populations reflect our commitment to social justice. This is shown impressively in this fourth issue of AHEAD. First, we celebrate the opening of the renamed Vivian A. and James L. Curtis School of Social Work Center for Health Equity Research and Training. The center has a new director, Professor Daphne Watkins, and a new name that describes a more specific focus — but that still recognizes one of our School’s most generous and dedicated benefactors. Starting on the next page, you can get to know more about the history of the Curtis Center and meet its past and current leaders.

This issue also highlights the work of our Program Evaluation Group (PEG). PEG was established in 2009 under the leadership of former dean Laura Lein, who was committed to helping Michigan social service agencies in need of evaluation — in particular, those agencies where our students are placed for internships. The article reviews the incredible evaluation work PEG has done in the past, and how, under the leadership of Associate Professor Shawna Lee, the program will continue to conduct superb program evaluations using skills that define social work service.

We round out this issue of AHEAD with a commemoration of our friend and colleague from Michigan State University, Deborah I. Bybee, who passed away last fall. For many years, Deb Bybee collaborated with faculty from our School on many research projects, lending her expertise in statistics and always displaying a tireless work ethic as well as a kind and encouraging manner. She will be very much missed.

I look forward to highlighting the work of different faculty members and research groups in coming issues of AHEAD.

Rogério M. Pinto, PhD
Associate Dean for Research
University of Michigan School of Social Work
INAUGURATING THE NEW VIVIAN A. AND JAMES L. CURTIS SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK CENTER FOR HEALTH EQUITY RESEARCH AND TRAINING

The Curtis Center is on the move — in a new direction! Established at the School of Social Work in 2007, first for substance abuse research and later with a broader mission, the center today has a new director, Daphne Watkins, a new location on the third floor of the School’s east wing and a new name that describes a more specific focus.

Left to right: James L. Curtis, Daphne Watkins, director of the Curtis Center, and Lynn Videka, dean of the School of Social Work, at the rededication of the Curtis Center, November 14, 2019.
In November 2019, what had been the Vivian A. and James L. Curtis Research and Training Center was renamed the Vivian A. and James L. Curtis School of Social Work Center for Health Equity Research and Training. The center now focuses on health equity for marginalized communities in Michigan and around the globe. “We want to make sure we take care of home, but also go global,” says Watkins, “with social justice as a primary aim of our work.”

Changes notwithstanding, the center continues to honor a social worker, Vivian A. Curtis, MSW ’48 (1924-2007), and her husband, James L. Curtis, MD ’46. Both are celebrated figures in University of Michigan history and in their respective fields.

James Curtis matriculated at the U-M Medical School in 1943. The only black student in his class, he graduated three years later in the top fifth of that class. During his subsequent residency in psychiatry, one of his mentors had a progressive policy for the time — inviting social workers to meetings of mental health teams. At one of those meetings, Curtis met one special social worker, Vivian Rawls, from what was then the U-M Institute of Social Work. They were married in December 1948 and moved to New York City, where Dr. Curtis began a career as a clinician, educator and healthcare administrator, and Vivian Curtis became a nationally recognized leader in social work.

The Curtises conducted their long careers as expressions of social work values and ethics. In 2007, back in Ann Arbor, they sat down with Paula Allen-Meares, then dean of the School of Social Work, to complete an agreement to provide funding to support the Vivian A. and James L. Curtis Research and Training Center, to be located within the School. (Curtis gifts also support endowed scholarships at the School, including, for MSW candidates, scholarships in geriatric and hospital-based social work, and a research scholarship for those in the School’s Joint Doctoral Program.) “Our ambition,” Dr. Curtis says, “was to create more research opportunities for people, regardless of race, gender or family income.” Social work researchers coming through the Curtis Center would be bound by values expressed in their profession’s code of ethics, including equity and social justice and commitments to vulnerable populations and social change. Upon the establishment of center, Allen-Meares appointed two co-directors, both well-funded researchers in substance abuse and mental health: Professor Jorge Delva and the late Professor Matthew Howard.

