

Oral History Interview--Jane Elmes Crahall, 2021 May 14

Participants:

Christopher N. Breiseth

Tim Gilmour

Jim Rodechko

Suzanna Calev

Transcribed By: [Maddie McDonald](#)

JR: How are you feeling Jane? I know you have had various health problems.

JE: Yeah, I did. Actually Jim for the past two years or so I'm feeling much better than I did in decades. It took, well you know I had some problems and was anemic and had some digestive issues. It took them 8 years to diagnose what was wrong. But since 2019 I have been much better, and a lot of energy that I hadn't had so I'm happy about that.

CB: So you have a better pandemic year than most.

JR: I saw your post on facebook, it was very good.

JE: Oh, thank you. So you follow some of that. What happened is they discovered that my lower intestine was flopping, it's called volvulus. And so the surgery, the surgeon said it was complex and it took almost 4 hours. None of that is good news, but the good news is that in the end I have no restrictions on diet other than just being smart about it. And the energy level is so much better than it was. It honestly took almost 8 years for them to diagnose what the problem was. So that wasn't a good thing.

TG: Did you go to a new doctor?

JE: Actually it was my family doctor. My symptoms started changing a little so I called him about that and he said "Okay, pack your bags, you're going in tonight and you're having tests right now. When your doctor says everything is stat, you know it's serious. Really, when my symptoms started changing that was the key to what happened.

TG: Oh yeah. That's great.

JE: So how have you all been surviving the last year and a half?

CB: Tim, why don't we start with you.

TG: [laughing] Being the kid here -

JE: Okay, who's the kid?

CB: Suzanna.

TG: Well, no, actually Suzanna is.

JE: Well yeah, I would think.

TG: By quite a margin. But anyway, just quickly, I've been doing okay.

JE: Good.

TG: And actually, last weekend was the first time I've really been out on a big [? 00:02:00] away from home. Went up, actually to a memorial service. Jane you may remember him, Bill Tremayne.

JE: Oh, yeah, yeah.

TG: And uh, sad to lose him but it was one of the nicest memorial services I've ever been to.

JE: Good, Good.

CB: How's Laura?

TG: She's just a truly accomplished person. It's been a while, so I think she's pretty much grieved. So the service itself I think was just kind of a celebration of his life.

JE: Yeah.

TG: And they had several people speaking, but the most notable was Tom Cain who was a former governor, and it was obvious that the two of them had huge affection. He did a fantastic job. So, and the kids, they did a wonderful job. So it was a very nice thing to do.

CB: Was his sister Joyce there? Bill's wife.

TG: Uh, yes, Joyce was there. She looked pretty good.

CB: Good.

TG: She seemed to be happy.

CB: Well the Tremaine boys and their daughter, or their sister -

JE: Their sister, yeah.

CB: All were great contributors to Wilkes in different ways.

JE: Yeah.

CB: So Jim, do you want to give your health report?

JR: My what?

CB: Your health report . Jane wanted to -

TG: I didn't mention I'm fully vaccinated! There you go.

JE: Oh yeah, We have been since early March.

JR: I am as well and have been doing well myself. I've had trouble walking, but beyond that things are good. My grandson got COVID and so did my brother, but both of them seem to be pretty out of it pretty good.

JE: Oh my.

JR: So it wasn't easy, it's a disease you don't want to get. Your turn Chris.

CB: Well, Suzanna, do you and Jane know each other or did you overlap?

JE: Did we overlap?

SC: I started in 2018 so I'm not sure. I don't think I've actually met Jane.

JE: No, we haven't Suzanna. We mentioned that online, and I said when there's someone with the title of archivist who isn't Harold Cox, I'm proud of that fact that we moved in that direction, because we all worked with Harold for many decades. But, welcome Suzanna.

SC: Thank you.

CB: She's done a fantastic job, and this project has taken on a new gravity toss because of Suzanna. She's had a lot of students working with her on collections. And I'm doing fine. I'm in the middle of radiation therapy for prostate cancer. I just finished 7 weeks of radiation this morning, I have 2 more to go. So, I just got in from Vermont. I'm doing it from Burlington. Otherwise I am very healthy, and my oncologist says I should live another 10 years, which puts me at almost, I'm 85, so 95.

JE: Oh, wow.

CB: So, don't count me out.

JE: I would never do that Chris.

TG: I wish you could see him, Jane. He looks good!

JE: Well I'm happy to hear that. I can't see it but it sounds like the radiation is going well, so.

CB: Yes, it is.

JE: You do know Chris, that when I think of you I think of a man holding a balloon standing by you at an airport.

CB: Why don't you tell the group about that.

JE: Do you remember? Do you remember that?

CB: I surely do.

JE: Before I was even hired at Wilkes, or even interviewed, the day I flew into the airport I saw my then fiance standing at the bottom of the escalator holding a balloon saying "Welcome home" with this tall distinguished looking man who I didn't know. I came down the escalator and Brinley said "I'd like you to

meet the President of Wilkes College, Chris Breiseth. And, of course he knew I was coming in for the job interview and had actually mentioned it. So the next day when I was actually being interviewed. **Bob Heaman** was the man who took me in to meet Chris as President officially, and Chris you surprised him when you said “Professor Elmes, we’ve met.” He was like “How did you meet him?” So, I actually knew you before I stepped foot on the Wilkes campus, so we’ve known each other a long time Chris.

CB: Indeed. How is Brinley?

JE: Brinley is fine. He was out doing some gardening this morning. And I have to say if I was under lockdown with anyone, he was the perfect person. So he is doing very well, and that’s a good thing.

CB: Good. Give him my regards.

JE: I will, I will.

CB: Well let me say this project, I don’t know how much you have heard about it. Tim I’m not going to give the whole history so don’t worry. It began at a John Chwalek golf tournament dinner. It turned out that Tim, Mike, Bob Capin and I all came together and we stayed late after everyone else had left and started talking about our different perceptions as presidents of Wilkes culture, particularly Administration, faculty relations, administration trustee relations, and so on. One thing led to another and we started meeting, just the Presidents. We decided that we had sufficient common perspectives on some of the major Wilkes culture issues, that it would be helpful for whoever is going to succeed Tim, for us to do a memo. So we had a couple meetings, wrote a memo, and Tim put it in his final form and gave it to Pat Leahy when he came. Pat was very appreciative of it. And then, Mike and I, and Jim were on the very first interviews?

JR: I think I was. Clayton Karambelas?

CB: Well he wasn’t the first.

JR: Well, okay.

CB: This drug that I’m on for the cancer, they predict will give me some memory problems for a while, and it’s problems with words. I can’t think of our first one, what broke the ice. But Mike was very enthusiastic about it and he had done a lot of work with his own archives at home. He had a lot of three ring notebooks, and he started bringing those up for us to look at. Anyway, we started interviewing, it was an audio interview on the campus. And we’ve gone through, Suzanna what is it? 25 interviews?

JE: Oh, wow.

CB: We found some that went all the way back to Farley’s time, that Farley commissioned for one of his English faculty members, who actually interviewed **[Bruno Mars? 00:10:03]** and **[? Stark and ? McClintock? 00:10:05]** and all of a sudden, well I shouldn’t say all of a sudden because this has been several years in the making. We’ve actually reached back and have organized perceptions of the growth of the institution, including Farley. So, we’ve been adding faculty, trustees, and alumni. We haven’t done as much with community people as we would like, but it’s a very informal conversation starting with the person putting him or herself in some kind of historical context with where they grew up, their education, and finally how they came into context with Wilkes. So why don’t we just begin there. Say something

about your background, where you were born, you don't have to tell us when, but how you've segwayed through your formal education to get to Wilkes. Jane, are you there?

JE: Oh, sure, yeah I'm here. You want me to start with that. Sure I'd be happy to. I was born in 1950 in Reading, Pennsylvania. None of my parents were college educated, however had she been able to afford it I maintain my mother would have been the brightest. She was the brightest in the family. They eventually settled in south, it's the southern part of Luzerne County actually on top of a mountain. It's called Venus, Near Berwick and Nescopeck, in that particular region. It directly overlooks Interstate 80. And my parents had a 5 acre, kind of an oasis in the midst of a number of commercial farms. So it was agriculture, on top of a mountain, so I grew up in the country. I attended Nescopeck, not high school, we were the first class that didn't have Nescopeck High School when it blended with Berwick. So I graduated from Berwick High School. And I would probably say a couple things about that in terms of it's segway toward professional development, and maybe goes back to my family. My father was a small business owner of a construction company, my mother worked at a silk plant in Berwick for many years, and was an avid gardener and baker as well. And, my father always had the idea that "It's okay to disagree with me, but you have to explain yourself." So our dinner table conversations were often pretty feisty. I had two older brothers, and they knew I was the spoiled one. The only girl and the youngest. And so they always insisted I was the spoiled one. But I learned to debate at the dinner table at my house because that's what my parents believed. You can have an opinion, but be able to defend it. So when I got to Berwick High School and I found out they had a debate team, I joined it. So I did begin debating when I was in high school. College I ended up going to Bloomsburg because I could afford it, and commuted for the first year or two. And, Jim, you know some of the people I had there in History when I was a student there.

JR: Yes, I do!

JE: Yeah, you know many of them actually. I graduated in 1972. And again I would say forensic, and also college politics were part of what mattered to me. Going to college in the late 60s was, of course, a very exciting time with lots of ideas and a lot of controversies. I enjoyed forensics largely because it was the most competitive thing I had been in, and you could learn even by losing, and very quickly learn that if you were good at what you did and practiced and studied, it didn't matter where the other competitors came from. So, on a routine basis we would compete against Ivy league schools and did just fine. One of the key points I think when I was at Bloom was they merged, there was a separate community governance called the Community Governance Association, the CGA, and there was a faculty senate. Well in my junior year they blended, and there was a combined student-faculty senate at Bloomsburg, which is somewhat unusual. And I had the good fortune of being the first student elected to an executive office, and so, um, they even gave me a secretary. So here I was, a senior undergraduate student who had a paid secretary, who was in charge of keeping the minutes from all of the meetings and all of the files. So it was a little unusual, I was playing semi-faculty even then. In my senior year at a national convention I was recruited by Ohio University because they **were looking for someone to coach Impromptu, Extemporaneous Speaking,** Persuasive, Entertainment Speaking and Novice debate. One of their coaches judged me in a semi-final round of Impromptu Speaking and offered me an assistantship. I had, up until that point, been planning to go to law school. I was a political science major with minors in philosophy, history and speech. But when they offered me the fellowship to do what I loved, which was forensics, I figured okay I'll get a masters and then I'll go to law school. So when I went to OhioUniversity what surprised me when I got there was not only that my assistantship included coaching forensics, but I was

