



AGENDA
Committee on Strategy and Innovation
February 2, 2023

- | | | |
|------|--|---|
| I. | Approval of Minutes, November 3, 2022 | Tom Furr
Committee Chair |
| II. | Strategic Plan Update | Sharon Paynter
Co-Chair, Strategic
Planning Committee

Ravi Paul
Co-Chair, Strategic
Planning Committee |
| III. | Workforce Development / Industry Panel | Sharon Paynter
Facilitator
Acting CRO |
| IV. | Freedom of Expression Update | Tom Furr
Committee Chair |



AGENDA ITEM

- I. Approval of Minutes Tom Furr, Committee Chair

Situation: Approval of the minutes from the November 4, 2022.

Background: N/A

Assessment: N/A

Action: This item requires a vote by the committee.

Minutes
Committee on Strategy and Innovation
November 3, 2022

Vice Chair Leigh Fanning convened the meeting on behalf of Chairman Tom Furr. The conflict of interest statement was read and the minutes were approved.

The committee conducted the 2nd part of a two-part series on civil discourse. As a reminder, this is a topic has been front and center on university campuses around the country and the UNC Board of Governors have prioritized this as well. In September, Provost Coger and Vice Chancellor Hardy reviewed the university's policies as it pertains to free speech and walked us through initiatives across campus that encourage and support civil discourse, such as ECUnited and Cupola Conversations. The committee was joined by Dr. Tim Ryan, associate professor at UNC Chapel Hill who produced the Freedom of Expression in the UNC System report. In addition, the committee heard from two students and two recent graduates about their experiences both on campus and in the classroom.

The committee also heard an ECU Health update from Dr. Mike Waldrum. His update focused on the rebranding efforts of ECU Health, as well as the integrations of foundations.

There were no action items coming before this committee.

AGENDA ITEM

- II. Strategic Plan Update Sharon Paynter & Ravi Paul
Co-Chairs, Strategic Planning Committee

Situation: ECU’s strategic planning process is underway to develop a “refresh” of the previous plan. The ECU Strategic Planning Committee identified opportunities that are most likely to move ECU forward, and focused attention on ways the university can impact our local and global communities.

Background: ECU’s Strategic Plan, entitled “*Capture Your Horizon*” was in place from 2017 through 2022 based on our mission of student success, public service, and regional transformation. In 2022, the UNC System approved a new plan for the system built on the strong foundation of the previous plan entitled “*Higher Expectations*” with five broad categories of access, student success, affordability and efficiency, economic impact and community engagement, and excellent and diverse institutions.

Assessment: Drs. Paynter and Paul will give the board an update on the progress to date on the strategic plan refresh.

This item is for information only.

Action:

Final Strategy Statements with Taglines

University Motto

"Servire: To Serve"

Mission Priorities

Student Success (M1)

We offer transformative experiences for all students during their time at ECU and beyond

Public Service (M2)

We focus our efforts with the community in mind and to achieve goals that enable us to be more engaged citizens

Regional Transformation (M3)

We evaluate our success by the positive development of our region informed by local and global perspectives

Vision Statement

"Future Focused. Innovation Driven."

Vision Priorities

Social and Economic Mobility (V1)

Through innovative teaching and research, we will be an engine of access and advancement for all learners

Workforce Success (V2)

We cultivate a culture of care, belonging, and opportunity for our faculty, staff, learners, and all stakeholders

Rural Health and Well-Being (V3)

We will improve health access, sustainability, and outcomes for underserved communities

AGENDA ITEM

II. Industry Workforce Panel Sharon Paynter
Facilitator

Situation: One core tenant of ECU’s mission is to lead regional transformation. ECU continues to embrace both the challenges and opportunities of eastern North Carolina by being a resource for local industry partners to help grown innovation and meet the critical workforce needs in this region.

Background: This panel of industry leaders will talk about their experiences in bringing a problem to the university and having a solution emerge where ECU was able to address workforce needs and/or industry challenges, provide a glimpse of future challenges that the university might be poised to work toward creating a mutually beneficial and collaborative solution and/or put resources and time into a co-created strategy.

Assessment:

Action: This item is for information only.



AGENDA ITEM

II. Freedom of Expression Tom Furr
Committee Chair

Situation: The ECU Board of Trustees will consider a resolution to reaffirm its commitment to academic freedom and freedom of expression.

