In case there were any lingering doubts, the Covid-19 pandemic revealed that much about the American healthcare system is broken. In her research, Dr. Kiernan Riley (Nursing) explores the systemic issues that face some of our most vulnerable populations, not only the patients but also their caregivers, as well as the healthcare providers who are on the front lines every day. Drawing upon her work as a hospice nurse, Riley’s research has focused on end-of-life care for people with severe mental illnesses.

End-of-life care is a subset of palliative care, and Dr. Riley is interested in how people with severe mental illness experience it, as well as the healthcare system in general. Riley is interested in changing how we define severe mental illnesses. Currently, the definition is limited to the DSM diagnoses such as schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, or major depression. However, that can exclude some lesser, but still severe, illnesses such as anxiety. Additionally, Dr. Riley wants to look at how the end of life phase affects people with severe mental illnesses. “How do they experience the end-of-life? What are their needs in the end-of-life period? How are nurses caring for them? How is caregiving affected?” These are just some of the questions her work addresses.

When asked how palliative or end of life care is different for people with severe mental illnesses, Dr. Riley said we really don’t know because it really hasn’t been studied. Very few studies have included people with severe mental illnesses. “We know that they experience health care differently due to stigmatization. Their symptoms and diagnoses are often not socially well-accepted. Non-compliance is often a symptom for these patients, which tends to be seen as a moral failing by health care professionals.” Stigmatization affects all aspects of healthcare for people with severe mental illnesses. One study found that among cancer patients, those with severe mental illnesses were 2 ½ times less likely to receive a referral for palliative care than those without any mental illnesses. While the literature assumes that patients with severe mental illnesses experience the end-of-life period the same as anyone else, Riley disagrees. She argues we need to look at how it might be different and provide these patients with enhanced therapeutic communication and more mental support, not only for dealing with their illness but also those that could stem from their illness, such as anxiety. In short, she calls for a more patient-centered approach to palliative care.

Palliative care has evolved a great deal from its beginnings. Initially, palliative care was just for cancer patients and just focused on the physical aspects of the illness. However, palliative care has become more patient-centered, focusing on all aspects of the patient – the physical but also the psychosocial and spiritual sides as well. Palliative care is provided by an interdisciplinary team, including physicians, nurses, chaplains, physical therapists, and more. Basically, whoever is relevant to the patient, including their caregivers, should be included. According to Riley,
palliative care should be initiated from the moment a diagnosis is given in order to better serve the patients.

Dr. Riley’s research extends beyond end-of-life care to nursing in general and ways it can be more “person-centered.” What that entails is rather than just looking at the diagnosis, looking at the whole person and what that diagnosis means for them. Healthcare, according to Riley, needs to be tailored to the individual person. “Each person has a different experience on this planet, and their healthcare is tied into that. How do we make it work for them?”

To help her own patients in hospice, Dr. Riley recently got certified as a death doula. If a doula is someone who helps with major transitions in life, a death doula is someone who helps the patient and their caregivers prepare for the transitions involved with the end-of-life period. Getting certified as a death doula is part of her overall commitment to changing how we view death and dying. According to Riley, “Death is seen as a taboo subject, but that is not a healthy way to approach it. People need to be more comfortable with their own mortality so that when death comes, it won’t be so shocking to them.” In her research, teaching, and work as a nurse, Dr. Riley is impacting how our healthcare system treats patients and caregivers and dispelling the taboos that prevent people, especially our most vulnerable, from getting the quality care that they deserve throughout their lifecycles.
This fall, the Center for Faculty Scholarship will be launching an exciting new program—Falcon Scholars! Eight undergraduate students will be paired with a faculty mentor to conduct research in the faculty member’s area of research. The research projects will begin in late fall, will continue over the course of the Winter inter-session, and conclude at the end of the Spring semester. While Faculty-Student Research projects have been shown to be a High Impact Practice that contributes greatly to both retention and recruitment, the students will also receive special recognition at Convocation and Graduation, and will become part of an intellectual community on campus. For the faculty members, they will not only gain research assistance, but also the opportunity to get a student excited about their research, and they will receive a $750 stipend for working with the student.

In order to be eligible, students will need to have completed 45 credits and have a minimum GPA of 3.3; however, faculty members will also be able to recommend students who don’t meet the minimum GPA but show great potential. Over the summer, the University will identify eligible students, and the Center for Faculty Scholarship will notify faculty which students are eligible, and ask for any nominations of students not on the list. All of the eligible and nominated students will be invited to a Research Fair in the early fall, at which those faculty members interested in participating will be able to share a poster about their research and talk with the attending students. The students will then specify which faculty member they’d like to work with, and the Center for Faculty Scholarship will facilitate the match.

