It is my pleasure to introduce our speaker, Professor Aimi Hamraie. Aimi is an Associate Professor of Medicine Health and Society and American Studies at Vanderbilt University and Director of the Critical Design Lab. They are the author of Building Access to Universal Design and-- excuse me. The politics of disability published in 2017.

Their next book, *Enlivened City,* examines the aspiration toward livable cities through frameworks from critical disability studies and science and technology studies. Aimi is also host of the *Contra** podcast on Disability Design Justice. They are also a recent appointee for the US Access Board. Thank you so much for joining us.

We'd also like to thank Catherine D'Ignazio, Assistant Professor of Urban Science and Planning at MIT for facilitating today's conversation.

Thanks, Natasha and Shannon. Thank you so much, Professor Hamraie. This is really an honor and I'm so glad that you took time to speak with us. I want to just thank the students for the significant work that they have put in to this effort.

And I just want to recognize that these are first year students. And so, immediately jumped in-- saw a gap and jumped in and, I think, have led a really important and collective effort within the institution. And have done so much in a very short period of time. And so, I just want to acknowledge that labor and also say thank you to them. Because they're giving us and the department a real gift of reflection. And it's kind of like the critique in its most generous and loving form is this kind of critical dialogue. So I just really appreciate that.

And Professor Hamraie, just super thrilled to have you here and taking time out of your busy schedule to talk with us. I've known about your work for several years and I'm a admirer and fan. So it's great to get a chance to hear about it in person.

So the way that this will work is we'll hear from our guests for about the next 20 or so minutes around the topic of Critical Access Studies. And then, please, everybody be thinking about questions. You can put the questions in the chat. Or then, you can just save them and we'll have a time for questions afterwards so you can ask them directly.

I will probably ask the first question. But then, we're going to open it up for everyone. So yeah, so I think without further ado, the floor is yours. Take it away.

Thank you so much for these wonderful introductions and for having me here. I'm going to share my slides. So my name is Aimi Hamraie and I teach at Vanderbilt University in an interdisciplinary pre-med program that's based on the social determinants of health. And in that program I teach disability studies. I also study histories of the built environment and accessibility.

And I work in a field that is emerging called Critical Access Studies, which is a field that is really pushing how we think about accessibility in the built environment beyond the Americans with Disabilities Act and related legal approaches to accessibility.

Here on this slide, I'm showing an image from my archival research on the History of Universal Design, which I write about in my book *Building Access.* And this image shows a photograph from the 1970s of the lobby of a business school. And there are two standing people and one person who's seated in a wheelchair. That's the architect, Ron Mace, who's the founder of the Universal Design Movement.

And on top of the image, Mace has basically drawn some lines to indicate what it would look like to create an accessible vestibule in this lobby. And to me, this image is a representation of the types of experiments that disabled people have done historically and in the present to really think about what makes space accessible not in a standard and codified wide way, necessarily, but as this sort of ongoing experiment. And so, some of the ideas I'm going to talk about today are related to this.

Just a slight change. OK, so first I want to just give a little bit of background to-- about the vocabulary of accessibility. The types of words and concepts that typically get used when we talk about this concept. You might hear terms like accommodations, barrier-free design, compliance, sometimes consumers or employment. These are spheres where accessibility typically takes place. The value of independence, practices such as retrofit, which is when you take an inaccessible space and you make it accessible.

Often, this is described in terms of the social model of disability, which is a concept from disability sociology that says that it's society that creates inaccessibility and inequality for disabled people, not something inherent to disabled bodies. And we also sometimes talk about universal design in terms of access, which is the idea that if you design things for disabled people, they can also be accessible for non-disabled people.

And some of the images we might associate with access that I've included on this slide are of a curb cut that goes from the sidewalk to the street in the upper left hand corner, an aluminum ramp on the right side there that goes up a concrete incline. And then, also, I've included a page from an accessibility code as well that indicates the ideal slope of the ramp.

And something that we can tell from these representations, too, is that often when we're talking about access in a kind of mainstream cultural way, we're talking about physical disability and wheelchair users, which is, one, very important, and just one part of the broader constellation of what could be included when we talk about accessibility.

So I'm just waiting for the slides to change here. So the field of Critical Access Studies has emerged in the last 10 or 15 years. The best way to think about this is that people before Critical Access Studies, and certainly, this is still an important project, were very focused on convincing people who did not care about disability that they should care about disability. That's what a lot of the literature and accessibility tries to do.