Delva, today dean of Boston University School of Social Work, recalls, “Matt and I initially wanted to write an NIH proposal for a center for substance misuse research.” But a year and a half in, Howard departed for the University of North Carolina. Delva and Allen-Meares looked to then Associate Professor Joseph Himle, a well-funded mental health researcher with strong management skills. Himle accepted the co-directorship of the center, but Howard’s departure had also raised the question of the center’s purpose.

“Matt and I had focused on substance abuse,” Delva explains, “but Paula envisioned a service unit for all types of projects, so that no one was privileged.” Delva and Himle met with faculty to hear their needs. Then, the School’s associate dean for research position opened up. Delva took the job, surrendering his co-directorship of the Center. Himle became sole director, though Delva remained on the board of the bustling, growing center. Allen-Meares retired about the same time, and Laura Lein became dean.

“Jorge and I built a center useful to all faculty and all types of research,” Himle recalls. “We developed consultation services, a pilot grant program, and the Program Evaluation Group (aka PEG; see next article). In 2009, the Curtis Center began to take postdoctoral fellows. The first was Cristina Bares, MSW ’04, PhD ’07. Today an associate professor at the School, Bares recalls that “Working in the Curtis Center as a postdoc allowed me to focus exclusively on research, to be part of a team, learn new methods and attend conferences.”

She remembers mutual support among faculty and PhD candidates. “Faculty and students could meet and discuss research methods and emerging ideas. We could present preliminary results, practice conference and job talks and get feedback on research ideas. One of my first tasks as a postdoc was to translate a statistical model and test it. I presented the results as part of my job talk. When I took a faculty position, I was ready to apply for NIH funding. The Curtis Center helped me set up innovative research questions that I continue to ask today.”

Assistant Professor Addie Weaver, also an early Curtis postdoc, says that “the training I received at the Curtis Center was instrumental in shaping my research on mental health treatment access disparities in rural areas. I received exceptional mentorship from Joe Himle, and I worked as part of an interdisciplinary team with a shared
mission of health equity; the center provided infrastructure and resources that supported my successful federal grant application.”

The center had funded many pilot projects, supported fellows and offered program evaluation services. And yet, by conceiving its work very broadly, its identity became unclear. “The broad content scope limited researchers to early stages of support,” Himle says, “and so we did not build a strong presence nationally or internationally.”

The center’s next director, Professor Brad Zebrack, invited faculty to two professionally moderated retreats to discuss what the center might be instead. “Faculty said they wanted a clearinghouse for ideas and opportunities to hear about each other’s research,” Zebrack says. He remembers how, when he himself was in the Joint Doctoral Program in the 1990s, “there was an exchange of ideas and many venues for mixing doctoral students and faculty.” Returning as faculty in 2008, he saw less of this. “I wanted the Curtis Center to be that venue again,” he says, “especially regarding health and mental health.” Zebrack stepped down before he could create such a forum, but his tenure saw one significant change: the center’s Program Evaluation Group (PEG) had grown significantly, and so spun off on its own in 2015.

In the summer of 2016, Lynn Videka became dean of the School. Videka believed that the Curtis Center’s potential would best be realized by returning to the original intent of the Curtises’ gift: the study of health inequities. Videka had seen how, across the U-M campus, mission-driven research centers were focusing on substantive goals rather than core facilities. But who would direct the reconceived Curtis Center?

Professor Daphne Watkins, who studies gender disparities and mental health, and who was then directing the Joint PhD program, had been approached by another institution to direct a mental health research institute. Videka realized she could help Watkins create something similar right where she was. “Given the intent of Dr. Curtis’s gift and the importance of health equity to social work,” Videka says, “Daphne saw that it fit our focus to reimagine the center as mission driven, with that mission being health equity.” Watkins would lead the Curtis Center, which would bear a name she herself suggested.

“Our ambition was to create more research opportunities for people, regardless of race, gender or family income.”
– DR. JAMES L. CURTIS

“There was uncertainty on our part about what the center did,” Watkins admits, taking a break from preparations for the center’s official reopening last fall. “The Curtises never wavered in their vision, though. The gift was for work they valued: addressing health inequities.” Watkins explains the center’s atypical situation. “Usually,” she says, “you get a grant and then create the center. We have a center and now need to land some grants. Dean Videka has been kind enough to allot us funds for a limited time, but we must become
self-sufficient. We are putting in as many proposals as we can because we need to rebrand the center and support ourselves. But we are seeing collaborations happening quickly.” Says Videka, “I’m thrilled with her approach to the job and the renewal Daphne has created.”

