Round Table I
Measures of Student Progress and Outcomes: Scope, Value and Relevance

1. Is the focus on student progress and outcomes the right one to support the Commission's mandate? Explain.

2. Do the measures adequately describe student progress? Student/graduate outcomes? Are there other measures that should be included?

3. What are the key information requirements in your work? What sources of information do you draw on (e.g., do you run/participate in surveys/data collection)?

4. Do/can these measures support you in your work? How? /Why not? What is missing?

5. What is the relative relevance of these measures within the landscape of other sources of measures/information you may use or consult, e.g., ACUDS, Maclean's rankings? How can their relevance be increased?

Round Table II
Measures of Student Progress and Outcomes: Focus on the Graduate Outcomes Survey Program

Roadmap

1. Is the roadmap clear; is there anything missing, or that can be improved (i.e. elements for greater clarification)?

2. Does the Roadmap help you understand how the Graduate Outcomes Survey Program will support the Program's research objectives, and how the Program's various components are inter-connected?

Key Challenges

1. What could institutions do to encourage graduates to take part in the GO Surveys?

Quality of contact information

2. How up-to-date, accurate, comprehensive are institutions' graduate contact databases (i.e. e-mail, phone, address)?

3. What are the challenges in managing the contact database and keeping it up-to-date, what are some ways institutions can improve contact information?

Reporting/Dissemination of findings

4. What reporting format would be most useful and relevant for how you use the Graduate Outcomes Survey findings? For example, does the format proposed in the conceptual roadmap work or not work for you?

5. What are the reporting/dissemination options you'd like to see explored?

Round Table III
Reporting

1.   Is the traditional reporting practice useful? Does your institution make use of the custom information provided?

2.   Is there interest among the institutions in sharing with each other measures and other information at the institutional level (but not publicly reported) under a data-sharing agreement? If yes, would it be preferable to share anonymized information, or to identify institutions? What might be some pros and cons to such an initiative?

3.   How do you rate the usefulness of the measures/information reported at the different levels – e.g., discipline, institution and system? What other level of reporting would be informative?