But then, once the ADA had passed and fields like disability studies emerged and there was more of a critical mass of people who were convinced that accessibility was an important project, a number of critical concepts have started to emerge that are helping us think through the values underlying accessibility rather than taking accessibility for granted as a de facto good or as a kind of common sense.

And so, these concepts are the next wave of theory around accessibility and they have important implications for built environments as well. So this slide shows a list of them. And I'm not going to go over all of them. But they include things like access intimacy, access fatigue, access washing, collective access, some of you may be familiar with DeafSpace, which is a specific type of accessibility created by deaf architects, disability dongle, which is a term that describes forms of accessibility that non-disabled people create that disabled people don't actually want, and radical access.

And so some of these are-- I include this slide here to just show that there's a pretty big discourse about this that has emerged. And I'm going to talk about some of these specific concepts in more detail. Also, to say some of these concepts come from activism. Some of them come from the humanities or social sciences. So they're not so-- only coming from architects and urban designers as they were previously.

OK, so one important segment of Critical Access Studies is crip theory. And the word crip is a reclamation of the term cripple, which is a pejorative term. In the '70s, disabled activists, specifically, physically disabled people, started to reclaim this term. And what they meant by reclaiming it was that medical providers were using the word cripple pejoratively to say that there was something wrong with disabled people's bodies.

But by reclaiming it, disabled people were also able to say, we don't have to abide by the norms that the medical field is setting out for what our functions should be and what kinds of work we ought to be able to do. And so, from this has emerged a field of crip theory, and there's a subset of this focused on technology and design that is different approaches to thinking about accessibility as something that isn't necessarily assimilating disabled people into mainstream society or making disabled people better able to do things that non-disabled people do.

But actually, creating a whole other aesthetic and practical way of being. And so, we have terms like criptastic hacking. I've written about crip technoscience and crip mobility justice and there are a number of others. And just as an example of this, the designer, Sara Hendren, who some of you may know, she's based in Boston.

She did this great project called Engineering at Home in which she documented with Caitrin Lynch the-- who I believe is an anthropologist, the adaptations that one disabled woman had made to do things around the home in which she had, basically, rejected the medical prosthetics that were offered to her as they weren't working for her. And she developed her own tools instead, even though they didn't look-- they didn't make her look like she was, quote unquote, "normal." And so, one of those is this silicone sleeve for an amputee that holds a fork, which is shown on this slide.

So one of the primary areas of theorization in Critical Access Studies is around the question of users and inhabitants. And this is where I've done a bunch of work, for example, showing the way that norms of the body have shaped design standards and parameters. On this slide on the left hand, I'm showing two sculptures created by the sculptor Adam Belsky where he used anthropometric data from soldiers and also housewives during the World War I era to create these eugenic ideal bodies, basically.

And then, these sculptures would be taken to the state fair and people would stand next to them. And whoever's body most closely approximated the norm would win a prize. And this was part of a cultural project of promoting a certain idea of what is beautiful and what is normal in American society. And this same data actually shaped design handbooks.

And so, on the right is the industrial designer Henri Dreyfus created these materials called the design for man and woman that uses that same data. And then, drew these prototypical figures and then released the data for use by people who do product design and architectural design. And so, this, again, is the way that these numbers get translated into built environments and also normalized what kinds of people designers might think exist in the world.

A similar thing happened, actually, with disabled users. So in the post World War II era, researchers at the University of Illinois were collecting really similar data about disabled veterans and disabled housewives, shown on the slide. And then, taking that and creating a kind of concept of a normal disabled user. What the prototypical disabled user might be.

And this is actually why, when we think about disability access, we focus so much on wheelchair users because there's a lot of data about wheelchair users historically. But it also has this kind of cultural impact. It's not just that the data is scientific and exists out there. It shapes laws. It shapes how we talk about disability.

And so, here I'm showing the standards and codes that came as a result of that data. And also, the ways that our architectural handbooks took this data and translated it for architects showing a prototypical wheelchair user as disability itself.

So accessibility isn't just about standards, though, it also has politics. And so I want to talk about this using some Critical Access concepts. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, when Congress was considering and then later passing the ADA, we had these representations of disability that were pretty limited in terms of law and in terms of design practice.

But there were some people, like manufacturers and disabled designers, who were trying to change representations of who is disabled. And so, here I'm showing some representations where they are trying to take race and gender into consideration. On the left is an advertisement for a drafting table that shows a young white woman, androgynous, architecture student. And then, on the right a Black man, architecture student who's a wheelchair user and has an afro and they're using the same table.