The Curtis Center’s new home has been a beehive these past few months, with several new staff on board in just the past year, including program manager and health disparity researcher Jamie Abelson; Kirstn Tatar, a data management specialist and executive assistant to Watkins; and biostatistician Tao Wei. Watkins has also hired two postdoctoral fellows: health disparities researcher Zachary Jackson and developmental psychologist and interdisciplinary social policy researcher Lloyd Talley. Says Talley, “Being a postdoc at the Curtis Center is an honor. And as a Black male PhD, it is as special honor to be affiliated with and to build upon the legacy of Dr. and Mrs. Curtis, given their contributions to Black mental health and well-being in America.”

On Thursday evening, November 14, 2019, the Curtis Center officially reopened with a reception attended by Dr. Curtis, Dean Videka, and Professor Watkins, all of whom spoke to a group of some 50 faculty, students, postdoctoral fellows and others. An exultant Watkins declared, “The day has finally come!” She introduced the center’s renewed mission and new team and engaged the audience with a real-time poll about health equity. Addressing Dr. Curtis, Watkins said, “Thank you for your candor and your commitment to the community. Furthering that commitment is an honor that we don’t take lightly.” She then explained to the gathered guests, “The center’s mission is to stimulate research, training and outreach opportunities that promote health equity by supporting work that deepens our understanding of factors that lead to inequities and the strategies that eliminate them.”

The dean described how the re-creation of the Curtis Center points the School toward the future by joining the research mission with the strong commitment to diversity, conducting research using cutting-edge approaches, creating faculty in interdisciplinary teams and engaging the public. The reconceived center thus aligns with the School’s newly articulated strategic plan, as well as with a vision James and Vivian Curtis shared for some 60 years. The new Curtis Center also can respond to the visions that many of its former directors had in some form, in terms of focus, collegiality, exchange of ideas, support of

students and postdoctoral fellows and significant contributions to forward-looking research agendas.

After Videka and Watkins, Dr. Curtis took the floor and declared: “The rededication of the Curtis Center represents wonderful aims for the whole country and progress toward greater health equity,” he said, and then referenced President Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s declaration of an “economic bill of rights,” including rights to employment, housing, education and, of course, medical care. Roosevelt articulated these rights in the State of the Union address delivered January 11, 1944, at which time a young James Curtis was training to be a physician, and a young Vivian Rawls was looking ahead to earning a master’s degree in social work. Said Dr. Curtis, “How well these rights fit with the mission of the Curtis Center. “Imagine how different the world would look if we had these universal rights.”

The Vivian A. and James L. Curtis School of Social Work Center for Health Equity Research and Training is indeed making the Curtises’ vision a reality for a new generation of “leaders and best.”
Whenever you answer questions with scaled responses ("Very satisfied," "Somewhat satisfied," etc.), you are helping someone evaluate something: a program, a study, an organization, or their own history and habits. Beyond that, you may be helping their work to get funded or to get renewed funding.

Personal, institutional and programmatic data, survey data, unstructured data, (text or multimedia content such as video, audio, presentations and webpages) or personal, experiential data may also help an important organizational or a programmatic evaluation. You may have conducted program evaluations yourself, to help an organization demonstrate the efficacy of an intervention, to justify past or future spending or to apply for new or renewed funds. Organizations pledged to create progressive change must continually compare measure outcomes against visions in order to survive — that is, in order to be funded. They must be able to tell funders with the greatest possible certainty how much, how many and how well.

“You would be hard-pressed,” says Associate Professor Shawna Lee, recently appointed director of the School of Social Work’s Program Evaluation Group (PEG), “to find a foundation or government funder that does not require some form of evaluation from those it funds. Evaluation has been a critical skill set for social workers. Social workers make particularly good partners for agencies and communities because they are skilled in conducting needs and resource assessments in a collaborative
manner. Social workers are trained to listen and they know how to tell a story about the value of community-based agencies and the services they provide.” In order to accomplish this, social workers may use personal, institutional or programmatic data, unstructured data (text or multimedia content such as video, audio, presentations and webpages) or experiential data.