The Center for Faculty Scholarship is very excited about this program, and would like to thank Drs. Barricelli and Marshall for all of their support in bringing the program to fruition! Stay tuned for more information….

Tips for Special Projects Grant Applications

1: MAKE THE BUDGET AS SPECIFIC AS POSSIBLE

Try to itemize discrete costs. This becomes especially beneficial to applicants when it’s not possible to fully fund a grant request but the board wants to support as much of the request as they’re able. Describe what other campus funding sources were considered. For course release applications, it’s helpful to articulate how you will use your time.

2: MAKE THE NATURE OF YOUR WORK CLEAR

When faculty review the applications, they want to be able to clearly see what the applicant(s) will be doing. Sometimes this gets clouded by what other collaborators or students will be doing. Be sure the responsibilities of each party are clearly articulated.

3: WRITE FOR A MULTIDISCIPLINARY AUDIENCE

Write active prose that privileges clarity. Since many CFS board members know little about your specific field, it’s helpful to provide some brief hints at the larger context of your discipline’s approach to your research topic so we can place your work in the field.

4: SHOW REVIEWERS YOU ARE READY TO CONDUCT THIS WORK

Explain your project planning and timeline. While you do want to focus on the current stage, we appreciate hearing a brief description of the history of the project or related projects that show your preparedness to embark on the grant-funded work. It also helps to share a brief picture of anticipated future stages of the work.

5: ARTICULATE THE IMPACT OF YOUR WORK

You can certainly get your project funded without this, but it’s especially lovely to see applicants share how their research project will connect to other interests. Maybe there is some spillover benefit of the project to how you might teach a course. Perhaps the research contributes to a community need on or off campus.

We’ve reprinted the names of last year’s winner too should you see some friendly names who might be willing to share their experiences with the process.

RESEARCH ASSISTANT
• Eric Budd
• Elyse Clark
• Daniel Welsh
• Eric Williams

MAJOR GRANTS
• Michael Hove
• Jon Krasner

MINOR GRANTS
• Dennis Awasabisah
• Elyse Clark
• Katharine Covino
• Erin Rehrig
• Jason Talanian
• Jeffrey Warmouth

ANTI-RACISM
• Zachary Miner
• J.J. Sylvia
While Eric Budd’s first book, *Democratization, Development and the Patrimonial State in the Age of Globalization*, addressed the barriers to democratization and development in several developing nations, his work in peace studies has brought him to study conflicts in many other countries around the world. After a decade of work on the democratization process in the Philippines and other nations, Budd was ready for a new project. Much like all of his projects, Budd likes to start with a simple idea, a necessary counterpoint when you study complex conflicts. So, when it came to considering the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, Budd began with the question: “How could you sideline extremists?”

However, during his research on the peace process, Budd became increasingly disillusioned with the moderates, the “so-called peacemakers.” Budd found that those moderates “end up stymieing the whole peace process because they’re torn. They’re not sure if peace is possible, and they’re not sure if there’s a partner for peace on the other side, so they’re very tentative. They send out conflicting signals, which then ends up reinforcing the fact that the other side is also torn.”

Part of the problem in the peace-making process is seeing how others view the conflict. The stories one side tells aren’t the same as the stories another side brings. “The Israeli story is they arrived at this empty land, and they built this great success story: the State of Israel. Well, that’s true to an extent. They did build this great success story, but it wasn’t an empty land. Palestinians were there. The Palestinian story is that they were driven out and didn’t have any choice. But it’s also true that the Arab states encouraged them to leave and they decided on their own to leave. The problem is neither side recognizes the story of the other and recognizes its truth.”

Following the publication of his second book, *Conflicted are the Peacemakers: Israeli and Palestinian Moderates and the Death of Oslo*, Budd turned his focus to how national narratives don’t just make conflict resolution difficult but also pose a significant challenge to reconciliation. In his current manuscript, *Reimagining the Post-Conflict State: History, Memory, Narratives and the Prospects for Reconciliation*, Budd looks at how five different countries – the Philippines, Northern Ireland, Bosnia, Sri Lanka, and Rwanda – dealt with the aftermath of a national conflict.

One factor he considers is how equitable the distribution of power is after a conflict. For instance, the Tutsis in Rwanda are a much smaller group than the Hutus while there is a nearly equal amount of Republicans and Unionists in Northern Ireland. Budd also considers if the conflict’s ending was imposed or negotiated. He had not originally planned to include Sri Lanka in the book, but considering that Rwanda’s case was unusual in that the minority group imposed its will post-conflict, Budd added Sri Lanka as a more typical example of a country with unequal populations and an imposed ending to a conflict.