And the advertisement is trying to make the argument that disability access benefits many types of people, but it's also showing disability in a much more expansive way than we were previously seeing. And similarly, on the right, some images from barrier free design handbooks showing disabled people who are blind. And also, people of color and women. And so, these are some challenges to the concept of the user that started to emerge.

The universal design movement in the late 1990s also was trying to challenge the Americans with Disabilities Act. And here, I'm showing a poster that has the principles of universal design. And what they were trying to do was to, basically, convince architects and other people that you should go beyond the code. That you should be thinking about usability and tolerance for error and how simple intuitive something is to use rather than just obeying an accessibility checklist.

One really interesting part of the politics of accessibility is economic access. And when I was researching my book, I visited this 7,000 square foot house outside of Columbus, Ohio called the Universal Design Living Laboratory shown here. It's this craftsman style suburban house. And this house showcases a variety of different accessibility technologies inside and markets them as forms of luxury.

And this is a very prevalent practice. But as a lot of people have explained, it also creates a lot of inequalities for disabled people who cannot afford this type of luxurious home environment in order to have accessibility.

A concept that I am thinking with now comes from the late disability activist Stacey Park Milbern. In this concept is access washing. And Stacey Park Milbern was a transformative justice activist and disability justice activist. And she was trying to get us to think about how the concept of accessibility, even though disabled people absolutely need access, sometimes the concept of accessibility gets used against certain disabled people, namely people who are unhoused.

And so I'm showing an image of a tent city on a sidewalk here. And Stacey Milbern in an article called Notes on Access Washing wrote about how leveraging accessibility as justification to harm communities of color and poor and working class communities is a prevalent practice. And she asks, if accessibility is made at people's expense, we have to question and challenge that as access. Access for whom?

And the specific example is city government implementing anti-homeless measures under the guise of making streets more accessible to people with disabilities with no consideration that those most harmed by this houseless community members are often disabled people themselves.

Another way that these critical concepts about accessibility show up in thinking about the urban environment is different forms of ableism that are coming up in, for example, attempts to promote health through the built environment. And this is something I'm writing a book about right now called *Enlivened City.*

Here, I'm showing a bicycle rack that's outside of my local public health department's building. And the bicycle rack shows these legs in motion. And the whole building itself is designed to promote exercise and movement. But the way that it gets talked about and the specific structures that are within and around this building and in the surrounding urban environment are very focused on, actually, eliminating disability rather than including it.

And so, those kinds of norms of the body are still showing up, even though there's nothing about this bicycle rack that is non-compliant with the ADA necessarily. It's sort of like the cultural discourse that it introduces that could be exclusionary.

So I know that I just have a little bit more time. So I'm going to talk just very shortly about some alternative conceptions of access that come from disability culture. Disability culture is the term that we use to talk about, basically, what happens when disabled people get together and design things or have cultural spaces.

One really important component of this is the Disability Justice Movement. And some of its principles include intersectionality, anti-capitalism, sustainability, interdependence, collective access. And a conception of access that this movement has introduced is the idea that access is love. So thinking about the design of public spaces-- accessible public spaces as a gesture of hospitality rather than something that is checking off a compliance checklist.

One of the conferences that I go to frequently is the Society for Disability Studies. I'm showing an image of a conference plenary here where there's a lot of disability culture and there are a lot of disabled people in the room. We can see power wheelchair users, ASL interpreters, there's transcription happening for everyone to look at on the right side.

And all of these together are the kind of baseline or the norm for what access is like in many disability cultural spaces. And this is different than the approach that just accommodates people individually or on a case by case basis.

Here is an image of the Ed Roberts Campus in Berkeley, California. This is a building that sits on top of a public transit station. And it houses the historic disability organizations in Berkeley. One of its most interesting design features is a ramp that is bright orange and winds around the interior of the lobby. And it's kind of flanked by these images of disability protests and it's visible from the outside.

And this building has many other accessibility features as well. But the reason I include this here is that it is very explicitly trying to show the presence of accessibility in the built environment rather than hide it. And that's kind of a critical access move. A lot of ADA compliance and other approaches to accessibility that are more rooted in accommodation are more about assimilation. And here is this kind of-- showing the ramp. Contextualizing it in terms of disability protests and historic movements.

