<div align="center">

**November 20, 2012
Time: 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM
Location: Senate Chambers, N940 Ross**

</div>

Agenda Item	Notes
Introductory Remarks (R.Haché and C.Haig-Brown)	R. Haché welcomed community to the SRP Open Forum. C. Haig-Brown greeted audience and made introductory remarks, outlining the objectives of the Forum and highlighting the SRP consultation engagement to date with over 1000 community members consulted. Emphasized that the initial themes presented are in a draft form and encouraged input from the community on how we articulate our story within each theme.
Discussion and Feedback from Audience	<u>Comments & Clarifications on SRP feedback to date:</u> -Expressed interest in consultation feedback received on traditional metrics and community engagement; sought clarification on relationship between this and the current tenure evaluation and if being addressed within the Plan. Stressed that we as an institution need to look forward to adjusting our process; to recognize. -Clarified that the Plan will encourage and enable all forms of research that happen at all levels of the institution; further clarified that tenure policy is managed at faculty departmental level. -Encouraged inclusion of graduate and undergraduate student engagement in research; Plan should address how undergrad students in particular can be included in engagement and learning- increasing their research skills -Encouraged support for development of a research projects searchable database -Stressed obstacles in administrative support for those faculty members with a non-funded research agenda. <u>Comments & Clarifications on SRP Online Survey:</u> -Regarding survey question #10- balance between teaching and research – would like to see clarity on the results; faculty do a variety of both and definition is often blurred- need a qualitative set of results. -Expressed concern on behalf of part-time graduate students, particularly those with disabilities that require part-time participation, specifically missing opportunities for engaging in research and networking; additionally more generally encouraged addressing accessibility for students with disabilities within the Plan -Clarified that accessibility is important in how we develop our research programs; needing flexibility and the ability to accommodate. The Plan will speak to our core values in providing access. -Inquired about what the Plan will say about distinctions between teaching and research, especially in relation to "apprenticing" student researchers, and the need to better focus on research. Need for teaching release to support research in light of SSHRC no longer addressing course release. -Clarified that an internal Chair program is being developed to provide enhanced support for researchers- will be announced at Senate later in the week. -Encouraged Plan to better define research – better illustrate what types of research addressing to define more concretely. Make space for qualitative distinctions. <u>Comments & Clarifications on Draft Themes:</u> -Welcomed inclusiveness of the themes -Expressed gratitude for the comprehensiveness and scale of the SRP consultations -Encouraged addition to the themes- feel that, for example, within theme #4 international research is diluted, would like to see a stronger statement of international research over all and the global relevance of the research we produce.

	-Theme #4, reiterated that the international dimension is missing, also stressed that the accent on international global and political economy as key dimensions of social and political life is missing and should be included. -Recognized that themes are articulated well and showing a real progression. While appreciating the active aspect of the wording, also expressed caution that some of the action words suggest where we might go rather than where we are. -Expressed concern that the roles and research from ORUs isn't clear within the themes. Suggested "urban" research should be included more prominently. -Should be more recognition for cross-cutting research within themes. Theme #3 does not clearly recognize the critical work being done such as the critique of urban infrastructure and technology. -Considers theme #5 to be contradictory; not able to have an integration of entrepreneurship and the public good -Stressed concern regarding the absence of disabilities/ disability studies within the themes- would like to see the word disabilities included explicitly. -Recognized that themes are very discipline focused, but feels boxed into a perspective of the faculty, real strength of FES is very much social science- should engage more with what FES does to enable a better representation of what we do -Clarified that these themes are porous and there are many levels of connectedness between them. Will be considering including some research stories (hyperlinks within Plan) to better articulate areas of research at York.
Concluding Remarks	Thanks to community for attending. Underscored the importance of consultation process and need for participation and engagement towards developing the SRP. Please continue to share feedback through the website: http://srp.info.yorku.ca