While the book will cover many cultural and economic elements that contribute to reconciliation, one chapter will examine history textbooks as national narratives. He examines how they deal with inconvenient truths about their past and how minority groups are represented in the stories told. For instance, a popular Philippine textbook in high school history classes mentions in passing that “there was some fighting in Mindanao” but otherwise the religious conflict with minority Muslim groups does not surface as a part of the national narrative. He also considers the language choices in textbooks such as assumed identities in phrases like “We Filipinos, as Christians.”

Peace From Many Sided-Stories

*BY ELISE TAKEHANA*

While Eric Budd’s first book, *Democratization, Development and the Patrimonial State in the Age of Globalization*, addressed the barriers to democratization and development in several developing nations, his work in peace studies has brought him to study conflicts in many other countries around the world. After a decade of work on the democratization process in the Philippines and other nations, Budd was ready for a new project. Much like all of his projects, Budd likes to start with a simple idea, a necessary counterpoint when you study complex conflicts. So, when it came to considering the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, Budd began with the question: “How could you sideline extremists?”

However, during his research on the peace process, Budd became increasingly disillusioned with the moderates, the “so-called peacemakers.” Budd found that those moderates “end up stymieing the whole peace process because they’re torn. They’re not sure if peace is possible, and they’re not sure if there’s a partner for peace on the other side, so they’re very tentative. They send out conflicting signals, which then ends up reinforcing the fact that the other side is also torn.”

Part of the problem in the peace-making process is seeing how others view the conflict. The stories one side tells aren’t the same as the stories another side brings. “The Israeli story is they arrived at this empty land, and they built this great success story: the State of Israel. Well, that’s true to an extent. They did build this great success story, but it wasn’t an empty land. Palestinians were there. The Palestinian story is that they were driven out and didn’t have any choice. But it’s also true that the Arab states encouraged them to leave and they decided on their own to leave. The problem is neither side recognizes the story of the other and recognizes its truth.”

Following the publication of his second book, *Conflicted are the Peacemakers: Israeli and Palestinian Moderates and the Death of Oslo*, Budd turned his focus to how national narratives don’t just make conflict resolution difficult but also pose a significant challenge to reconciliation. In his current manuscript, *Reimagining the Post-Conflict State: History, Memory, Narratives and the Prospects for Reconciliation*, Budd looks at how five different countries – the Philippines, Northern Ireland, Bosnia, Sri Lanka, and Rwanda – dealt with the aftermath of a national conflict.

One factor he considers is how equitable the distribution of power is after a conflict. For instance, the Tutsis in Rwanda are a much smaller group than the Hutus while there is a nearly equal amount of Republicans and Unionists in Northern Ireland. Budd also considers if the conflict’s ending was imposed or negotiated. He had not originally planned to include Sri Lanka in the book, but considering that Rwanda’s case was unusual in that the minority group imposed its will post-conflict, Budd added Sri Lanka as a more typical example of a country with unequal populations and an imposed ending to a conflict.

While the book will cover many cultural and economic elements that contribute to reconciliation, one chapter will examine history textbooks as national narratives. He examines how they deal with inconvenient truths about their past and how minority groups are represented in the stories told. For instance, a popular Philippine textbook in high school history classes mentions in passing that “there was some fighting in Mindanao” but otherwise the religious conflict with minority Muslim groups does not surface as a part of the national narrative. He also considers the language choices in textbooks such as assumed identities in phrases like “We Filipinos, as Christians.”
His work here draws on Benedict Anderson’s book *Imagined Communities*, which argues that a nation is built on stories and the sense of belonging that those national stories create. In his book, Budd argues that “the stories, voices, and memories of both sides have to be incorporated into the national story and that dominant group must share power so the other doesn’t feel discriminated against, unrepresented, or unheard throughout the system. Power, voice, and memory are all interconnected like a triangle, and they all reinforce each other.” For Budd, reimagining the state means incorporating non-dominant groups into the national narratives.

While Budd hasn’t written extensively about conflict in the United States, he did use our unresolved issues with race relations as an example of a nation that was not able to reimagine itself. “In Germany, all students either visit a concentration camp or learn about the Holocaust. Germany is not perfect and the growing power of the far right shows that they haven’t completely dealt with it either, but still, nationally, I’d say they’ve come a lot further than we have. Look at all the debates in this country about critical race theory.”