also handed a teaching assignment in interpersonal communications. Now I was a pre-law and political science major, I hadn't had an interpersonal course. And here I was to teach it, in my first summer as a graduate fellow. And, so, I did a little bit of prep. I'm glad I read fast because I was reading the textbook a day ahead of the students. And, learned pretty quickly that teaching was something that I loved. And I think some of you know this story too. I also had an unusual class where some of my students would show up in orange attire and had escorts. They were from the Chillicothe State Penitentiary, in Ohio. And rather than having Ohio people go into the penitentiary to teach, they were trying experimentally to bring some of the criminals and inmates to the campus to see if it could get them socialized better and faster. So I had several of the inmates from the Chillicothe State Penitentiary, dressed in garb that identified them immediately for what they were, mixed in with a few regular undergraduate students who were mostly freshmen women. And that was my first teaching experience. I had something to say to the people of Ohio, I said don't you do that to another grad student again. Don't tell them that they're teaching something the day before it begins and they have one day to prepare. . But I figured if I could get through that class I could manage most other things. And so Ohio taught me not just that I was a good forensics coach, but the teaching taught me as much as I could teach the students, and I gained confidence in it. And so at the end of my second year at Ohio when the director left there was a 1 year opening at Clarion State College, and it was also in speech. So, I figured that I would earn some money and then go back and finish. I was by the way admitted to a Doctoral program, not a straight master's degree but a 3 year doctoral program in Ohio. So at the end of 2 years I went to Clarion for 1 year. Someone was on leave for one term, and as soon as I arrived their debate coach said, "Oh, you're here." And he knew my background, and Ohio University was the national champion of forensics so they said, "Would you like to start a speech team here to go with our debate team?" Well, that was a one year appointment and I stayed 11 years, got tenure, and promotion, and that was really where I probably grew the most as a teacher. It was mostly in the rhetoric area. I also ended up for 5 years being the department chair and that department was speech and theater. So, the arts were always a part of what I had managed and what I worked with. In the midst of that, probably toward the 8th year, I got a letter unexpectedly from someone I went to college with at Bloomsburg and that would be Brinley. He had heard that I was in Bloomsburg and at an Alumni function, so he dropped me a congratulatory note, and said "If you're visiting your parents again, call and maybe we can get together and have dinner." So, we did. And after commuting back and forth between Wilkes Barre and Clarion, which is about a 3 hour drive, and the phone bills at that point because this was in the early 80s and we didn't have social media, the phone bills were very high. We thought maybe we better start planning something together. Before entering the job market I wanted to finish that doctorate. I had a BA and 109 credits from Ohio University. So, I applied to the doctoral program in a couple of places but went to Pitt, and spent 9 months there, finished up all of my coursework and wrote my comprehensives. While I was there, a colleague that I had known for a long time, Brad Kinney, let me know that there was an opening coming up at Wilkes. And, I had known Brad and the forensics team for probably 20 years. So, I knew him and respected him, and knew of the forensic team at Wilkes because they competed with Clarion a great deal. And so, when I applied for the job I was finishing up my residency at Pitt and working on my dissertation. I got an interview and flew in. And when I flew in for the interview, this would be in 1985, that's when I first met Chris at the airport, where Brinley was waiting holding the balloon. So I have to say my segway to Wilkes in many ways was very much the influence of two men, my husband Brinley and also because of Brad because I had known him and respected him for a long time. So when that opening occurred at Wilkes it was in the location where Brinley lived, and it was in an area that I did want to do and was qualified to teach. So, that's how I ended

up at Wilkes. There's my path. I think forensics might be the theme there, the speech and forensics area. I don't regret not becoming a lawyer. I definitely am happy with the fact that I ended up making teaching my profession, and I love it. And Wilkes gave me a chance to grow in very creative ways. So, I retired not too long ago in 2017. So after 31 years at Wilkes I did retire and I have to say the teaching and the students I worked with still to this day continue to amaze me and keep me very vital and very lively. So for that I am very thankful. So that's my path, who's next?

CB: Great intro. Say something about the Wilkes speech tradition that preceded you, as well as what happened with you and Brad in the time that you were at Wilkes. Because it has a great history, and we've never talked about it in these interviews. Jane?

JE: I'm having trouble hearing.

CB: Let me get closer.

JE: Okay.

CB: If you could comment on the history and tradition in speech forensics at Wilkes. I knew Jesse Choper who really became a national champion.

JE: Right.

CB: He's back in the Eugene Roth generation, but, there's Arthur Kruger, I mean there's a long tradition which you and Brad were a part of. But, put that whole program into perspective as part of Wilkes.

JE: Well, as I said I first met Brad back in the 70s. It probably would have been around 1975 when I had just started coaching at Clarion. The Wilkes program had been well established. And you're right, there was a historical background in that program that went back to maybe, I thought, well I knew some people from the 50s and 60s but it probably goes back further. The reputation was very good. I know that when Brad took over in coaching he was told to keep the level of competition where it was. And for a small liberal arts college to compete at that level is rare. Unlike sports, it's not necessarily divided into leagues. But, ordinarily the smaller colleges did not compete against the biggest universities and Wilkes always did, and did very very well. And as I said I had for many years judged Wilkes students in competition, and I knew Donna O'Toole Sedor and I knew many of the people, Alfred Mueller and a lot of the people from the team. And they were excellent. They were always fun to be with. The Wilkes students and Clarion students got along, they ended up becoming friends. Brad and I also alternated being president of the state organization and at the national level as well. So, outside of the Wilkes community, in competitive forensics, Wilkes had a reputation that was very much at the national level. I think that's usually the first question that Brad stills asks me when we speak, and I just talked to him last month. He wants to know how the forensics team is doing and if they're doing anything these days, because it's a part of how he defined excellence. I think if you were to speak to any of the people on the Wilkes team they'd say the same thing. He was very powerful in terms of their influence, and a lot of people, I know some of the lawyers in the area [00:24:34] among others, will attribute Brad for giving them the kind of polish that they needed. So I was familiar with the Wilkes reputation, and probably would not have considered applying for that position when it opened if it hadn't been for Brad. That's what I said he was one of the reasons I came, and the forensics tradition. But they always competed in a level way beyond

the size of the campus. It wasn't unusual to be competing against the major universities and the Ivy League Schools. That happened pretty routinely.

CB: A theme that we've talked about, with almost everybody, is a sense of what Wilkes students were like. Obviously generalizing, but you've just said enough about a couple of the students in your experience, I mean you've been to several different institutions. How would you characterize the culture of Wilkes students and what they are like and how they develop in their time at the university?

JE: That's a good question and it's a unique one because I came from, as I said, the state system from Clarion. And there you've got a public institution and we always thought they were pretty much middle class students. The student life at Wilkes was different the minute the first day I was there. This was an interesting moment - the first group that I advised, and it was during a freshman orientation that first summer, I met with each student individually. And, getting to know a student and advising is one of the things that I think sets Wilkes apart from many other colleges. You establish a relationship that's personal, and it's not just that it's a teacher but it's a mentor. And I remember that the father of my one student, his name was Jason, at the end of the orientation when the parents are there that day he said "Here I want you to sign this paper" and I said "For what?" and he said "I want you to promise not to retire or leave before Jason graduates." He wanted me to verify that I would stay as his advisor. And I will say the advising role at Wilkes is somewhat underrated. I don't think it's appreciated for the level it should be, because you develop a relationship that goes outside of the classroom and you get to know the total student. You get to know not just their proven academic skills, but what are the areas they've thought about doing, where their fears are, and a lot of personal issues that have to be held in trust. And I think that that was one of the vital things that set it apart. And I think that my relationship with the students at Wilkes is probably what I appreciate the most. To this day I still maintain that they taught me more than I taught them. Just in terms of, especially technology, and boy could I use them these days. But they were always very respectful. I heard things I necessarily didn't want to hear in terms of what was going on in their lives, but there was trust that was there. And I think that advising expanded roles for mentoring really was one of the things that was set apart. I also noticed that in the classroom, while I would be teaching public speaking, as you all know, fear of public speaking is one of the biggest fears among people, and that's certainly true when you're teaching a public speaking class. Once they relax with that and are comfortable with it, most Wilkes students are very straight forward and very eager to work. They're willing to try new things and to learn. I always liked that, they would honestly come in and say "What can I do?" And I don't think I ever heard that from the students at Clarion or from other places. When does a student come in and say "What else can I do?" And, that just builds so much growth and potential. Many were first generation students, that was true, as I was you know when I went to college. But I don't know that they knew where they wanted to go career wise in the first year or two. Many changed, many grew, they evolved. But they were always willing to do that. And I always liked that, the fact that they were eager and willing to learn. Classrooms were lively. I don't think I had very many that were boring classrooms, and I wasn't the one who was the life of the party all the time. The interaction was very strong, and curious. So, I think that there was a vitality, and I think that might be the best word. The vitality, and eagerness to try new things I thought defined the Wilkes environment a bit more than what I had learned from teaching at Ohio and Pitt and at Clarion. I thought that was unique.

CB: Very interesting. Now you, in my days, you opened up a whole new field of communications and open relations.

JE: Yes.

CB: Why don't you tell how all of that began and what it turned into.

JE: Many of you know about Zebra. And, public relations for me, I got into that, and this gets back to the rhetoric background because I had been a speech writer and worked on political campaigns. And, organizing a political campaign is one of the more demanding, time conscious activities you can do. But when I got to Wilkes, PR was one of the areas where they asked me to come in and develop it because Brad said there really wasn't much in that area when I started. And, we started first with what is called the IABC. It's an institute for business communication, but eventually evolved into the PR society of America, it has a student chapter. But along the way, we organized what was called Zebra communications. It still exists as I understand it. Kalen Churcher is now advising it. It was founded in 1999, and it was a student-run PR agency that worked primarily with non profits in the Wilkes Barre community. In the 10-11 years that I worked with Zebra we had about 150 different clients. So you name the non profit, the Salvation Army, the Red Cross, the Ousterhout Library, and they probably were a client. They would approach or apply to get help from our students. To do maybe a fundraising event, or if they needed a new website. A more interesting one toward the end there, I didn't know there was a Wilkes Barre curling club. As in, what you see in the Olympics with the curling. I didn't know that, and most people didn't, so they wanted to know what we could do to make people aware that there was a curling club, and that kids and women could join. So, we had some interesting ones over the years, and I am very proud of the fact that the Wilkes Zebra organization raised hundreds of thousands of dollars for a lot of nonprofits. And meanwhile, they are learning professional level qualifications. At one point we would have as many as 15 different clients in a given year. And, so the PR started as one class where you work with actual clients. And working with the actual clients is what made it work so successfully. It was also community based, which I think is very important to Wilkes as well. So, out of that first PR class, and Jim if you remember, I taught it down in the basement of Capin Hall. If you remember when they still had classrooms in the basement.

JR: Oh, I forgot about that.

JE: Only for a year. After the first year we decided we weren't going to teach in the basement anymore. But that's where it was first taught. And, then, it evolved and we decided to organize it into a more structured organization. And it was modeled after a basic business pattern, and over the years it worked very, very well. The students would become the account team. I supervised it, but they basically were the ones who did it. And many will still tell you that that hands-on experience in Zebra is what got them into the job and the profession that they have now. So, it's one of the things I am most proud of, and I think that benefitted. We did some activities on campus as well, but basically it was community based. And we would sometimes have more applicants for getting help with certain events than we had students to do it. Usually there were about 25 to 30 students active in Zebra every semester, which is a lot for a campus the size of Wilkes. It was a large chapter. So, one of the things I think I can be most proud of. And as I said, as I understand it, it's still working. But by not being in person Kalen has had to scale back, and I don't even know if she has more than one client at the moment. But, that will change again in the fall once Wilkes goes back to in person classes, so that may change again. But Wilkes I think has benefitted and so has Zebra. But PR was one area that I was asked to develop, and the political communications as well.

CB: Now would you say that that was your major interaction with the Wilkes community, as a Wilkes faculty member? Thinking of the tradition of Wilkes, its very active in the community right from its beginning as BUJC.

JE: Again, I'm having trouble hearing. What was that about the community?