The History

In 2009, when Laura Lein came on as dean, the School of Social Work was looking to ways to benefit the southeast Michigan communities and social service agencies where our students do internships and where our faculty conduct research. To learn just what services those agencies needed, Lein headed to Detroit. She checked into a local bed and breakfast and spent her days visiting agencies, asking staff what our school might do for them. Their response: “Evaluation.” It was, for all concerned, the right answer.

Our students needed on-the-ground experience in evaluation, as they were becoming more interested in macro practice and community organizing. Many faculty were also interested in evaluation, but the School had no forum for discussing the state of the art, no mechanism for creating evaluation opportunities for students and no plan for investing in the evaluations that local agencies and communities needed.

However, those agencies and communities were nonetheless under pressure. Funders wanted evaluations; it is difficult to convince funders to fund anything without evaluative data. Furthermore, Lein says that funders agreed that external evaluations from a reputable place were best. Agencies would have to find the resources to import evaluators. But where from? Most schools of social work did not see evaluation as part of their mission. Ours was an exception. A third of our students are interested in macro practice, the part of the profession that focuses on groups, communities and institutions. Macro practice offers opportunities to budding managers, policy experts, researchers and, of course, evaluators of community, institutional and governmental programs.

At the time Lein came in as dean, Sue Ann Savas, MSW ’88, was adjunct faculty and also operated her own evaluation firm. Dean Lein and then Associate Professors Joe Himle and Mary Ruffolo sat down with Savas to see if she would help start an evaluation unit at the School’s Curtis Research and Training Center (now reconceived and rechristened; see previous article). The following year, Savas became a full time clinical faculty member and director of the Program Evaluation Group.

The School announced that it was creating an evaluation unit for community-based projects, as well as developed

Former dean Laura Lein (left) originally proposed the Program Evaluation Group. Associate Professor Shawna Lee (right) directs the group today.
a field unit where students could come for hands-on experience. “It was a period of rapid growth,” Savas recalls. “We quickly had 20-some evaluation projects. The Curtis Center was also developing, but we thought PEG should be its own entity, faculty-led, with a program manager reporting to the associate dean for research.”

A decade later, PEG’s reputation and client list have grown, and the group now serves dozens of local as well as national organizations. “For agencies and programs, evaluation is the pathway to sustainability,” says Lee.

Program Evaluation In Context

Anthony Abshire, MSW ’19, worked with PEG when he was a student. Abshire conducted program evaluations for nonprofits in Detroit. He helped design logic models (graphic depictions of relationships between program activities and intended effects), collected and analyzed qualitative and quantitative data, and created surveys. “PEG is the best field placement I could have,” Abshire says. “I have loved working with them and have learned a lot. They put me on projects that align with my interests, such as youth and the foster care system. I get to use my micro and macro skills doing evaluations on the ground.”

Abshire has evaluated the Urban Neighborhood Initiative (UNI), a nonprofit in the Springwells Village neighborhood of Detroit, that helps local youth set and reach social, educational and life goals. “Like me,” says Abshire, who was a foster child, “the people at UNI are invested in the voices, development and accomplishments of youth.”

What does it take to conduct an evaluation? Says Abshire, “I was charged with creating logic models of different programs UNI runs, helping them figure out what improvements to make in those programs and how to meet their minimum, hard-line goals as well as their ideal goals, while staying true to their mission.” All this can be tricky, not just numerically, but socially. “You have to take the temperature of the room,” Abshire says. “You are dealing with staff, stakeholders and clients. Everyone wants to be heard and you must balance everyone’s personality, so it helps to have those micro and therapeutic skills. Otherwise, things can get away from you.”

“You train students to expect conflict,” Lein says. “Agency staff might not fully understand the ins and outs of evaluation. They might think you are going to do actual programming. We have to share with them what evaluators do and don’t do and what kinds of outcomes to expect.” To counter misconceptions, the School asks agencies to demonstrate an understanding of and a willingness to participate in the evaluation, in the form of an evaluation plan. They are, after all, coming to PEG because they must fulfill a specific requirements.