Unfortunately, Budd is ultimately only optimistic for Ireland’s chances at reconciliation since they have begun to reimagine their nation. Ireland’s textbooks ask students to think critically about their past. In Bosnia, textbooks are written for specific groups. In Rwanda, people cannot identify themselves as Hutu or Tutsi, but that identity and the tensions around it still exist. In the name of promoting reconciliation, the Tutsi leadership is ultimately promoting division by adopting only their narratives.

While shared economic development helps lessen tensions, sometimes identity issues pull harder. It also doesn’t help that identity politics is a powerful tool for those in power. According to Budd, “politicians use these identities for their own agendas. It’s good from them to have an enemy to blame. Take the former Yugoslavia. There was a lot of intermarriage between Serbians and Croatians and then you get this ethnic cleansing. There was intermarriage of Hutus and Tutsis in Rwanda and then you get the genocide. So those tensions are there, but politicians rile them up for their own purposes.”

Budd will be finishing his book, *Reimagining the Post-Conflict State*, in the coming year or two and then will create an OER reader for Peace Studies that looks at the origins of conflicts, challenges of conflict resolution and reconciliation, just war theories, and the dilemmas of peace and war, which will likely be his final book before retirement.

Faculty Spotlights for the 2022-2023 Academic Year

The Amelia V. Galluci-Cirio library continued with its Faculty Spotlight series on their blog throughout this past academic year. If you missed them, take a minute to read about featured faculty on their recent scholarship.

Dr. Joshua Spero (Economics, History, and Political Science) for the March 2023 Spotlight.
Dr. Jonathan Harvey (Humanities - Music) for the February 2023 Spotlight.
Dr. DeMisty Bellinger-Delfeld (Music Studies) for the January 2023 Spotlight.
Dr. Aruna Krishnamurthy (English Studies) for the December 2022 Spotlight.

Dr. Reid Parsons (Earth and Geographical Sciences) for the November 2022 Spotlight.
Dr. Amy Wehe (Mathematics) for the October 2022 Spotlight.
The Business of Business Is Business and Ethics and More.

BY ERIC BUDD

Back in the 1960s and 1970s, Milton Friedman, a University of Chicago Economics Professor, famously argued that the only job of business was to create a return for their shareholders. John Lohmann, an Assistant Professor of Business, disagrees and feels that businesses can be about a lot more than just profits. Lohmann’s academic and research interests are at the crossroads of business and the law, particularly in a sociological or political way. For example, he is interested in the changing nature of work, how businesses are evolving, and the regulation of business.

While Milton Friedman argued that businesses just need to focus on their shareholders, Lohmann asserts that their stakeholders are important as well. Thus, while Friedman would have deplored the notion of companies giving shareholders’ money to their favorite charity or cause, such donations can benefit a business’s stakeholders. According to Lohmann, in Europe they have moved further than the US from focusing just on the shareholders. As a result, “In Germany, they have a legal requirement that a certain number of seats on the board must be held by union representatives. In Scandinavia, they now have requirements that corporate boards must be diverse, especially when it comes to gender.” Anyone impacted by a business could be seen as a stakeholder, and businesses have responsibilities to them as well as to their shareholders.

Interestingly, while Friedman focused on profits, he recognized that the market could not be entirely free, such that some regulation was necessary. Lohmann’s interest in business regulation stems from his deep interest in civil rights and civil liberties issues. Currently, Professor Lohmann and his colleagues Yang Liu and John Crowley are examining the “dark side” of social media. How can social media companies be held accountable for dangerous or harmful materials posted on their sites? One possible way, according to Lohmann, would be by charging them with negligence. However, do social media networks or providers have any responsibility beyond not being negligent? One type of regulation on business is referred to as strict liability, and this liability comes into play when their activities lead to ultra-hazardous effects.

One particularly challenging area is when regulations on businesses like social media corporations raise free speech issues. However, Lohmann points out that protections for free speech are in place to protect against governmental infringements on free speech, not those by private parties. Thus, while many people complained when Elon Musk took over Twitter and sought to change its policies over what could or could not be tweeted, that was perfectly within Musk’s right as the company’s owner. Those who disapproved of those changes could exercise their right to take their business elsewhere. Musk’s actions were a good example of how an act can be perfectly legal, but not necessarily ethical.

When a corporation acts in a way that is legal but not ethical, Lohmann feels that other enforcement mechanisms can be applied to rein in corporate malfeasance. Specifically, this is where the power of the marketplace kicks in, with NGOs (non-governmental organizations) and consumers applying pressure on corporations to change their ways. As he points out, “Nike, Kathy Lee Gifford, and others got into trouble for using children in their production process. Not directly, but their sub-contractors did, and they weren’t doing a good job regulating or monitoring them. So, they got in trouble for that. There are obligations that need to be followed that go beyond just the law.”