CB: Was the Zebra work that you do, was that your major interaction with the Wilkes Barre community as a faculty member from Wilkes?

JE: It was not my major one. The first year that I started, even the first semester, because I had been active with the League of Women Voters out in Clarion or the western part of the state. When I moved into the Wilkes Barre area, and I lived in the city for the first year and half, then after Brinley and I got married we moved out to Larksville. But, I joined the Wilkes Barre League of Women voters because that was something that I really benefited from. It was nonpartisan, and because of my background in debate I was often picked to be the moderator or negotiate the format for political debates. And when I joined it, the president of the Wilkes Barre League of Women voters happened to be Phyllis Mundy. And if any of you know Phyllis, she went on to become a state legislator for many, many years. And I was very lucky with the people with whom I interacted. And when they discovered that I had moderated debates, and I wasn't afraid to do it, they were thrilled. So fairly quickly I ended up becoming active in community politics. Not from a partisan point of view. The League of Women Voters is nonpartisan, and that's very important to me. And so we held a lot of public events, and I also benefited. The first year that I started at Wilkes in 1985, was the first year that Tom Biggler - well later it was January of that year - he became an endowed chair of Journalism. So, with his background in the media, he came in and introduced me to all sorts of people in the community. We had lunch with Max Rosenn my first week, and so I got to be very lucky in terms of meeting people you wanted to get to know in the Wilkes Barre region, largely through the League of Women Voters and Tom. Tom was wonderful. He had never taught before so I could be his mentor with teaching, and I was new to the Wilkes Barre area so he was my mentor in introducing me to the people in town. So I was very active in the community largely through the league and different organizations. The Chamber of Commerce was another one where I helped with them in terms of leadership in Wilkes Barre. And so, Zebra I think fits in that mind. Clearly I am one who is active in the community and I hope that doesn't change.

CB: Jim I want to turn to you. Let me just put in an insert here cause I've never said this before and I think it fits Jane's interview. Tom Biggler, when I arrived - because I arrived in '84 so we're just a year apart, Jane. He was the key news guy at channel 28, was it the NBC?

JE: It was 28, yes.

CB: Um, and, who was the [David Baltimore], was the CEO

JE: Yes.

CB: And he was going through a real recasting of that channel, and he was going to let Tom go.

JE: Yes.

CB: And one Sunday, the only time this ever happened in the 17 years I was there, my neighbor Gene Roth came to me and said “We’ve got to save Tom Biggler.” Well we were having real trouble with numbers of positions available. We were in tough shape financially. And I said, the only way to do it is to do an endowed chair.

JE: An endowed chair.

CB: So I began with Bernard, what’s his name Jim? The old, the guy that Tom Bigler had [inaudible]

JR: Oh. I keep thinking of Bernard Baruch but that’s obviously not it. [laughing]

JE: I don’t remember Bernard.

CB: He lived on the Sterling in an elegant apartment on the second floor of Sterling. And he and Tom, he was ailing and older, and Tom would have dinner with him. Almost every night. So it was a kind of devotion that was striking. And I got him to give 50,000, and that allowed me to go to David Baltimore who was not easy to get money from. And when I told him that Bernard had contributed 50,000, I got 50,000 from David Baltimore I don’t think we ever raised any more money for that endowed, so-called endowed chair than 100,000. And I think it was the first endowed chair, so called, at Wilkes. I may be wrong on that. But I, you know I didn’t even confer with Brad or the faculty at that time. It was kind of the leader of the board saying “You’ve got to figure out a way to do this.” So I kind of just threw myself into it, and of course fell in love with Tom Biggler.

JE: Yes.

CB: As with you, I worked with him on his first Syllabi. We went over it sentence by sentence, and he was so nervous about approaching students after having kind of commanded the public as he had done for decades. Anyway, It was one of the most rewarding, I think, relationships at Wilkes and I’ve never told that before. Gene Roth knows that because he was pushing me in the back to get out there and get these old guys who owed Tom so much and who had paid him so little to make it possible. And he ended up being one of our most distinguished teachers and he had a base at Wilkes that was really wonderful. And I just happened to be coming through town as he was dying. And I saw him twice, the day before he died and the day he died. And, when he was apparently in a coma, I mentioned my wife Jane and he started being active, trying to communicate. The two of them got in just fabulously. So your relationship and, hold on, I’m terrible at names. Our admissions director’s wife who took on his blindness, oh what was her name?

JR: Oh, Andrea France.

CB: Andrea France. So -

JE: Yes, Andrea.

TG: Yeah.

CB: So that was great and all, and Andrea France, if you tell the story, Tom Biggler, the two of them basically shepherd this man. I mean, how many years was it Jane? I mean he came in ‘85. He must’ve died around, well, I think I was already living in Hyde Park when he died.

TG: Oh yeah. No, no he was around when I first came and in fact I think it was 4 or 5 years. So 2005 or 6. Jane may remember, but I do remember the situation.

CB: And he was, his breakfast group was -

JE: Yes.

TG: Yep.

CB Mike Conyngham

JE: In the basement of Boscovs, right?

TG: Yeah.

JR: Yeah.

CB: Which was named for Sophia Lauren at one point.

TG: Oh really?

CB: We had a great portrait of Sophia Lauren. We had a torch club there and Tom was part of torch -

JE: Yes he was.

CB: I mean really, give us your word portrait, Jane, of Tom Biggler.

JE: Well he was a dearest friend and as I said he was my mentor. And I respect him in every way. And you mentioned even Andrea. His vision began to fail if you remember that, and he was still the column at least everyday, then twice a week for the Times Leader. But his vision was basically gone. He had macular degeneration. Andrea would come and read to him. Read articles in the different newspapers, the New York times or whatever. And then, he would dictate his column and she would write it. I mean, physically write it, he composed it. But she spent many years doing that. But Tom without a doubt, the timing could have been better for me as a newcomer to the community, not just Wilkes. He started in January after I started in August. So, roughly a semester apart. And our offices were next to one another, and thank goodness for that. In Capin Hall up on the second floor when we got out of the basement. And just anything about the community, plus he was the best informed and best educated person I knew. And, ironically he had never finished his college degree. He got it as an honorary degree eventually but because of the war he enlisted and never finished college at Ithaca. And I still maintain he's the most intelligent person I had ever worked with, and just a wonderful, wonderful person to introduce me to what's best about Wilkes Barre. And, he didn't hesitate to say "Jane, you should do this." You know, if there was something he would say "You should do this." And I would. It was like having another father, but more than that I'd think. He was really quite special, and our department benefitted from his prestige of having him as the Biggler Scholar abroad. And as you know, eventually we did establish a journalism conference in his name for high school students. That would attract 250 or more students to come in.

TG: Yeah, I remember that.

JE: And usually the keynote speaker was one of his former friends. They may be the head of MSNBC, they may be a writer for the New York Times, but they were all people that knew and respected Tom. So, his legacy still is pretty great in my opinion.

CB: Tim -

TG: Well I certainly wasn't aware of that.

CB: Tim, what's on your mind?

TG: Well, Jane, so I remember well you giving me my Wilkes pin when I first came to Wilkes, and I still appreciate that. But, you know it's interesting because if you look at the arch of your service at Wilkes, you really did evolve the program in which you worked significantly. And I'm just interested in how your mind worked. And indeed, as I recall when I left, the communications major was one of the largest at Wilkes.

JE: Right.

TG: And so, maybe you could talk about how you thought about that and how you made that happen. I'm sure you had to bring some people along with you as you did that.

JE: Well, I think you need to understand too that Brad Kinney played a huge role in a lot of that as well. He and I had similar backgrounds in terms of rhetoric, but different practice areas. Where I did more of the public relations part. But when I first was hired at Wilkes, we were combined with theatre. It was speech communications and theatre. Jim you may remember that, it was Mike O'Neill, you know he was one of the ones in the department with us. And then, after about 2 years there was a division. And it needed to happen, because communications was growing and was starting to grow, especially when we did introduce courses in what we now call the organizational or strategic field in PR. And the fine arts needed to be coordinated a bit better. And so, theatre split from communications, and what was once speech communications took on a broader scope. And, the areas of organizational strategic PR, those were new, and became very very popular. And that is one of the reasons why, Tim as you're saying, by about 2011-12 was one of the largest majors in the country, and it wasn't just mass media any longer, it was emerging. And I think we were smart enough to do that. And I will say, one of the other key parts was the development of the TV studio. It was in the basement of Stark, but it was fully equipped and it was impressive. The equipment was so good there that on two occasions we hosted state-wide gubernatorial debates that were broadcasted across the state. They were done in the Wilkes Barre, or the Wilkes TV studio. And also the government, or I'm sorry the governor of Pennsylvania did a town hall meeting. And so our TV studio was equipped so well and we had the good fortune of having Carl Brigido [00:47:32] and some excellent people to staff it. That also allowed our students, you know, to get hands-on with equipment that they would use when they went out and interned. And I will say we began, not requiring but pretty well pushing all communication majors to do internships, and that was key. We were always very hands on. And I think that's what set us apart from some of the regional colleges. I know in comparing with Misericordia, Kings, even the University of Scranton, back in the late 1990s and early part of the 20s, we had a more diverse curriculum. You could concentrate in journalism, you could concentrate in multimedia, you could concentrate in PR, you could concentrate in rhetoric. Most of the others did not have that breadth, where we did. And I think that that really has been a benefit. And I think

internships are still vital, and they always were in our department. Now when social media began evolving, and you're going to hear me say something critical here. Integrated media became a major, and, frankly, that should have been a part of the communications major rather than separate. Our students benefited from both, but I think they would have grown much better together if they had been able to. So I never did understand why they were separate. And the IMAD department is an excellent one, but the communications studies department and the IMAD should have been put together and they would have been one of the strongest in not just this region, it would have been even stronger. So there's my, my critical comment. And I worked with and taught courses in the Integrated Media department and benefited from it, learned a lot. And I never understood why they were separate, I never really did. So there's my comment on that.

JR: Jane -

TG: That's interesting Jane, that makes a lot of sense. Um, Jim did you have some thoughts on that?

JR: Yeah, I, in another area I wonder if you have any impressions of the future of journalism as a part of the communications program?

JE: That's a really good question Jim, and that's a question people are asking all over the country, about the future of journalism. Partially because it has become so ideologically oriented. And I'm looking at now not just print, but we also talk about broadcast journalism, and I think that's where the concentration needs to be. I don't think journalism can - I don't think we can afford to do away with it. And, we need to keep it as ethically grounded as possible in terms of telling facts, and progressing in that regard. And I know that that was always the approach for The Beacon. I thought The Beacon was very good for a campus paper, better than what we even see sometimes in terms of more commercial. But as newspapers are dying or going online and not doing well, the future of journalism is in doubt. But I think as much of that is because of the perceived political biases that everyone is retaining. And, I have to admit I don't know that I read any single paper for a source of information without being very critical of it and looking to see an alternative point of view. If it does exist and I hope it does, I think it's vital in the field of communications, we need to really ground it in ethics, and ground it in terms of fair journalism. And, yes it needs to be presented in social media, I'm not saying don't do that. I'm not that hardcore and old fashioned in print, but the content needs to be the focus. And I'm not sure I'm seeing that right now. I don't know what the enrollment is at Wilkes in the journalism concentration right now, I really don't. And they've got a very good person to head it. Kalen is excellent with that, Kalen Churcher. But right now I think that's a risk, and you know about weekly and daily papers closing nationwide on almost a weekly basis and that's not likely to stop. So I think that's a legitimate concern Jim.