Background: The UNC System has prioritized civil discourse and freedom of expression for all UNC System institutions. The ECU Board of Trustees have conducted a two-part series on this topic. The board previously heard from Provost Cogger and Vice Chancellor Hardy on several campus-based initiatives that support and promote freedom of expression and civil discourse at East Carolina University. In addition, the board participated in a panel discussion with current students and young alumni about their experiences in the civil discourse space, as well as engaged in dialogue with Dr. Tim Ryan, UNC Chapel Hill faculty member who led the research and published the report: Free Expression and Constructive Dialogue in the UNC System.

Assessment:

Action: This item requires a vote by the committee and a vote by the full Board of Trustees.

DRAFT

Resolution on the Affirmation of Academic Freedom and Freedom of Speech

WHEREAS, Chapter VI, Section 600(1) of the Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina (*the Code*) establishes that the University of North Carolina System is “dedicated to the transmission and advancement of knowledge and understanding” and that “Academic Freedom is essential to the achievement of these purposes”; and

WHEREAS, Section 600(1) of *the Code* further establishes that the University of North Carolina “supports and encourages freedom of inquiry for faculty members and students, to the end that they may responsibly pursue these goals through teaching, learning, research, discussion, and publication, free from internal or external restraints that would unreasonably restrict their academic endeavor”; and

WHEREAS, Section 600(2) of *the Code* requires the University of North Carolina and its constituent institutions to “protect faculty and students in their responsible exercise of the freedom to teach, to learn, and otherwise to seek and speak the truth”; and

WHEREAS, Section 600(3) of *the Code* acknowledges that faculty and students “share in the responsibility for maintaining an environment in which academic freedom flourishes and in which the rights of each member of the academic community are respected”; and

WHEREAS, the University of Chicago’s July 2014 Report of the Committee on Freedom of Expression (the Chicago Principles) acknowledges a commitment to free and open inquiry on all matters, and acknowledges guarantees to all members of the University community the broadest possible latitude to speak, write, listen, challenge, and learn except insofar as limitations on that freedom are necessary to the functioning of the University;

WHEREAS, the University of Chicago’s Kalven Committee Report on the University’s Role in Political and Social Action (the “Report”) recognizes that the neutrality of the University as an Institution on social and political issues “arises out of respect for free inquiry and the obligation to cherish a diversity of viewpoints” and further acknowledges “a heavy presumption against the university taking collective action or expressing opinions on the political and social issues of the day,” while, at the same time, acknowledging that in extraordinary circumstances the University has a duty to speak to defend the very mission of the University;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED: The East Carolina University Board of Trustees reaffirms its commitment to academic freedom and freedom of expression as embodied in *the Code*, the Kalven Committee Report on the University’s Role in Political and Social Action, which is attached hereto as Attachment A, and the Chicago Principles, which is attached hereto as Attachment B.

Approved by the East Carolina University Board of Trustees on February 3, 2023

Scott Shook
Chairman, ECU Board of Trustees

Megan Ayers
Assistant Secretary, ECU Board of Trustees

Kalven Committee:
Report on the University's Role in Political and Social Action

Report of a faculty committee, under the chairmanship of Harry Kalven, Jr. Committee appointed by President George W. Beadle. Report published in the Record, Vol. I, No. 1, November 11, 1967.

The Committee was appointed in February 1967 by President George W. Beadle and requested to prepare "a statement on the University's role in political and social action." The Committee conceives its function as principally that of providing a point of departure for discussion in the University community of this important question.

The Committee has reviewed the experience of the University in such matters as its participation in neighborhood redevelopment, its defense of academic freedom in the Broyles Bill inquiry of the 1940s and again in the Jenner Committee hearings of the early 1950s, its opposition to the Disclaimer Affidavit in the National Defense Education Act of 1958, its reappraisal of the criteria by which it rents the off-campus housing it owns, and its position on furnishing the rank of male students to Selective Service. In its own discussions, the Committee has found a deep consensus on the appropriate role of the university in political and social action. It senses some popular misconceptions about that role and wishes, therefore, simply to reaffirm a few old truths and a cherished tradition.

A university has a great and unique role to play in fostering the development of social and political values in a society. The role is defined by the distinctive mission of the university and defined too by the distinctive characteristics of the university as a community. It is a role for the long term.

The mission of the university is the discovery, improvement, and dissemination of knowledge. Its domain of inquiry and scrutiny includes all aspects and all values of society. A university faithful to its mission will provide enduring challenges to social values, policies, practices, and institutions. By design and by effect, it is the institution which creates discontent with the existing social arrangements and proposes new ones. In brief, a good university, like Socrates, will be upsetting.