And then, the last thing I'll just mention is the idea of methods and protocols for critical access. This is something that we work on in my lab, the Critical Design Lab. And the image I'm showing here is of a hand-drawn protocol from when we did a campus accessibility mapping project that led to, basically, a 40-year master planning process for accessibility on the Vanderbilt campus.

And what we were trying to do was to introduce university administrators and people in our campus community to the idea that, first of all, the campus was not actually accessible despite what everyone else was saying. But also, that when we started to engage with the built environment, new critical questions come up for us that then we have to account for in our building standards and other things.

And so the protocol shows the questions we're asking. First, we were looking for specific things like, where can I find the accessible restrooms? And we went to Google Maps and other things. But the answers that we got were raising other questions. So we were starting to question, what counts is accessibility and for whom?

And this led to more and more questions. And then, finally, we started to theorize together ideas about what it would mean for people who inhabit a space and don't typically think about accessibility to be the ones who do the work to document the inaccessibility of that space and what would happen. And it produced a very politicized process of thinking about accessibility that actually didn't just change how the university allocated resources towards this, but also, the types of conversations that we could have and whose expertise was valued.

So I have more examples of critical access protocols that I can talk about. But I'm going to stop here and just open it up for questions. And if anyone's interested, we can go back and show some of those examples.

Thank you so much. Thank you. Fantastic. A lot in a short period of time. So I'll kick it off, but I would just really welcome folks to please put your questions in the chat. Or else, you can also raise your hand in Zoom and we can just call on you. We're a small group, relatively speaking.

So yeah, Dr. Hamraie, one of the things that I really appreciate about your work as-- what you're starting to show at the end around these various kinds of concepts that have been brought in to Critical Access Studies and to thinking about disability and things like about intersectionality and white supremacy and critical race theory. And drawing from a lot of these different fields to think about how different forms of oppression are intersecting and thinking about accessibility and access.

And I saw on your Labs website, you also have a very strong statement. We reject forms of accessibility rooted in anti-Blackness, settler colonialism, and white supremacy. So I was just going to ask you-- and you had the great example, I think, of the access washing, too. So I feel like that was a really concrete example of how these things get pitted against each other rather than being thought of together.

But I was just wondering if you can elaborate a little bit more about how these-- what we think of maybe these other forms of oppression, other than ableism, start to show up in mainstream thinking about accessibility and how we can begin to see those or begin to take note of those and what to do about that or how you navigate that in your own work.

Thank you so much for that question. I think it's a really important one because there's-- the sorts of things that in a urban studies or urban planning context may be obvious from a social justice perspective are not always coming into conversations about accessibility. And so, one of those things is the inherent racialization of the street as a space or the sidewalk as a space.

And what happens to pedestrians or other people who are using those spaces if they're perceived as not belonging there. So the access washing example of how encampments of unhoused people are treated is one example. But if we think about the policing of public spaces, who is likely to get a ticket for sleeping outside in a bench is very racialized. It has to do with class perceptions. It has to do with gender.

And so, just on a really basic level, there's no way that accessibility codes account for that at all. At the same time that those codes adopt very normative representations of what spaces are for. So for example, there are codes for bathrooms. And in the code, it'll tell you that the bathroom signs look like this. And they look like there's the male restroom or the female restroom or the family restroom.

And those distinctions and divisions are inherently rooted in a heterosexual and cisgender understanding of gender and sexuality. But they're just there without comment in the code. And they're offered as examples.

But our ways of thinking about those spaces, not even just the gender binary, but what happens in the gender neutral or all gender restroom are shifting. And so, someone if is a disabled person of color or who is using family and are judged as being outside of the allowable use of that space, there can be certain forms of policing and surveillance that happen around that.

And if they are a trans person, even more so. And so, these are the sorts of things that, I think, are just starting to be part of a conversation about accessibility. And they contrast with some of the approaches that people would take before, for example, to universal design where they would try to say, oh, we should have an all gender restroom because disabled people and trans people can both use it.

And that's a very liberal multicultural approach that's like, one of you and one of you and one of you. And not taking into account that there are people who are both of those things and more. And how someone inhabits that really shapes their experiences in public space.

And then, when we add in all of the considerations of gentrification in cities and where certain types of amenities appear and don't appear and who has access to those, who gets to live in a place that has benches when they're walking around, and they're a walkable community, who is deemed worthy of sitting on a bench and who's accused of loitering and all of those things.