TG: Yeah, it's interesting that you kind of point to the bias issue. But in some ways I think it may have to do with the financial model that just collapsed when, I guess you could say, social media stole a lot of their advertising revenue.

JE: Yeah, it did.

TG: And then they get into this spiral of trying to figure out ways to make money, and one of the ways is to be contentious. You can certainly see that in the cable industry now.

JE: Well I think that the loss of revenue is certainly the key. The advertising.

TG: But I couldn't agree with you more Jane on that the core, it's just, you even read the New York Times and the Washington Post which I do daily and you can see the bias there. And, it's unhealthy I think. I think they're both making efforts to get their editorial pages more balanced which is very interesting, but it's an industry we really need to figure out how to keep it in business because we certainly need it.

JE: If I might say, one of the, I think, important courses that has been taught, not just at Wilkes but certainly at Wilkes is a communication criticism course. Where the students are taught to look at everything that they read or see or listen to critically, and form their own judgement. And I think that's very important, and I'm not sure that's being emphasized enough. And I'm not just criticizing Wilkes at all in that regard, but I think just in general our population has lost sight of critical thinking and needs to do that. And with many of you I know we'd have a really heated conversation with what's going on in terms of Trumpism and the cults around the personality. That's the absence of critical thought. When you have people wrapped, just circling around a personality. And, I think our students need to definitely be concentrating on how do I form an informed and legitimate point of view that I can justify, rather than just do what people tell me to do. And I think that critical, communication criticism is vital.

TG: You could really teach that course well. You ready to come back out of retirement? Jane, this is supposed to be an interview but I just wanted to comment. I couldn't agree with you more. I don't know if you've picked it up, and I'm not sure I could find it but I've been looking at Gen Ed curriculum and some of the most thoughtful stuff that I've read on it - that is a core component now, of being able to look at important information. And being able to assess its objectivity and validity. And I really think that should be a required course, myself.

SC: Yeah, I can completely agree as a Librarian, so.

JE: Well I'm sure you do. [all laughing]

SC: Add that aspect. I've been listening in - I've been muting myself but I completely agree from a librarian, a reference librarian perspective. Teaching students how to vet sources has been a very big challenge in recent years. Especially with the, I think we've been changing our new freshman - I forget what it's called - FYF courses.

JE: Oh, the FYF.

SC: Yeah, so it's been kind of, I wish there was a core Gen Ed that really required students to take that on, so.

JE: I think that's a good idea.

CB: I've got two footnotes. One, is that my congress woman, it's a person named Elise Stefanik.

TG: Oh yeah!

CB: The local paper did not print my op-ed today.

TG: They didn't?

CB: They did not.

JE: They did not?

CB: They didn't. So I'm going to pursue that, and send it to some other papers. So anyway, as I deal with my prostate I'm trying to deal with my mind as well. Secondly, just to insert the name in this history is Tom Shellburg, because Tom is the one that got us the money for the TV studio. And he also was probably the leading man in the whole environmental movement, earth day and so on, in northeastern Pennsylvania.

JE: Right.

CB: And the Pennsylvania environmental council was his baby, and getting him to lend his enthusiasm and his resources was very important, and Tom Bigler was part of that.

JE: Yes. Yeah, he was.

CB: And the two of them were great friends. If no one else has anything more to say on this topic I want to get you into faculty governance and the issue, as you look at your three decade career, it's always been an issue. Every campus I've been a part of it's been an issue. But, how did you see the evolution of faculty governance and its relationship both with the administration, and with its trustees.

JE: That's really an excellent question. One, remember I said some things struck me very quickly that were unique to Wilkes compared to what I was used to in the state system, which was unionized. And one of the first things that surprised me was faculty did not chair their own meetings and didn't even draw up their own agendas. The administration did, and that was still the case when I first started. It took a little while before faculty could actually chair or preside at their own faculty meetings. The other thing, this wasn't really governance but it's an observation that tied into governance eventually. When I started at Wilkes there was one female who held the rank of full professor on the entire campus, one. And that was Waygia Taylor and I gather that she is still there teaching. But she was the only one. And it became very evident that the year I started there had been some difficulty the year before with I think primarily nursing faculty being denied promotion and tenure. So there was a lot of discussion going on when I first set foot on campus about sexual discrimination and the difference in terms of women and male faculty. So there were a couple of things that hit me very quickly. It did take a little while, but thanks to some of you, faculty and the faculty affairs council emerged. And, not only were they entitled to preside at their own meetings and the drove their own agenda, we redid the structure of committees so that the committees had a chance to talk to one another, and the chair of the FAC was then sort of in charge of all the committees and knew what was going on. It took a while to evolve. And I know Jim, you'll remember that when [?? 00:59: 10], that we had a women's faculty caucus that was founded in, I think it was 1987. But, by '86 we were already meeting informally after that really contentious year in terms of women not feeling that they had a fair chance to get promoted. And the faculty women's caucus, Anne Kolanowski was the first chair of it. But it was very well attended, and I think what shocked a lot of people is we did our own study in terms of salary differential, and I was told "How can you do that? We don't talk about salaries." And I surprised some people and I said that the women in the women's caucus decided to voluntarily bring in their contracts. And so we knew what women were being paid and we shared it with each other, and then it was really hard to refute what we were doing. And, we also decided because there was so many problems in some areas, that we would begin supporting one another in other ways. We began sitting in and doing classroom observations of each other. Not even in our department, I know I did in engineering

more than anything which was sort of unique. And we would write up a classroom observation just as you do in a regular tenure promotion process. But here, if you were observing me and you were a biology professor, I could take that letter and put it in my file for tenure, or I could throw it away if I wanted and it wasn't formal. And we found it very helpful to hear what other people outside thought. I would be asked how can I improve my classroom delivery and if I could help a colleague do that. And this caught on, and faculty women benefited a great deal, and we got to know each other better outside of our individual departments. And, the women's faculty caucus formalized. I had the good fortune of being secretary for a while, then chairing it. And, I knew more about what was going on in biology and chemistry than I ever would have if it wasn't for that. And if you remember, some of the men noticed that we were helping each other by sitting in on classes and they said "Why can't we do that?" Meaning the men. And, eventually faculty mentoring became part of the tenure promotion process campus wide, not just women. So, I think that was part of the interpersonal part that went on. It also affected governance, because now that we knew each other we could nominate one another for committees and have a bigger voice, and I think that did help. When you talk about the governance relationship thinking back, oh gee when would this have been? About '93, '94, I think I was FAC chair at the time. When we were going through a strategic planning community, Jim, Paul, you were both on it. Chris I know you knew of it but I'm not sure you sat on it at that point because of being ex-officio. But, it was an interesting time. We called it the SLURP committee, and there were at least three board members. I remember Rick Ross and Gerry Moffett, and I'm pretty sure [? 01:02:21]. I don't remember if Steve Ross was or not. Jim, do you remember?

JR: It was, I don't think Ellie was on it. I think it was 3 but I don't remember who now.

JE: Well I know I spent most of my time working with Gerry Moffot and Rick Ross. And Gerry was living in Florida at the time I remember. But, the other faculty were Fred Sullivan and Bonnie Bedford.

JR: Bonnie was on it.

JE: And I think maybe, who was from business at that point? I think Barbara Loftus was the business representative. But I remember having head-to-head conversations with Rick Ross especially about the faculty's role in campus governance. He wasn't a big fan of it originally. And, I think we learned to respect each other's point of view a great deal through that committee. And I know Gerry was one who was very active and was very interested. And we drew up the shared governance model and I think that that was the real key. And, originally when faculty were to attend the Board meetings, they didn't report. They didn't give a report, they still didn't answer any questions or say anything. I know that changed when we had the Strategic Planning Committee, and the faculty representative to the board was allowed to speak and give a perspective, and there was a discussion on it. I think some dialogue opened up, that probably had not before. I think the question that a lot of board members always had was "What do faculty want? What is it you need?" And so those discussions were vital. And, I know that that particular strategic planning committee made some real forward progress in terms of mutual respect between board and faculty rather than hostility. And, I think that that was probably better than what you see sometimes in the more collective bargaining organized campus. But, that was my perspective of it and I knew many members of the board because of having been FAC chair for a number of terms. But it didn't necessarily come easy. That took a while to evolve, and I think it took the faculty a while to evolve to that too. But Jim, you were very active in that committee at that point too. What do you recall from that?

JR: Well, it was a very collegial group. I think we made a very, very detailed study of the whole campus.

JE: Yeah, we did.

JR: I think we had very good statistics that largely were provided by [Cheryl ?

JE: Yeah.

JR: And I think on the whole it came out with some reasonable conclusions.

JE: Well I do too, and I always thought that that was one of the most productive ones that we had had. And I remember the long debate when, it was growing out of some budgetary concerns of course, and the debate over where do you begin in terms of trying to get a reasonable budget? It was a hard debate but we concluded that the last thing that we want to cut away was at the heart of Wilkes' mission, and that was the faculty and the teaching. And so that was a last resort. Although we did reorganize, it wasn't "Let's cut off faculty first." If you remember, and I know Jim you heard the heat and so did I, when we collapsed the schools or combined them. And it was arts and sciences together, and a lot of people weren't happy about that, but it reduced the number of Deans without cutting faculty. It didn't last forever, but I think it was critical at that particular time. And, I always was very thankful that we had the people that we did. But I thought that was a productive committee and I do think, moved us more toward a shared and more respectful shared governance system. Where it was no longer the faculty totally being dominated or being told what to do, but they did have a voice. I think a respectful one, I think it was one where there was mutual respect.

JR: Yes.

JE: At least that's how I walked away from it.

TG: I think Jane, just if I could say you were a critical player in the constructive nature of those discussions.

JE: Well thank you.

TG: I want that to be on the record.

JE: Thank you.

TG: Yeah, I think unless you've been on a campus where there's collective bargaining it's hard to appreciate how good things are at Wilkes. I think they to some degree remain that way.

JE: Yeah, I agree.

TG: It's still tough, but it's a very different kind of relationship. And I know, I think SLURP may have been a little later than the dates you gave because I was aware of it when I came in. I think I had that report to read and to study, and I think there were some things that Gerry - Oh gosh that's embarrassing, we just talked about him.

JR: Moffitt.

JE: Yeah, Moffitt.

TG: That Gerry Moffit wanted to accomplish. Because he really did, I think learn a lot from that interaction. So I just point that out. I hope I'm historically accurate, and Chris might know more than I but I do remember those recommendations.

CB: There was a strategic planning committee going on at the time that we had our difficult middle states visit.

JE: Right.

CB: It wasn't quite complete at the time of the visit, which is one of the places we got zinked. But, I think when you use the SLURP acronym, I think that goes back -

JE: Further.

TG: Well I've just never forgotten it.

CB: Maybe we kept that, for one, for several strategic meetings. We always had a strategic planning committee.

JE: Right.

CB: You know, we started my first year there and then there were iterations of it as we went along, and as we hit crises we would then renew it. The admissions crisis of the mid 90s, what brought it back into existence, and I wonder if that wasn't the period that what we call SLURP -

JE: I think it was, Chris.

TG: Yep, that makes sense Chris. It does, yeah.