The instrument of dissent and criticism is the individual faculty member or the individual student. The university is the home and sponsor of critics; it is not itself the critic. It is, to go back once again to the classic phrase, a community of scholars. To perform its mission in the society, a university must sustain an extraordinary environment of freedom of inquiry and maintain an independence from political fashions, passions, and pressures. A university, if it is to be true to its faith in intellectual inquiry, must embrace, be hospitable to, and encourage the widest diversity of views within its own community. It is a community but only for the limited, albeit great, purposes of teaching and research. It is not a club, it is not a trade association, it is not a lobby.

Since the university is a community only for these limited and distinctive purposes, it is a community which cannot take collective action on the issues of the day without endangering the conditions for its existence and effectiveness. There is no mechanism by which it can reach a collective position without inhibiting that full freedom of dissent on which it thrives. It cannot insist that all of its members favor a given view of social policy; if it takes collective action, therefore, it does so at the price of censuring any minority who do not agree with the view adopted. In brief, it is a community which cannot resort to majority vote to reach positions on public issues.

The neutrality of the university as an institution arises then not from a lack of courage nor out of indifference and insensitivity. It arises out of respect for free inquiry and the obligation to cherish a diversity of viewpoints. And this neutrality as an institution has its complement in the fullest freedom for its faculty and students as individuals to participate in political action and social protest. It finds its complement, too, in the obligation of the university to provide a forum for the most searching and candid discussion of public issues.

Moreover, the sources of power of a great university should not be misconceived. Its prestige and influence are based on integrity and intellectual competence; they are not based on the circumstance that it may be wealthy, may have political contacts, and may have influential friends.

From time to time instances will arise in which the society, or segments of it, threaten the very mission of the university and its values of free inquiry. In such a crisis, it becomes the obligation of the university as an institution to oppose such measures and actively to defend its interests and its values. There is another context in which questions as to the appropriate role of the university may possibly arise, situations involving university ownership of property, its receipt of funds, its awarding of honors, its membership in other organizations. Here, of necessity, the university, however it acts, must act as an institution in its corporate capacity. In the exceptional instance, these corporate activities of the university may appear so incompatible with paramount social values as to require careful assessment of the consequences.

These extraordinary instances apart, there emerges, as we see it, a heavy presumption against the university taking collective action or expressing opinions on the political and social issues of the day, or modifying its corporate activities to foster social or political values, however compelling and appealing they may be.

These are admittedly matters of large principle, and the application of principle to an individual case will not be easy.

It must always be appropriate, therefore, for faculty or students or administration to question, through existing channels such as the Committee of the Council or the Council, whether in light of these principles the University in particular circumstances is playing its proper role.

Our basic conviction is that a great university can perform greatly for the betterment of society. It should not, therefore, permit itself to be diverted from its mission into playing the role of a second-rate political force or influence.

Harry Kalven, Jr., *Chairman*

John Hope Franklin

Gwin J. Kolb

George Stigler

Jacob Getzels

Julian Goldsmith

Gilbert F. White

Special Comment by Mr. Stigler:

I agree with the report as drafted, except for the statements in the fifth paragraph from the end as to the role of the university when it is acting in its corporate capacity. As to this matter, I would prefer the statement in the following form:

The university when it acts in its corporate capacity as employer and property owner should, of course, conduct its affairs with honor. The university should not use these corporate activities to foster any moral or political values because such use of its facilities will impair its integrity as the home of intellectual freedom.

Report of the Committee on Freedom of Expression

The Committee on Freedom of Expression at the University of Chicago was appointed in July 2014 by President Robert J. Zimmer and Provost Eric D. Isaacs “in light of recent events nationwide that have tested institutional commitments to free and open discourse.” The Committee’s charge was to draft a statement “articulating the University’s overarching commitment to free, robust, and uninhibited debate and deliberation among all members of the University’s community.”

The Committee has carefully reviewed the University’s history, examined events at other institutions, and consulted a broad range of individuals both inside and outside the University. This statement reflects the long-standing and distinctive values of the University of Chicago and affirms the importance of maintaining and, indeed, celebrating those values for the future.

From its very founding, the University of Chicago has dedicated itself to the preservation and celebration of the freedom of expression as an essential element of the University’s culture. In 1902, in his address marking the University’s decennial, President William Rainey Harper declared that “the principle of complete freedom of speech on all subjects has from the beginning been regarded as fundamental in the University of Chicago” and that “this principle can neither now nor at any future time be called in question.”