What evaluation can do

While program implementation is not necessarily a part of an evaluation, agencies can expect evaluators to: help articulate a program’s theory of change (a description of how and why a desired change is expected in a given context), compare a program to national models and other best practices, document program successes and areas for improvement, help improve program efficiencies, measure program outcomes and impact, determine cost savings of a program, and help build the agency’s capacity to conduct its own evaluations.

“Working with PEG, I get to use my macro and micro skills. I created logic models for Urban Neighborhood Initiatives in Detroit. Like me, UNI is invested in the voices, development and accomplishments of youth.”

– Anthony Abshire MSW ’19
However, “it is difficult for agencies to pay for evaluation,” Lein says. “We serve some agencies with minimal budgets.” She remembers one agency with a $50,000 annual budget that had to pay for everything. Even a small-scale evaluation can cost 20 percent of that. The School has traditionally absorbed PEG’s management costs and sometimes partially subsidizes the actual work. Our current dean, Lynn Videka, made a significant contribution toward community engagement as part of her recently released strategic plan for the School. Dean Videka sees PEG as part of that investment — although, as mentioned, clients do pay part of the cost of the service. “The School makes a considerable financial contribution,” says Lee, “including space and computers. The dean makes a contribution for the program manager position and role.” Also reflecting the strategic plan, Associate Dean for Research Rogério M. Pinto is helping PEG further consolidate its empowerment evaluation philosophy and practice aimed to highlight social service programs’ strengths and social justice goals.

Evaluation methods and outcomes in context

While evaluation may answer funder demands for data, Lee cautions against overreliance on numbers. “There is a downside to quantifying everything,” she says. “Social worker evaluators often mix qualitative and quantitative methods. We train people to think about equity-based approaches to evaluation, where you look at outcomes from multiple perspectives: clients, service providers, staff, volunteers and so on. The work is focused on collaboration and sustainability. Staff then see the value in collecting the data, and you tell the funder a more nuanced story than you would if it were just about numbers.”

PEG helped Washtenaw County in another way.

In November 2107, citizens voted for an eight-year property tax increase for support for those needing mental health services as well as for continued law enforcement services, provided by WCSO and local police forces.

What have been some landmark PEG projects? Lee and Savas point to two in particular. In 2013, the Washtenaw County Sheriff’s Office (WCSO) approached PEG. The county had the highest jail recidivism rate in Michigan, between 75 and 85 percent. PEG, led at that time by Savas, would analyze jail data in order to understand the needs of inmates, including mental health needs. PEG would further develop and evaluate a jail reduction program. Savas and her students analyzed over 230,000 rows (as from spreadsheets) of jail data from the period January 1, 2000 to October 18, 2013, which accounted for 102,929 bookings of 44,133 individuals. The evaluation team extracted information on inmate age, race, gender, recidivism and most frequent offenses. This data would point the way to predictive modeling — i.e., the process using statistics to predict outcomes of events — and the creation of an inmate survey to help the Sheriff’s Office understand reasons for recidivism and inmate needs upon reentry.

The PEG study may have helped the WCSO in another way. In November 2017, citizens of Washtenaw County voted for an eight-year property tax increase for support for those needing mental health services as well as for continued law enforcement services, provided by WCSO and local police forces. The proposal will raise some $15.4 million between now and 2026, 38 percent of which will go to the Sheriff’s Office for collaboration with the local mental health community. PEG’s assessment of WCSO programs and practices may well have helped the tax increase go through.

The year after the WCSO project began, the county called on PEG for another kind of evaluation. The JuvenileProbation Department had begun to use Assessment.com’s Positive Achievement Change Tool (PACT) in its assessment and case planning. PACT is a 46-item,
multiple choice assessment that measures an offender’s risk of reoffending. The county was using PACT with youth diversion cases (cases in which the offender is sentenced to join a rehabilitation program); with youth predispositional assessments (which include social histories) done by probation officers; and with youth referred to sex offender treatment. The department engaged PEG to assess the efficacy of PACT in predicting youth reoffending, as well as protective factors that might mitigate or eliminate the risk of reoffending.