CB: We had major board participation on that. I mentioned this before, Jerry Goldstein was on the recruitment and retention committee. He would meet with us by phone on Monday mornings. I think that was the period when [? 01:09:45] was back on one of his tours of duty at Wilkes. But I think your perspective is very helpful. I guess I, and maybe this is something Suzanna will cut out, but just to put the perspective on the role of women.

JE: Yeah.

CB: The most outrageous example when I got there was Pat Heaman. And I spent considerable political capital with the English leadership to take that case on and follow it all the way through to a full tenure line appointment, and tenure for Pat. And that to me is the example that opened up the picture that you're talking about.

JE: Yeah.

CB: I mean, it was outrageous.

JE: I agree.

CB: But before you got there, my first year I saw that the issue was that the department chairs were barons. They had no power broadly with the faculty, but they had tremendous power in their departments. And they controlled the tenure, and the appointment, the tenure and the promotion decisions. This is not true of most departments, but there were three or four where these chairs had been there forever, and they really were outrageous. And so my challenge was to make the department chairs themselves the first strategic planning committee, and they did a great job. They came up with the three divisions and the three deanships. So, giving up power to the deans was something that entered into collectively, and one of the recommendations is that there would be three year terms for department chairs. And I think that became a great safety belt of the institution.

JE: Yeah I agree.

CB: And that allowed us to take on the issue of women. Of course, in the AAUP censure, I can't give you the numbers now but if Bob were here he probably could. But, the number of women who were aggrieved, or the number of faculty who were the aggrieved individuals were dominantly women, who had been cut off because of the flood, and they had been serving for more than 7 years. Which by AAUP 1940 tenure policy meant that they should have been either fired, or given tenure.

JE: They should have been, yeah.

CB: So that whole system was there for me to have to deal with, right from the time I got there, cause we were under AAUP censure when I arrived. For that and for the renewal of tenure, which the board imposed before I got there. It reflected their impatience with the faculty. So we had a kind of armed camp when I arrived between trustees and faculty.

JE: Yes.

CB: Without a viable faculty governance system that could do any interacting. So I regard my first year there, which is crucial in starting the process that you've so well described. And part of it was to bring in, from my Sangamon State background in Illinois -

JE: Right.

CB: A five year review, which really allowed some faculty interaction around where one wanted to go professionally as an individual faculty member. And one of the key parts of that is that you did your own review -

JE: Yes.

CB: And you shared that with a three person committee, one of whom had to be outside of your department, so we were dealing with the interaction of cross disciplines. And we gave people the option if they didn't - tenured faculty now - if they didn't want to go through that evaluation they could work at an early retirement. And I don't remember, Jim, how many people we got out of that but we got a very healthy number.

JR: Yes we did.

CB: It opened up all kinds of departments for some new hires. So I'm sorry to sketch that history but it was there just before you arrived Jane, and I thought it was -

JE: Yeah, I was going to say, I did the five year review and I thought it was helpful. I didn't realize it had just been put into effect the year before I came.

CB: I did it as a negotiation between the trustees and the faculty.

JE: And the faculty, yes.

CB: You may have remembered, Jim, in a faculty meeting, I opened this up very openly and I said "I think I can get the trustees to back off tenure too, if you will adopt the five year review for tenured faculty." And we did both. We did the five year review, led by Max Rosenn, who I had to persuade in his chamber. They backed off tenure too and that allowed us to deal with one half of the AAUP censure. The other part was the individuals who had been let go without declaring financial decisions, which we didn't do after the flood. They had the [? 01:15:46] but we didn't declare it, so they were being fired with over seven years of experience which was a real red flag to the AAUP.

JE: Yeah.

CB: So I just wanted to say there was a little [? 01:16:01] just before you got there that may have slipped into the darkness in terms of our history.

JE: You know, and to use the term tenure too is somewhat startling.

TG: Yeah, I heard about that too Chris. And you know, the judge never quite gave up on that issue.

CB: Oh, I know, but that was where I really forged my relationship with him. I said, "Max, you just got to understand the academic culture, and I am a product of it." You got to know that what you're asking for, that's at the very heart of academic freedom.

JE: Of academics, yeah.

TG: Yeah, I remember, and I don't know the date, and I don't think Jim was around but, we had another one of those flare ups with the board and it was interesting. I don't know about your time Chris but in my time, and I think this is true of most boards, there were four or five people who really were the thinkers on the board. And frankly, held most of the power. And they came at us on this issue, and I - talk about memory Chris, and I'm not even under treatment. Probably should be. But, in any event we had this discussion and the provost was very opposed to any kind of modification of our existing process, and as was I. But the person who really sort of shut down everything was Jay Sidhu. And I think, he wasn't chair at that time, but he just said "You cannot tell these people who know the culture how best to do it. I see a good process here and I think that's what we should stick to." And that sort of just shut down the discussion.

CB: Oh I'm really glad to hear that, I didn't know that.

TG: Yeah, Jay was - it's funny because you have different kinds of board chairs, and Jay was a great board chair but he, because he was so busy, was not as hands on as some of the other board chairs. But boy, when I had a serious crisis Jay seemed to know it was happening and was there. It was very helpful.

CB: He was a brilliant administrator, really most unusual.

TG: He's still, I mean he literally remade himself after he was asked to leave his bank.

CB: Sovereign Bank.

TG: Yeah, Sovereign Bank. And he, you know, he drifted around a little bit and then started his own bank and that bank is cleaning up right now. Although he is very much involved in the situation in India and I don't know if you've talked to any friends you have in India but it is just a disaster, it's much worse than reported.

CB: On the other side, the emergence of Indian Americans into leadership positions is one of the remarkable facets of our lifetime.

TG: They're literally, and thank goodness they are, everywhere.

CB: Everywhere.

TG: They're really capable people, absolutely.

CB: And part of it, and I don't want to detract from talking to, from getting Jane's story.

TG: Yeah this is off [laughing]

JE: No, no.

CB: And it relates to Jay, that the complexity of Indian Culture, and the many layers of it. Meaning the people who come out of that background have a kind of extra sense of issues in our own culture that many of us don't see.

JE: That we don't see, right.

CB: That they can move into a situation and bring it kind of extrademen with a different kind of temperament. It's not to say that all Indians are like that, we have had enough at Wilkes in my years to know that there are some that don't kind of rise to that level. But there are a lot of Indian American people on the faculty at my time who really were first rate -

JE: Right.

CB: In this regard, and Jay with his emotional intelligence you know, saw through to the kind of challenges of leadership in this culture. And he was able to apply it within that very unusual bank. Which, as you know Jane was in Reading, located in Reading.

JE: Yes, yes.

CB: Um, well I want to say a little more about the -

TG: Just so we can be accurate here, Jay would say Wyomissing but [laughing]

JE: He'd be specific.

CB: But who's parochial? [all laughing]

JE: Ohhh.

TG: I don't, by the way I don't know where that new bank, Customers Bank, is headquartered, but apparently they're doing everything a bank should do. You know you sit down, take a clean sheet of paper approach to thinking about what a bank should be, and, as a result, they're doing really well. But just one other quick story on Jay, because we don't talk enough about alumni like him. Jay was asked to leave Sovereign Bank because he was trying to build a larger, truly sound bank, but the people on the bank board wanted to take short-term profits. The conflict ended with Jay standing his ground and having to leave the bank. But after he did that he took the money he got, and we're talking a hundred and fifty million dollars, and guess where he invested it?

CB: I can't.

TG: First Union and Wachovia Banks--both failures in the Great Recession. No one, including Jay, imagined such a catastrophic set of circumstances. As a result, for a short period, Jay was nearly penniless.

JR: Wachovia.

TG: Wachovia. He put his money in Wachovia, and literally lost most of the fortune, right. And he also had an obligation cause he got his brother out of something and that was quite a few billions as well. Anyway, he's turned all of that around. It's just amazing to see somebody who you know, and I saw him when he kind of hit the depths and he was really reflecting. But he, it's that emotional intelligence that you discussed Chris that really brought him through, and he's doing well now.

CB: Now, before I forget it, and I've never thought of this before. We might at some point, just the two of us, record our discussion on our experience with our board chairs.

TG: It would be a good idea. Because they really -

CB: They're crucial. And I think that when it's preserved with confidentially

TG: For me at least, and I don't know about you Chris, it would basically be a great story.

CB: Mine would be with two exceptions.

TG: Oh yeah, I'm sorry.

CB: I had thirteen board chairs. Not all at Wilkes but in my experience. And I had two that, one of them was going through a crisis himself which he imposed on us as a board chair, with his nervousness and his panic. But I think it is so critical in organizations like ours, the relationship between the president and the board chair. That, you and I could really say a lot that could be valuable in the future. It would not be

stuff that I would want in public. Whereas almost everything we've said in this interview up until now, and Suzanna I'm very comfortable with being shared with people who want to do the history of Wilkes.

TG: Well, anyway we need to get back to Jane and I am completely at fault for this. So, we'll move back to the important agenda for today.

CB: You know one of the things that we've asked people, and I've done it with you with Tom Biggler, is to get your sense of some of the major people. We almost all have talked about [? 01:25:23], and given what you said about course monitor colleagues you may want to add to that.

JE: Oh, there would be a lot.

CB: In your faculty leadership role, you really dealt with almost all of the key faculty figures. In my, you would have been, 16 of my 17 years we shared. We have interviewed Owen Fout. We interviewed Wagih Taylor, we just interviewed Terry Wignot.

JE: Oh good.

CB: Les Turoczi.

JE: Les Turoczi I heard about before I started teaching at Wilkes.

TG: Oh really?

JE: Yes, his influence on the medical staff. Doctor Stanley Lobitz, my first family doctor in Wilkes Barre was one of his pre-med students. And the first thing he said was "Oh you're at Wilkes. You're going to see Dr. Turoczi". And so Les, and not just his sense of humor, that didn't hurt either. But, he apparently had a very vital role in shaping a lot of people who went on to go to med school and became doctors. And I hear it from more than one, not just the one family doctor. And so he's one who I think has had an influence well beyond just the campus in some ways.

CB: And in the generation before him it was Chuck Rife. The two, they were doctor producers.

JE: Yes. Right.

TG: Well Jane you would sort of appreciate that Les was such a great audio file.

JE: Uh-huh. And would talk about it all the time.

TG: [laughing]

JR: He liked food too.