There's basically no way to talk about any of this without taking the intersectional perspective. But unfortunately, that's how accessibility codes have tended to do things prior to this.

Thank you so much. I want to open it up. Anyone feel moved for a question or comment? Otherwise, I'll keep them.

There's one in the room, I think. [INAUDIBLE].

Oh, good. OK, great. Go for it.

Thank you so much for the really powerful presentation and contents. I'm really interested in how institutions implement design, both in the structural infrastructure, but also thinking about shifting system paradigms around thinking about accessibility.

I just wanted to hear a little bit more-- especially being situated in a space like MIT that is currently grappling with how to handle a lot of these design approaches and initiatives. What are things for you that are precedent to keep in mind as institutions are making these decisions?

That's such a good question. This is something I have been thinking about a lot, really, in my whole time as a professor. So I've been working at Vanderbilt for nine years. And navigating institutions, especially universities, is very challenging because they are, at the end of the day, very guided by economic decisions.

And things like retrofits cost money, building new buildings cost money. And so, I spent a bunch of time-- at the same time that I was finishing my first book, I was doing a lot of institutional activism and just trying out the different strategies from the historical disability activists who I was studying at my university and trying to see what would work.

And the sorts of things that did not work so well were disabled students asking for access. Because they were constantly told that, no, everything's ADA accessible. And I don't know who is-- where that information was coming from. But it was something that was being said a lot.

What did work was national attention being drawn to inaccessibility. So a student wrote an op-ed in the *Washington Post* about his experiences navigating access. What did work was doing. We had these mapathons for the Mapping Access Project where hundreds of people would show up to map campus accessibility. But that also meant that a lot of people who were saying everything was accessible were seeing that everybody was going out and actually measuring things and studying the campus.

And within two months of doing that, the university was basically like, oh, we want to do our own accessibility mapping and have our own data. And then, once they did that, they could no longer perpetuate the narrative that the campus was accessible. Because I had data and they had data and couldn't ignore it anymore.

And so, the next time a master planning process came about, there's a whole accessibility master plan that was done for that. We rewrote the building code. It was amazing.

But it took getting-- it was a Critical Access Project. It took getting away from some of the ways of talking about accessibility that have historically been part of how we talk about the ADA. Like, oh, we need things to be accessible so that disabled people can be good students or productive workers.

We just did away with all of that and took a more aggressive and data-driven approach. Because that, in a way, put more pressure on the institutional logics and ways of working than trying to appeal to, oh, you should recognize someone's humanity and their citizenship like that. We know that universities, in general, are not propelled by that so much.

So those are some of my thoughts about it. But of course, every institution is different. And so, it is really about finding what the pressure point is that [INAUDIBLE] I would say. And trying to intervene in ways that can't be swept aside or ignored.

Thank you so much.

I love that. I love that point, including thinking about what works to make change within institutional structures that are not set up to recognize humanity, let's say. I was wondering if you could-- just to follow-up on that, if you could talk a little bit more about the Mapping Access Project. Because that was actually originally how I discovered your work.

And I remember being really struck at the time around the expansive conception of accessibility that you were mapping. Again, departing from the notion of disability as people in wheelchairs and going to this more expanded conception of, what does it actually mean to map access? So maybe you could talk a little bit more about that.

Yeah, for sure. So when I started my job, as I was saying before, there was this notion that the campus was 100% accessible. And I was trying to think about, what would it take to challenge that and who should be part of the conversation? And there were some map projects on campus already in a way that offered opportunities for allyship.

So for example, the Women's Center had a map of the lactation spaces on campus. And there are only three. I don't know why they made a map. They could have just listed them. But making the map was really effective in showing how few there were.

The LGBT Center was starting to map the all-gender restrooms and keep track of which ones were changing designation and stuff. And so, we got together and we basically came up with a strategy of we're not going to do an ADA accessibility audit. We're going to talk to our community about what it would mean to go beyond the ADA and make a survey instrument based on that.

And in that instrument, to frame the questions in ways that whoever was gathering the data really would just start thinking about exercise of doing accessibility mapping. And that became a whole method of critical mapping, basically. How to crowdsource data. But in the process, teach people to read the built environment in really critical ways, including people who never ever think about the built environment.

So if anyone's interested in that, there's a little toolkit on our Lab website. I can drop the link in here. That has some classroom exercises or ways of doing this on a campus level. If anyone's using a screen reader, I'm about to put a link in the chat. Yeah, that methodology can be used as an activist tool, I guess, is the main takeaway of all of that.