Thirty years later, a student organization invited William Z. Foster, the Communist Party’s candidate for President, to lecture on campus. This triggered a storm of protest from critics both on and off campus. To those who condemned the University for allowing the event, President Robert M. Hutchins responded that “our students . . . should have freedom to discuss any problem that presents itself.” He insisted that the “cure” for ideas we oppose “lies through open discussion rather than through inhibition.” On a later occasion, Hutchins added that “free inquiry is indispensable to the good life, that universities exist for the sake of such inquiry, [and] that without it they cease to be universities.”

In 1968, at another time of great turmoil in universities, President Edward H. Levi, in his inaugural address, celebrated “those virtues which from the beginning and until now have characterized our institution.” Central to the values of the University of Chicago, Levi explained, is a profound commitment to “freedom of inquiry.” This freedom, he proclaimed, “is our inheritance.”

More recently, President Hanna Holborn Gray observed that “education should not be intended to make people comfortable, it is meant to make them think. Universities should be expected to provide the conditions within which hard thought, and therefore strong disagreement, independent judgment, and the questioning of stubborn assumptions, can flourish in an environment of the greatest freedom.”

The words of Harper, Hutchins, Levi, and Gray capture both the spirit and the promise of the University of Chicago. Because the University is committed to free and open inquiry in all matters, it guarantees all members of the University community the broadest possible latitude to speak, write, listen, challenge, and learn. Except insofar as limitations on that freedom are necessary to the functioning of the University, the University of Chicago fully respects and supports the freedom of all members of the University community “to discuss any problem that presents itself.”

Of course, the ideas of different members of the University community will often and quite naturally conflict. But it is not the proper role of the University to attempt to shield individuals from ideas and opinions they find unwelcome, disagreeable, or even deeply offensive. Although the University greatly values civility, and although all members of the University community share in the responsibility for maintaining a climate of mutual respect, concerns about civility and mutual respect can never be used as a justification for closing off discussion of ideas, however offensive or disagreeable those ideas may be to some members of our community.

The freedom to debate and discuss the merits of competing ideas does not, of course, mean that individuals may say whatever they wish, wherever they wish. The University may restrict expression that violates the law, that falsely defames a specific individual, that constitutes a genuine threat or harassment, that unjustifiably invades substantial privacy or confidentiality interests, or that is otherwise directly incompatible with the functioning of the University. In addition, the University may reasonably regulate the time, place, and manner of expression to ensure that it does not disrupt the ordinary activities of the University. But these are narrow exceptions to the general principle of freedom of expression, and it is vitally important that these exceptions never be used in a manner that is inconsistent with the University’s commitment to a completely free and open discussion of ideas.

In a word, the University’s fundamental commitment is to the principle that debate or deliberation may not be suppressed because the ideas put forth are thought by some or even by most members of the University community to be offensive, unwise, immoral, or wrong-headed. It is for the individual members of the University community, not for the University as an institution, to make those judgments for themselves, and to act on those judgments not by seeking to suppress speech, but by openly and vigorously contesting the ideas that they oppose. Indeed, fostering the ability of members of the University community to engage in such debate and deliberation in an effective and responsible manner is an essential part of the University’s educational mission.

As a corollary to the University’s commitment to protect and promote free expression, members of the University community must also act in conformity with the principle of free expression. Although members of the University community are free to criticize and contest the views expressed on campus, and to criticize and contest

speakers who are invited to express their views on campus, they may not obstruct or otherwise interfere with the freedom of others to express views they reject or even loathe. To this end, the University has a solemn responsibility not only to promote a lively and fearless freedom of debate and deliberation, but also to protect that freedom when others attempt to restrict it.

As Robert M. Hutchins observed, without a vibrant commitment to free and open inquiry, a university ceases to be a university. The University of Chicago's long-standing commitment to this principle lies at the very core of our University's greatness. That is our inheritance, and it is our promise to the future.

Geoffrey R. Stone, Edward H. Levi Distinguished Service Professor of Law,
Chair

Marianne Bertrand, Chris P. Dialynas Distinguished Service Professor of
Economics, Booth School of Business

Angela Olinto, Homer J. Livingston Professor, Department of Astronomy and
Astrophysics, Enrico Fermi Institute, and the College

Mark Siegler, Lindy Bergman Distinguished Service Professor of Medicine and
Surgery

David A. Strauss, Gerald Ratner Distinguished Service Professor of Law

Kenneth W. Warren, Fairfax M. Cone Distinguished Service Professor,
Department of English and the College

Amanda Woodward, William S. Gray Professor, Department of Psychology
and the College