JE: Remember I said one of the benefits of the women's faculty caucus was I got to go in and observe what happened in the classroom in chemistry and in engineering, and math and computer science. Not just with the women's faculty but then I meant my colleagues there. And that was always I think a real benefit. Just from the very beginning some of the people - Well remember I mentioned Ann Kolanowski in nursing, she was the chair. And, I thought for the years before she moved on from Wilkes, I thought she played a significant leadership role and probably wasn't necessarily regarded as such campus wide,

and should have been. Anne Batory, there were, Pat Heaman, you know both Pat and Bob. But I worked probably a little more closely with Bob when he became dean, but Pat was always, you know, just a colleague that I respected in every way. And was very close to my own department, I think you know that. We were a very cohesive communications department. I was always fortunate that I got to work with colleagues that I liked as individuals and respected as professionals, and that wasn't always the case. I ended up mediating a lot of disputes occasionally on campus. But yes, Les Turoczi he was one of the people that I thought played a key role, and always would. And as I said Anne Batory to this day remains a close friend, and we would compare the difference and the similarities in marketing and PR, and her Marketing students and mine. And they overlapped a lot, so that was very good. In theatre I thought there were some. Mike O'Neill originally, when I was there. And I think there was later some in terms of the music and the arts. Sharon Cosgrove still is one of the more, I think, classified artists. But also as a colleague was very supportive of almost any kind of humanities activity and scholarship that was going on. Just so many, but there were some people that played key roles. I remember Ken Pidcock when he became secretary for the faculty, when I was one of the terms for FAC chair. Ken had one of the most astute, logical minds in terms of structure. If things weren't making sense all I'd have to do was look at his face and I could read in his nonverbal that somebody was about to go off track. And, that kind of insight was very, very helpful. Mike Steele, you know, just a wonderful scholar, and also one who would show up at the door say "Jane, you need to be aware, here's an issue that's occurring that may come up at the faculty meeting." And I would quite often have colleagues from every department or almost every department come and candidly share insights and ask for advice. So there was a repore, there was a comradery. And I think that that developed once the faculty felt comfortable that within the faculty affairs council and general faculty meetings, that what they had to say mattered. That it wasn't just for form, that it honestly is an area where some pretty heated discussions could occur, and I think that was very helpful. Tom Baldino, just the sense in terms of politics, and I mean you know, both organizational politics and also broader. Just a very, very bright, astute man, one of the most articulate. So there were some, I think pretty key people there. On FAC I was very fortunate to get to work with, we worked it out so that there were people who were at different ranks, so we would have some newer faculty who would be also involved, and I think that that allowed us to get some new ideas as they came up as well. Like I said I feel very fortunate. I will say I think the one thing I always told the FAC chairs when they came up, is learn your parliamentary procedure. If you don't know how to run a meeting you're in deep trouble. And, that became very clear a couple of times when I would sit in on the school of pharmacy and their meetings. And we didn't mention that yet, and I think it needs to be. One of the keys not only to turning around what had been a declining enrollment for a while, but also I think broadening some of the science strengths at Wilkes which I think were already there, was the development of the school of pharmacy. And, Brad Kinney and I were very fortunate that we actually taught in that school of pharmacy for three years. And people often would say to Bernie Graham when he was the first dean "How did you get the two most senior speech people to teach in the school of pharmacy?" And he said "I asked them." And he made his point. And really working in pharmacy I thought was very, very eye opening and very helpful. We taught their version of an oral competency and interpersonal, that professional pharmacists need to know. So we developed the competencies and skills and the ways to measure it, and then we taught them, so there were units in it. And so for, as I said, for 3 years Brad and I taught in the school of pharmacy, and that was an eye opening experience too. I met so many bright, young faculty who were professionals and scientists, who had no clue what academic procedure was, or "How do I go about this thing called tenure" because it was brand new. It was a new culture to many of them. And so that was, I think an area of

growth and I think obviously one that has strengthened Wilkes overall. I assume the school of pharmacy is still doing well.

TG: Yeah it's uh, the whole field of pharmacy has had a huge influx of schools wanting to get into that area. And so, enrollment demand is not what it used to be, but the Wilkes program is still I believe holding its own. And they are now actually talking about doing a low residency pharmacy program, which could be really beneficial for the program and for Wilkes. They are operating now a low residency nursing program, and that has just been, Jane I don't know if you - you probably still are talking to people on campus, but it appears to have taken Wilkes quite a ways towards solving some financial problems they had a couple years ago.

JE: Well I'm not surprised, good, I'm glad to hear that. But I would think that residency, and clinical right now must have been very difficult in the past year and a half.

TG: Oh they are, they are. Both in nursing and in pharmacy, so. But on the other hand the need is so great, particularly for nurses that the medical community is really doing a whole lot more than they used to.

JE: Right, right. Cause you mentioned, I don't even know if I mentioned this, my one niece, she's my god daughter, she actually got her nursing degree from Wilkes and she works at Geisinger South in pediatric nursing. But she keeps me up to date when Wilkes nursing students come there to do clinicals and what's going on. But, some of the more impressive people I met - Annie Lynn.

TG: Oh, yeah.

JE: If you remember Annie when she chaired the pharmacy practice division. A very good friend, we still stay in touch to some degree. And Bernie. I knew Bernie very well, but I thought Annie was one who brought a lot of leadership. And having a female head of that program, in the sciences, I thought was a smart move at that particular time. And in nursing Debbie Zbegner was another one who I think stands out, you know just in terms of skill as a leader, and also within nursing. So, there were some people that I felt fortunate that I got to know.

TG: She's the one who's leading the charge on this new, actually she's the Dean of nursing.

JE: Debbie is?

TG: Yeah, Deb.

JE: I'm not surprised. I'm glad to hear that, and she'll be fine with that because she could always think long term. And, working with colleagues from different departments and committees on FAC for example, I thought was one of the better parts of faculty governance. That you really do build respect or different points of view. And anything that allowed that to happen I think strengthened us overall as a faculty.

CB: How about your thoughts on some other major personalities like Bing Wong?

JE: Uh, I got along okay. Not really, I don't remember too much specific at this point about Bing Wong.

TG: Boy Jane I am glad you can't see my face.

JE: You're shocked?

TG: Just shocked.

JE: Well there's some things you forget about, and you probably want to.

CB: How about Bill Stine?

JE: Bill Stine?

CB: Yes.

JE: I, I got along fine. I expected certain things to come out, and they would. But, I got along okay.

TG: [laughing]

CB: We just had a wonderful interview session with Anne Batory.

JE: Oh, yes.

CB: So we share your affection for her, and admiration.

JE: Absolutely.

CB: She really enjoyed it. She wrote a wonderful note to me afterwards about how much she enjoyed it. Say something about the campus, just the physical campus. You watched -

JE: Oh it changed, yeah. It changed a great deal. The first place where my office was was in what's now Capin Hall, and I was not used to a campus that had historical buildings, or that kind of traditional background. Because if you've been on many of the state universities they're all general construction, and they're all brick and mortar and that's about it. There is nothing terribly unique about them. Now, Bloomsburg has a few that are still historical but many of them do not. So I loved the Wilkes Campus, the fact that there was a history behind the buildings. Weckesser is gorgeous, and many of the others. But it has changed. I think for maybe less than a year the old bookstore was still on campus, and it was for people to pick up mail, and then that disappeared. And then there was a lot of new construction going on, and I think for the most part very nice. And I remember teaching down in the conference center for one course, and I asked for it. I said "At least I'll get out of the office and walk a while." You know, to get down there. And then when we began upgrading the classrooms so that everyone could have access to computers and also make it easier to work with, that was a big improvement but it was a little gradual in coming but I think it did come. The student center was a big highpoint I think when it came as well. And unfortunately, I retired months before the communications department moved into the Karambelas center. So although we had been working on it and getting the department all under one roof rather than scattered on campus, it had a beautiful design to it, but I never got to be there or to teach there. But I understand from what Evene Estwick and everyone tells me that they love it. That just being near each other, where in the past the com department was split all over campus, and so that's a really big plus as well. The campus has grown, it's I think better, eh it's prettier. In terms of the architecture and also the caring of the grounds, although they were always pretty good. I think the campus is a very attractive one, and one you

enjoy being on. And like I said, it does not look like a generic, brick kind of setting, and I think that's one of the things that makes the Wilkes campus nice. Some of the science buildings, the sign is still in Stark, varied depending on what floor you were on, you know and what was there. I don't think they teach anything in Capin Hall anymore, and that was an interesting one. You know, where you would teach in one of the older buildings on campus. But I think that history being preserved as well as updating and making it relevant, and the new constructions that are around, I think that the campus itself is very attractive. And I haven't set foot on campus in over a year you know, so I'll have to come back and see if that's still true. How's the library, Suzanna?

JR: Loaded with computers.

SC: Yes, loaded with computers. It's actually been pretty busy here. Lots of students. I think it's a way to get out of their rooms during the pandemic, just to study and go to the different floors, so.

JE: Well I know for a while the Library was one of the ones that was on the list to be upgraded. Not, I don't mean to be built onto or anything but that it needed to have some refurbishing done, and just wondered if that actually did happen you know, but. I think the campus has grown a lot. There was this one year, I don't know if we've spent a full year, but they were trying to figure out where to put the communications department and were renovating what was going on in Capin. We went down and there was a Ben Franklin Hall, and we were up on the second floor. That was a unique experience. You had 6 or 7 communications faculty basically in one room, with slight dividers between it. We had a good time, and it was loud, but it wasn't necessarily a place you would want to be. But, it was temporary housing, and that was a good thing before we moved back into the renovated Capin, so that was an improvement.

JR: Where was Ben Franklin Hall?

JE: Um, on the corner. Next to the corner. Am I getting the name wrong Jim?

JR: I don't recognize it.

CB: I don't think we ever had a Ben Franklin hall.

JE: No, Franklin formally was Capin Hall.

TG: Oh really?

JR: Yeah, Franklin was the original name for Capin Hall.

JE: Yeah, right. I knew that.

CB: Okay, now I have been waiting the entire time to ask you this question. Did you and Brad ever use the John L Lewis speech on the front of Capin Hall for rhetoric?

JE: I don't think so. He spoke on the front of Capin Hall?

CB: There's a huge plaque on the front of Capin Hall which is John L Lewis at this rhetorical best, taking in mine owners. And almost every visitor I've brought to campus, we've stood in front of it and I said "You have to read the whole thing."

JE: The whole plaque?

JR: The whole plaque. It is purple prose, it is wickedly telling. It is a Welsh American union man's. Have you ever read it Tim?

JR: Yeah.

TG: Actually he's asking me. He knows you've read it Jim [laughing]. No, no I have not.

CB: Well the next time you're on campus, do it.

TG: I will.

JE: Yes! I will.

CB: It's remarkable. I spent a big part of my time on Francis Perkins. I have a Francus Perkins and John L Lewis story which I tell all the time. So when I found this on the Wilkes campus, you know I saw it when I first came. And I thought wow. And then there's that Mosaic in Stark in the wall, in that archway that is from ancient, it begins with A. Not Aleppo. But that was a gift, or I think it was, came from Walter Carpenter. I think we have that on loan from Princeton University, and it's embedded in the wall. It's about 3 feet by 2 feet, maybe a little bigger than that. I've never heard anyone talk about it, but it's part of the ancient word that is encased in that building. This is the new Stark part that faces out on the River.

TG: Right.

JE: Hm.

CB: I haven't talked about it much because I didn't want to raise the issue that maybe Princeton wanted it back.

JE: Oh, good point.

CB: It was part of the ancient world.

TG: Have you mentioned that before Jim? Because the Princetom connection rings a bell and that they might want it back. Do you know if you've mentioned it since we've been doing this history thing?

CB: I don't think I have, I don't think I have. I regard it as somewhat sensitive because it's one of those things that I'm not sure if there is anyone around who knows or who remembers the terms under which we got it. Suzanna, have you ever seen any reference to, or do you know what i'm talking about? I guess she's not -

SC: Hello?

CB: Suzanna do you know the mosaic that is sealed in the walls of Stark?

SC: Oh yeah! From Princeton. Yeah we have been trying to restore it. Well so, we were to actually figure out what the - it's on permanent loan from Princeton. And Paul Riggs had been working with their special collections department.

CB: Good.

SC: Because we could either restore it, but that's going to cost a lot of money. Or, we could give it back to them. And, I think we were trying to figure out the terms of how long we can keep it, because obviously no one wants to pay thousands of dollars to restore these, just to give it back in like 2 years, 3 years. So, I think right now there's negotiation happening now about that. But there's I guess plans to restore these mosaics, potentially.