From 2015 to 2018, PEG examined: how PACT was implemented by the county; how probation department staff were trained in PACT; the use of PACT data in court reports and case reviews; risk factors and protective factors of youth who appeared in juvenile court; the relationship of PACT scores with youth risk factors for reoffending; and the relationship of PACT scores with actual youth reoffending rates. PEG’s final report suggested that PACT was indeed an effective assessment tool.

PEG found that youth with “High” PACT risk scores reoffended 5.5 times more often than youths with “Moderate-high,” “Moderate” or “Low” scores. PEG’s findings advanced both the reputation of PACT and its utility to those in the juvenile and adult justice fields.

What might be the future of a PEG-PACT relationship, or any relationship begun with PEG? It could very well be the careers of Anthony Abshire and his classmates. According to Shawna Lee, “Most students who do field placements with PEG go on to positions of leadership in program evaluation across the country.” Abshire ultimately wants to work in health care or foster care policy. His path could run straight through evaluation work. “I want to see youth included in policy,” he says. “We write policies as if they affect everyone the same. But we must tailor them with an understanding of how they affect traumatized youth.” Articulating that understanding by showing which policies fail youth and which policies help them, would, of course, be the job of an evaluator. PEG today has helped more than 100 clients from the agencies Laura Lein first visited in 2009, to WCSO, to clients across the country.

The School’s strategic plan includes furthering its mission around community engagement requirements. Among the plan’s points: preparing students for leadership of the social work profession and for collaboration with other professionals; advancing the scientific basis of the social work profession; and engaging with regional, state, national and global communities to advance social justice and create progressive change. The work of PEG answers all of these points, serving students and the community in concrete and measurable (yet still nuanced) ways, but with an emphasis on social justice, collaboration and sustainability.
Statistician and research methodologist Deborah I. Bybee, PhD, a longtime colleague and friend to many in the University of Michigan School of Social Work, died at her home in Ann Arbor on September 14, 2019.

Bybee held faculty positions in the Department of Psychology at Michigan State and in the School of Social Work at U-M, where she was a co-investigator, offering methodological and statistical help and often serving as a co-author. Professor Richard Tolman calls Bybee “a one-person research corridor” between the two universities. “Deb knew the numbers and the issues,” Tolman says. “She applied sophisticated statistical tools, and she was also friendly, collaborative, modest and generous.”

Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs Joseph Himle remembers Bybee as “a kind-hearted person who deeply cared about the people she was helping. She remained focused on her noble causes. She kept no distance from people in need.”

Born July 21, 1952 in Jefferson City, Missouri, Bybee received her Bachelors of Science in education from the University of Missouri in 1973. She earned a master’s (1980) and PhD (1985) in Ecological Psychology from Michigan State University. She specialized in social justice research on women’s and children’s health and well-being, and transformed services for victims of intimate partner violence and sexual assault. At U-M, she provided colleagues with expertise in community mental health, gender-based violence, trauma, parenting, and mental illness.

Professor Mieko Yoshihama worked with Bybee on several projects. “She used science to challenge oppression and marginalization,” Yoshihama says. “She was extraordinary but also so modest.” Joe Himle agrees. “Deb was one of the most capable people yet one of the most humble and approachable. Her input felt like support not judgement.”

“She was incredibly generous and was an exceptional teacher,” says Assistant Professor Addie Weaver. Yoshihama points out, “there is a huge list of people she collaborated with and trained. Now we are training a new generation.”

Those wishing to honor Deborah Bybee’s life and vision are asked to contribute financially and/or donate their time to an organization dedicated to creating a fair, just, nonviolent world.
For this issue of AHEAD, we generated from our database a list of all faculty and PhD candidate publications that appeared since we last printed this information, in the Winter 2019 issue of Ongoing. With great pride, we announce that the list ran to 23 pages! We could not print it in its entirety. Instead, we chose one article per faculty member or PhD candidate currently represented in the database. To view the full database, please visit ssw.umich.edu/research/publications.
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