With consumers increasingly pressing corporations to change their behavior, and as corporations have come to recognize that they have obligations to their stakeholders as well as their shareholders, corporations have started to evolve in new ways. While in the US we have tended to differentiate between for-profit corporations and non-profit entities, a new hybrid category has recently evolved. For example, a restaurant was incorporated and its purpose is to feed the homeless. Restaurant patrons pay as able, with the hope that richer people will pay more and then the homeless could eat for free. With the rise of such hybrid corporations, it is becoming increasingly clear that the business of business is not just about making money, but a lot more. For Lohmann, “It’s about creating jobs, producing products, providing services, and not just for profits.”
A Warm Good-bye from Eric Budd and Elise Takehana

For the past four years we have had the wonderful privilege of co-coordinating the Center for Faculty Scholarship. It has been a joy to share in the successes of our colleagues, to hear more about your research, and to help highlight the intellectual community of our very busy campus. In that time, we have hosted 28 Speaker Series Talks, published 16 volumes of this newsletter profiling the work of 63 of our colleagues, brought guest lecturers to campus, ran a research summer camp for faculty, planned two research weeks this academic year, and hosted and published the papers of three faculty panels on the digital humanities, on inequality, and on data use across disciplines. We are so thankful to all our colleagues who participated in these many CFS events and initiatives, whether presenting or attending. Even when life is busy, a little time share in each other’s scholarship is a fresh reminder of why we all embarked on our academic journey.

It is certainly not lost on us that maintaining an active research agenda is beyond challenging on our campus. In our years as co-coordinators, we’ve heard again and again how difficult it is to train and keep student research assistants, to have the time and financial support to conduct our research, to keep one’s head in the game throughout the academic year, to secure grant funding, and even to accept that our research, done largely over the summer is essentially off contract, free labor. These are true concerns. A colleague said it well. After a long day teaching, advising, prepping, and grading, do I spent an hour with my child or try to read a bit for my research. The cost of scholarship comes in many forms and is sometimes just too high.

While we have worked hard to bring faculty research to the forefront of our university’s identity, work remains to shift the institutional culture such that all faculty have the mental space and support to conduct their research and perhaps even the physical space for more impromptu coming togethers of minds across campus. The summer research camp and upcoming Falcon Scholars program are small steps in that direction. We are both eternally grateful for Franca Barricelli, who has been a constant support to our many efforts, even the great big ones that did make it into the sun. Since her arrival, Patricia Marshall has been paving the way for a stronger institutional permanency for the Center for Faculty Scholarship. Our successors are in good hands with their support. We are both eager to see the great directions new coordinators will bring to the Center for Faculty Scholarship.

Again, out great thanks to you all for continuing to invest in your scholarship and for sharing in our community at Fitchburg State. As ever, our value as a university lies in the people here and their thought work. We are honored to have served our colleagues and wish you all a peaceful close to the semester and a fruitful summer.
Events

Please send details of events related to faculty research or intellectual life to etakehan@fitchburgstate.edu for inclusion on the Center for Faculty Scholarship’s calendar and newsletter.

- **04 03 23**
  - **12:30 Google Meets**
  - The Faculty Speaker Series features Andrew Linscott (Peer Services) in his talk “The Evolutionary and Cognitive Science of Religion in Philosophical Perspective.”
  - [https://meet.google.com/hmv-okvb-xtv](https://meet.google.com/hmv-okvb-xtv)

- **04 10 23**
  - **Deadline**
  - Abstracts for the Faculty Symposium at the May Development Day are due to academicaffairs@fitchburgstate.edu

- **04 28 23**
  - **Deadline**
  - Special Project Grants are due to ProvostGrants@fitchburgstate.edu

- **05 01 23**
  - **12:30 CTL**
  - The Faculty Speaker Series features Jennie Snow (English Studies) in her talk “Framing Guantánamo Bay Prison: Release, ’Reentry,’ and Art Collaborations.”

- **05 23 23**
  - **8:00 Location TBA**
  - The Faculty Symposium at the May Development Day will celebrate faculty and provide opportunities to hear about each other’s research.

---

**Research Live**

The Center for Faculty Scholarship

Co-Coordinators: Eric Budd and Elise Takehana

If you are interested in having your work featured in Research Live, contact Elise Takehana at etakehan@fitchburgstate.edu
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