CB: Glad I mentioned it.

JE: So someone from Princeton donated it?

SC: Yes, it was a part of our relationship I believe. We actually used to have a lot of relationships with Princeton university with um -

CB: Was it Walter Carpenter?

SC: He sounds familiar.

CB: Walter is the one that gave the money for Stark Hall, and honored admiral Stark in the gift. It was an anonymous gift of IBM stock. And somehow I associate that as being a part of the - I don't know if Walter Carpenter was Princeton. He was not Wilkes, but he was one of our major benefactors, perhaps the biggest single gift we had at that point to make the investment in the sciences. Well Jane, what would you like to share or to ask of any one of us any topic that you think is important in the life of Wilkes or in your own experience. Oh I know what I wanted to ask you about was Chautauqua.

JE: Was what?

CB: Chautauqua.

JE: Oh!

CB: I don't think Tim maybe knows about that -

TG: No.

CB: That's been an important part of your life, describe your role.

JE: Chautauqua is considered to be one of the best public speaking platforms in history in the United States. It's in western New York near Erie, on the New York side. They were one of the few public forms where people could speak on almost any kind of issue and not be harassed, or arrested, or have stones and eggs thrown at them if they were taking a radical position. It's been around for a very, very long time. So far 9 presidents have spoken at Chautauqua, and back in 1996 I got a call from a former student of mine, and she asked if I would be interested in being the lead speaker for a week where they were talking about basically open expression and humanities. I was very honored, and I said yes. Then four years after that I was invited back a second time when they invited us to be a whole week of speakers into the archives of Chautauqua, and wanted to discuss some of the orators or the oratory that was mentioned there that doesn't get enough attention. So I contacted Brad Kinney, he was one of the people I invited to join us that week, my favorite professor from Ohio University who has since passed away, Paul Boas, and a

former colleague. So we each had one day where we spoke about someone from their archives that we wanted to discuss and create our own theme on that. So, twice I had the opportunity and the honor to be the keynote speaker at Chautauqua in New York. It is considered to be one of the best platforms around. And here's another message to learn, many of us benefit from the high places our former students arrive in. My former student from Clarion, she was on the forensics team there, she's now the Vice President in charge of the lecture series at the institution. She's the one who called and said I want to invite my two favorite teachers, one from grad school and you, Jane. They need to know that faculty and academics, not just politicians, have a lot to say. So, that was an honor. It's an outdoor amphitheater and it seats about 2500 people. They have music, they have dance, they have the arts. It was designed as the summer getaway for Sunday school teachers in the 19th century. They would take their families there on the lake and relax and study. They could be part of a choral group or poetry or lectures to instill people to think . There's always open discussion after every speech, and it's just a very big honor. So, I was very, very flattered by that and had the good opportunity to speak twice and bring some colleagues along as well. I hope to get back again, now this past year -

CB: Who were the people you focused on, the two 19th century speakers?

JE: For me I focused on suffragists who had not been able to get a fair hearing. One was Carrie Chapman Catt and the other was Susan B Anthony. Well, Susan B Anthony grew up near Chautauqua, so she was very familiar with it. But, when she started advocating on behalf of women getting the right to vote it was more common that she would get eggs thrown at her than get a polite audience. And so, Chautauqua was considered to be a civil setting. I combined her with Carrie Chapman Catt because Carrie Chapman Catt was the head of the National American Women's Suffrage Association when women got the right to vote, and she was the founder of the league of women voters. And so to compare the difference between the two, when one was still the primary advocate for women's suffrage but it hadn't been achieved, and then once it was achieved how did they differ in their values and what they said and what was the audience response to it. They were the two that I worked with, and in both cases in the archives at Chautauqua I was able to identify speeches that had not yet been published. They had not previously been published. So through my lecture we also got to publish two speeches by some famous historic women that had never been published before. So I don't mind digging through libraries by the way, Suzanna. In fact I like archives very much, and that was a good occasion for it. That was quite an honor. Have any of you been to Chautauqua?

TG: No.

CB: I have not.

JE: I will tell you one interesting thing. When you are the keynote speaker and you walk around, it's a very casual kind of an environment. People sit on their front porches, hundreds of them. They'll stop and talk to you about your speech at great length and from their front porch. I was told to expect that, and it was kind of fun. So here's an audience that gets very engaged and they're used to it. They have as I said, presidents speak there, the heads of almost every non profit, and some of the more innovative business individuals they are keynote speakers. These people get spoiled, they hear up to 50 different lectures a summer. It's only a summer. There are very few people who stay in residence the entire year, but for the summer it's quite the cultural environment and it's a wonderful place to visit. As I said, it's in western

New York, but well worth the visit. But that was a big occasion and something I'm very proud of Chris, so thank you.

CB: I think winters one would work on surviving the weather in that area.

JE: Yeah, winters would be tough.

CB: So summer is very special. I felt this in Vermont, as spring has come it just is magnificent.

TG: Is the sap rising there?

CB: Sap is rising. The blooms on the tree and bushes are just spectacular. That's been a nice part of my little odyssey. Jim, you've been terribly passive today. I'm particularly interested in the administration and faculty relationship, because both of you have played major roles in what has always been a difficult and challenging realm. What are some of the issues that the Jane Elmer Crahall leadership role brings to mind about that whole governance relationship?

JR: Well Jane had a, and I don't know if she knows this, but she made life miserable for me on one particular occasion.

JE: Which one?

JR: When she told me that Harold Cox had been laughing about what he saw in some faculty members credentials and voicing it about. Do you remember that Jane?

JE: Yes I do.

JR: Yeah, that had me going to the lawyers and it involved me in a considerable problem for a long time because that person was eventually denied tenure, and Harold had compromised the whole thing. I had to deny him any access to records he had been involved. Mike Lennon had let him get into information regarding salaries and so he had access at that point.

JE: Yes he did, but I thought you needed to know Jim.

JR: Oh yeah, yeah no question about it. We eventually, I just admitted it to when the person in question appealed. We did the right thing.

JE: Well I know and there were a couple of occasions where, Chris the same with you, where I know I had the trust of both of you where I could come and say "You need to know this is happening." And, you don't make that public, that is not formal procedure, that is more political and it's also a matter of trust. I always valued that and I think you did too, so that was always helpful. I will say I thought your suggestion about Tim and Chris sitting down and having a discussion of that relationship between the administration, the presidents, and the board is a good one. I couldn't help but think as I'm listening to that that there's never been that kind of discussion about the board and the faculty because it's been so limited, the direct interaction between it. I think that that might be an area, I'm not saying that it should be huge, but I think there needs to be maybe a little attention given to that as well. I can't tell you how often different board members said to me "Why should you get tenure? I don't get tenure in my job." I heard that so much from Rick Ross and Gerry. And I think in Gerry's case I won the argument eventually. But I

think the relationship between the faculty and the board within the organizational culture of the campus is a real big empty space, and possibly needs to have a little more attention. I felt very fortunate that one, I am one who is assertive, and two, always had the respect of people like yourselves and I knew I could always tell you if I thought something was of concern. That I wasn't going to wait and have a surprise that could hurt the whole campus. I always respected that kind of mutual regard and felt very beneficial for having it. So thank you.

CB: Jane say something about trustees, besides the ones you've mentioned -

JE: I'm sorry, say something about what?

CB: The trustees that you got to know, besides the ones you just mentioned, Rick and Gerry.

JE: Well I didn't spend that much time with Ross. Betsy Bell was on the board for quite a while, and knew her. Just in general, I think that they were as often cautious about talking to a faculty member as faculty were about talking to the board. I'm not sure where that came from, except for half the history you were all describing earlier. Going back into the 50s and even earlier, where the board could overturn very sacred and highly regarded faculty governance issues like tenure. That's very rare, and I think that kind of distrust may have the foundation for it. I'm not sure, is that still relevant? I would hope not. I would hope that there might be a better way for that to occur. And, I just know that that was sort of a gap. I could talk a lot about dealing with administration and faculty, and students and faculty, and staff and faculty, but not so much about the board and faculty. I think that that might be perhaps a length that needs to be straightened a bit more. And oh, I did know Max very well and that was largely because of Tom Bigler. In fact, you were talking about Chautauqua. Max is one who came up to me when we were discussing something over lunch and he said "You're the first from this area who I know that's been invited to speak at Chautauqua." I never knew that, and I don't know why but when he said it that way I was very flattered. Yeah I really was.

CB: It's impressive that he knew that. I mean, to know that much about Chautauqua and it's lack of roots in northeastern Pennsylvania.

JE: Yeah. I was surprised at that. Especially because of the unions, the mining unions and the leaders that grew out of this area. Yeah, I was surprised when he said that. Well I'm not sure I have anything else really to suggest at this point but I've really enjoyed talking to all of you. Sorry we couldn't be face to face this time but I'll fix that soon.

TG: Yeah, you need to Jane!

JE: I will.

CB: Technology is a challenge for all of us.

JR: Give our regards to Brin, Jane.

JE: Oh, I will Jim. Have you been to Cafe Toscano of late?

JR: Not recently, not since the pandemic. Before that I had.

JE: Yeah. Because every now and then we run into you there. That's why I was asking, so. Well, maybe sometime soon. And Chris, I hope your treatments go well. And I know you, you're strong.

CB: Thank you so much. Are there final, one of these that we've asked sort of towards the end, are there people on the faculty or the community that you think we should interview?

JE: You said you've already done Anne Batory?

CB: We've done Anne Batory, we've done Louise Berard, we've done Bonnie Bedford.

JE: Okay, Bonnie would have been a good one. You might want to talk to Fred Sullivan.

JR: That's a good point.

CB: Great idea, great idea. His daughter of course was in on this process very early on. She was doing the recording.

JE: Oh, really?

CB: Yeah, she was an archivist.

JE: Oh good. Let me think for a second. If you want a really historical one I'd get Wagiha while she's still there.

CB: We had Wagiha It was memorable, as you would guess.

JE: Oh you already did it? Okay. Anne would have been on my list as well. Maybe Bob Bohlander.

CB: Great idea.

JE: Because he helped the social sciences grow at a time when, I'm not sure there was a lot of support for that. He really did.

CB: Those are both great suggestions.

JR: Is Bob still at Wilkes?

JE: I don't know.

JR: I have no idea.

JE: Well, that would be easy to find out but I'm not sure.

CB: Well, thank you so much for giving us this time.

JE: Oh, you're welcome.

CB: And the transcript you eventually will see so you can make any corrections and additions that you find important. I guess I have one mischievous question to ask before we go.

JE: Uh, oh.

CB: Because this is an archives project, I think we should have your considered portrait of Harold Cox.

JE: Oh yes. He was a dear friend. When I first moved into Capin Hall he was right down the hall. But more than that, he would show up at my door and say “Have you ever heard of this person?” And you know him and his archival and historical background. I remember one day he said “Have you ever heard of Deborah Sampson Gannett?” and I said “No, why? Who is she?” She fought in the, not the Civil War, the Revolutionary War dressed up as a man. She was a trans, is what he said. She gave a speech, and he had it. She was the first woman to do a public speaking tour in the US. That was typical of talking to Harold. He would show up each morning with a little tidbit, and each one would be something that’s grounded in history, and unusual, that he had to do archival work to get, and it would be fascinating. He published so many things. When you gave him the title of the Wilkes University press, he did publish a lot of material that probably would have been lost otherwise. He was funny, and could be very nasty at times, but in a sarcastic way. He made life a lot more friendly, and a lot more fun at Wilkes from day one. He’s the one who pretty much pushed me into agreeing to be FAC chair. I was busy doing other things and he was the one who sat down and said “You’ve got to do it, you’re about the only one who can.” So he would make a lot of blunders every now and then, but for the most part he lived and breathed Wilkes. It meant so much to him, it was his soul. He did share that, and I was very lucky to have been in the same building with him. For good or bad, or funny or ugly, everyday was much more interesting because Harold was there, and I’m thankful for that. How is he doing?