I see that there's a question.

Yeah, Natasha, do you want to ask your question?

Sure. I mean, in your work, you talk a lot about interdependence and how that challenges the dependence versus independence binary, I think, or complicates it, rather. So could you talk about what interdependence could mean for planning or what planning could-- or interdependence can shift, because we were trying to develop transportation teaching tools for class for our independent study. And we kind of struggled with that.

That's a good question. I mean, I think that part of my answer-- I think I need to say why-- a lot of conceptions of disability rights are about de-stigmatizing dependence and promoting independence. And so, the figure of the independent mobile citizen who's moving through a transit system or going down the street without anyone else's help.

And I think that some of the really simple ways that that concept comes into friction with the lives of disabled people is that disabled people are not unitary agents. We are in community with each other. But buildings and streets are not designed for a group of people with different mobility needs or even the same ones going down the street together doing different things together.

And so, the types of interdependence that designers and planners can think about supporting are really just disability culture. What does it take to create public spaces where many disabled people can be together rather than just for tokenized and individualized disabled people who aren't usually thought of as wheelchair users or power wheelchair users.

I mean, there's really interesting stuff that you can look at from disabled artists on this, actually. Park MacArthur imagined a disability-- those communities that are like live, work, play kinds of communities. But one that was based in disability culture. And she has this audio description of it. I think it was part of Whitney Biennial. Describing what that kind of public space would look like and how people would be lounging by the pool together and helping each other do this and that. And how that was supported by the built environment.

And then, another form of interdependence that is more politicized comes from Shannon Finnegan who's a disabled artist who does a lot of activism and art against stares and against things that produce fatigue. So they have this project of benches that say, this space has asked me to stand for too long. Sit if you agree. And there's this kind of solidarity and sitting on the bench with somebody else.

They also did a really cool project called the Anti-Stares Club Lounge in New York City. I forget like, Hudson Yards, that Google campus. There is a building called the Vessel that is comprised entirely of staircases. And it's this sort of Instagram [INAUDIBLE] opportunity sort of thing.

But disability activists have argued that the structure of the building is inaccessible. But the building itself just represents this endurance-based physical ability model of being in public space. And so, Finnegan had this whole public protest. It was an art project public protest where people came to the Vessel and they signed a pledge that said, as long as I live, I will never climb the stairs of the Vessel.

And it was an interdependence and solidarity project where they instead created these makeshift hangout spots down at the bottom of the Vessel where they protested the Vessel at the same time. And it was just a public art sort of thing.

So I think some of the spirit of that can be a model for thinking about interdependence and disability culture. And I know that planning is not the same as artist practice. But I think that there are things that disabled artists are doing that could be really informative for planners.

Thank you, [INAUDIBLE].

Wonderful. Well, I realize we're out of time. And so, maybe as a way to carry us out, Dr. Hamraie, maybe you could just tell us about your podcast just in case people here want to follow it.

Just as a note, I went prior to this event and looked at all the past episodes. And there's just amazing guests and really interesting people. So that's my quick plug. Why don't you tell us more about it.

So Contra* is a podcast about disability and design justice. And in the previous seasons, we focused on technology and also on mutual aid and solidarity. And actually, right now, we're producing a whole season on Critical Access Studies.

So that will start to come out in the next few months. And it, basically, comprises different members of the Critical Design Lab engaging with Critical Access Theories. And then, all of us having conversations about it. And all the episodes have transcriptions, and show notes, and links and all that kind of stuff. So you can engage with them in different formats.

Amazing. I just put the link in the chat. So maybe everyone just join me in a big round of applause, silent or not. Oh, good, there's some real sounds. I can hear them. And Natasha and Shannon, I don't know if you want to say anything else from here.

Oh, just a big thank you to our speaker today to Katherine and to everyone who's been a part of the independent study [INAUDIBLE] looked for this creative space for this entire semester. So thank you.

Thanks so much for having me. And sorry, again, about the time mix up. It was really great to be here with you all.

Thank you for coming.

Thank you. All right, everyone, have a great day.

Nice to see you, Katherine.

Hi, [? Garnet. ?] Hi, [? Garnet, ?] through the internet.

[LAUGHTER]

I want to see those clothes if I'm every in your neighborhood. I like the background-- those clothes.

Thank you. [? Garnet, ?] are you on campus?

Yes.