CB: That I don’t know. Jim do you, do you know at all?

JR: Not a thing. He is in a nursing home, or was.

JE: Yeah I think it was about a year and a half ago was the last time I actually - I didn’t see him personally but he was interviewed. I think maybe it’s been two years already. So that’s why I was asking, I didn’t know how he was. But he was a dear friend, and remains one for everything that he is. He knew a lot about Chautauqua. So there was one person that knew about it, and I got to share it with him. So that’s a good question.

JR: The first surgeon general of the United States was a woman who dressed as a man.

JE: The first surgeon general?

JR: That’s the only way she could hold the position.

JE: Oh! Well Deborah Sampson Gannon as I said, she fought in the Revolutionary War for over a year and got wounded. It was only when she was wounded that they discovered that she was a woman. Prior to that she got away with it the whole time. She did speak, and her speech was on “My life as a Revolutionary War soldier” and people were curious about it. I’ve published two articles about her since Harold made me aware of her. He was one who would spawn curiosity and also scholarship. Like I said, I loved the fact that he was an archivist through and through. Well, thank you.

CB: Any other final comments from anybody? This has been delicious. Thank you Jane, very much.

JE: Oh, it was a pleasure speaking with all of you. I hope someday we will get to see one another. So, thank you.

All: Bye! **[Jane leaves the call]**

CB: Do we have our next - the Cathy DeAngelis one I'm ready to pursue if you want to.

TG: That'd be a good one. Is she willing to do zoom?

CB: Oh, yeah. She referenced her book which is *Pursuing Equity in Medicine* and it's got a whole section on her time at Wilkes. So before we do it what I may do is copy those pages so that we have that shared background.

TG: Have our homework done, yeah.

CB: She really credits Wilkes with her career opportunities.

JR: Tim, you seem to be in a new environment there.

TG: Me?

JR: Yeah.

TG: Oh yeah, by the way, that's referred to as my "shower stall wall." But it's just a room divider so you can't see the bed. That came from some friends of mine, I use that term loosely.

JR: I assume you're still in Richmond then?

TG: Yep, yep. I think I may be up to see you one of these days. In fact, Chris, maybe we should talk about doing something up there.

CB: Yes, I'm going to be ready shortly to do a little travel.

TG: Get in that big Buick and head down the road!

JR: Things are more open now.

TG: Yeah. Chris have you, so in terms of the treatment you're seeing the light at the end of the tunnel and you're probably coming back up in terms of how you're feeling?

CB: I have felt fine all the way through it. My energy is not what it normally is, but I'm still doing everything. I'm on zoom sometimes three times a day with different committees and other things, and I've been writing Op-eds about Elise Stefanik. My new deal grandchildren group is really going strong. We met last night and with a guy that my daughter introduced me to that is trying to get another writers project like the WPA writers project built into the legislation. So all of the grandchildren were there last night and we had a wonderful time. So I've got that every week, it's what I always look forward to. We think we've got the sector of labor that is going to meet with us on the second of June, Marty Walsh.

TG: That'll be fun.

CB: We'll have Francis Perkins' grandson there to urge him on and do some of the things like she did. So, that's been a big thing. I'm going to be on this Lupron for eighteen months total. I won't really start regaining everything I need to regain in terms of energy, and I hope memory, until that's done. It's a shot every 3 months, and I've got the next one on the 23rd of June. But in terms of the radiation you don't feel anything. It has some effect on your innards. Not that you really want to know all of this but as you go through this they narrow the beam more and more so it's just on the prostate, so it's not affecting the tissues around it. Which they wanted to be sure to get, in case there were any cells that needed to be radiated. So, certain things are starting to come back to normal because they are not being radiated, so that's been good. I've had friends who have come to see me. My niece and her wife came all the way from Boston to have lunch with me on Tuesday, which was really very special. And my brother and his husband are coming from Portland, Oregon on Monday, and they're going to spend five days in Burlington and then drive off to Maine, and then spend a week with me in Ticonderoga when I'm back full time. So, I haven't had much time to think about myself which has probably been pretty good. And there's been enough going on with the political world that I can't stay away from my MSNBC. I'm one of those ideological types that Jane Elmes -

TG: I think most of us are driven to it.

CB: Thank you for asking. I'm really doing very well. I see the aging process everytime I look in the mirror, but people have been very kind to not say that so I'm feeling frisky.

TG: That's good. That's very good.

CB: Yeah, I'm lucky. Very lucky. And my kids are doing well, and all of a sudden I've got a real dialogue going with my grandson who's 20 years old. We're debating ideas, and reading some things in common. He's up in Maine. He decided he didn't like his virtual learning at Dickinson, so he's going to wait and go back next fall. So he's met with some friends, and he's been hiking and reading. He just wrote me an email yesterday that is so sophisticated, it's kind of taken my breath away. I don't know how to respond to him, to let him know about the real pools of ignorance his grandfather's got. That's thrilling, because he's had some troubles along the way.

TG: That's great.

CB: He's bipolar.

TG: Oh yeah.

CB: So having him grab a hold of some intellectual things is really - so that's how I'm doing. My girls, well particularly the two in Baltimore, are dealing with the issues surrounding COVID with both of their jobs. I've been fascinated by the response, which I've been listening to while I'm driving, I listen to MSNBC, the reaction of taking off masks. Just how dependent we've become on them and that people feel insecure taking them off. It's fascinating how long that process is going to last.

TG: Yeah, a friend asked what I was going to do, and I wrote back and I said "Well, I believe the science." So basically, if you're vaccinated you're pretty much good to go. But you really do have to be sensitive to people who still need that security. Socially I think even now it continues to be something you need to be attuned to, so I'm going to be carrying a mask with me for a while.

CB: Oh, I think we all should, because there are situations. I was in the hospital this morning and I asked “Is there going to be any change?” and they said “No, no. Masks will be required.” And in transportation, if you’re flying you are going to have a mask on while you’re flying, even subways. I don’t know about the Martz busses.

TG: Well you would think especially them because the rides are generally pretty long. I assume the air exchange in them is pretty good, but still. Hey Jim, how are you doing?

JR: Good, okay. You heard what I said about my grandson?

TG: Yes, that he had COVID. We’ve actually talked about it.

JR: We’re a little bit relieved there. But we are feeling very good. We are now going out to dinner occasionally. Before the pandemic we probably ate out 5 nights a week. But we’ve gotten back to it a little bit. I noticed that quite a number of places that had been taking temperatures have ceased to do that. In fact, even one of my doctors offices has no longer been taking the temperature when you come in, which surprised me, but I’ve found that in many places.

CB: Do the Pennsylvania restaurants require you to write your name so they can trace you if something happens in the restaurant? Vermont does that.

JR: No.

CB: Every place I’ve gone to I had to fill out a lot of information.

JR: No we haven’t had that. When Ginger and I go out we have picked restaurants that are big, and where the tables are really separated from each other, and preferably places with really high ceilings.

TG: That’s smart. So Suzanna, how are you doing? Are they taking good care of you?

SC: It’s been kind of a sprint of a semester. So actually, I have accrued like six weeks off. But I also have a lot going on with students this summer so I don’t know if I will actually be taking off that much, so I might lose the time. But, just trying to get projects finished and get them up and online and digitized. It’s a process of first processing and creating the finding aids, and then digitizing all of the folders. And then the Agnes flood grant, I have to finish that up. So, there’s a lot going on but it’s very exciting once it’s finally finished.

JR: Do you know whether summer courses will go on as scheduled or as usual?

SC: Yeah, they’re starting I believe in June. In middle June I guess the first round, and then the second round will be July to August I guess.

JR: How did the graduations go? I know there were several different ones.

SC: So I think they cancelled the 2020 because not enough people signed up to come back for it, so I think it’s just going to be the 2021. They’re breaking it up into different schools.

JR: Oh, they haven’t had it yet?

SC: No, I think that next weekend, I believe? The 22nd through the 23rd I believe. Maybe it's the following, I'm getting confused with the initial email, but it's within the next two weeks.

CB: And where will they hold it?

SC: I think the gym, not the gym, the Martz center.

CB: The Martz center, okay. Tim, did you ever look at the chapters on Wilkes in my memoir?

TG: Chris, I promise I will do that before we meet next.

CB: I'm working on it now. So, particularly the middle states, I appreciate if whether you think the way I've handled it is politic. I don't see this being a book that has much distribution, but I want to send it to each institution that I've been a part of. So it will be accessible to people at Wilkes if I ever do the self publishing.

TG: I'll get to that, for sure. I'm sorry, I've just been so immersed in this -

CB: Is your book coming along okay?

TG: Yeah, actually, there still is a book at the core of the thing, although it may be broken into four parts. It's actually going to be more of a digital platform with information and tools and that sort of thing on transformation. We are now getting some interest from several national organizations, or I should say two. So that looks pretty promising.

CB: Wonderful.

TG: I think it's dawning on a lot of campus leaders that they simply are not going to be able to go back to normal, so they're looking at these things. We thought we were really kind of behind the eight ball if you will in terms of time. But it turns out, if you look at higher education in general, everybody realized that not so far down the road they've got huge problems. But the immediate financial problems have largely been evated in part because most institutions have been operating, and secondly because of the federal money that's come in. If they get the latest tranche, Wilkes for example will get somewhere around 7 million. Half of that for students, and half of that for operating issues. I don't know if I've mentioned it to you guys, but the digital, or the low residency nursing program which is largely digital, has just produced a huge amount of income. Probably net for Wilkes, around 12 to 13 million.

CB: Oh my God.

JR: Wow. That's impressive.

TG: They've gone from thinking they were going to have a huge deficit, to basically having a surplus.

JR: All right!

TG: And they've been able to restore virtually all of the cuts they have made, and taken all of the faculty that were notified off of notification.

CB: That's great. How are you staying in touch with all of this? Through Paul?

TG: Yeah, pretty much Paul.

CB: Have you and Greg gotten to know each other?

TG: No, no. We need to do something about that, you and me.

CB: Well that should be the occasion of physically coming to Wilkes Barre.

TG: Having him to dinner or something.

CB: That's worth it. And if we could do Andy Sardoni at the same time.

TG: Yep. I see a trip coming.

CB: Yes, I do too. I look forward to it. Okay everybody.

TG: Nice job Chris! Best history interviewer I've ever been around.

CB: Well, I was glad that I was up for it. I didn't know how I was going to be feeling at the end of week 7. I had some quiche just before and that seemed to get me up.

TG: Yeah, it perked you up.

CB: Okay.

JR: Have a good one!

TG: We'll be in touch soon. Our next one is -

JR: DeAngelis?

TG: Yeah. Cathy DeAngelis.

CB: I'll work on that.

TG: Alright.

CB: Okay.

JR: Have a good one!

TG: Great to see you all.

JR: Have a nice weekend.

SC: You too.

TG: Buh-Bye.

JR: Bye-Bye.

