

RESEARCH REPORT

OCUFA

Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations
Union des Associations des Professeurs des Universités de l'Ontario

83 Yonge Street, Suite 300, Toronto, Ontario M5C 1S8
Telephone: 416-979-2117 • Fax: 416-593-5607 • E-mail: ocufa@ocufa.ca • Web Page: www.ocufa.on.ca

The *Maclean's* Rankings and Ontario's Universities: A Comparison of the 2003, 2004, and 2005 Results¹

Michael J. Doucet, Ph.D

January 2006

**OCUFA Research Report
Vol. 7 No. 1**

¹ This represents an updated version of some of the material contained in Michael J. Doucet, *Ontario Universities, the Double Cohort, and the Maclean's Rankings: The Legacy of the Harris/Eves Years, 1995-2003*, Research Report Vol. 5, No. 1 (Toronto: OCUFA, 2004). For an interesting new look at these rankings see Qi Kong and Michael R. Veall, "Does the *Maclean's* Ranking Matter?," *Canadian Public Policy* 31 (September 2005), 231-42.

In spite of the good news in the 2005 Provincial Budget that Ontario's post-secondary education system would receive a cumulative injection of some \$6.2 billion by 2009/10, this new funding did not come in time to help Ontario universities in the 2005 *Maclean's* rankings. Indeed, these most recent rankings underscore the depths to which Ontario universities have fallen in recent times. The new money cannot arrive fast enough. Sadly, Ontario's university system remained tenth and dead last in Canada on both critical funding measures and its student/faculty ratio in 2005, and the government continued to provide not a nickle of operating-grant funding for about 6 per cent of Ontario university students. At this moment, the Ontario university system remains badly underfunded, and the cracks are becoming harder to hide from the people at *Maclean's*.

To be sure, there are many who question the value of the entire *Maclean's* exercise.² Nevertheless, the annual rankings are noticed by the media and the general public.³ Each year, more copies of *Maclean's* are sold during the week when the rankings appear than at any other time of the year. We have to learn to live with them.

Not surprisingly, the Province's universities did much worse in the 2005 *Maclean's* rankings than they had done in 2004, though clever administrators continue to be able to see some worthwhile nuggets in the annual slurry of statistics. Eight Ontario universities (Trent, Wilfrid Laurier, Brock, Ryerson, Nipissing, Guelph, York, and McMaster) fell in the rankings, five by more than one place, while only two (Lakehead and Carleton) rose, each by just one position.⁴ At both Trent and McMaster, officials were blaming their declines on their inability to deal comfortably with the double cohort class of 2003, a group whose members now are largely in the third year of their undergraduate studies.⁵ Again, this points to serious underfunding, even though some university presidents and

² See, for example, Kenneth M. Cramer and Stewart Page, "Playing the Ratings Game," *Academic Matters* (Fall 2005), 10.

³ Even in Toronto, the rankings get coverage; see Kevin Connor, "U of T Classes Too Big: Must Share No. 1 Ranking," *Toronto Sun*, 7 November 2005, 17. In outlying centres, articles about the local university's performance sometimes even receives front-page, above-the-fold treatment. For 2005, the coverage included: Tiffany Mayer, "Brock's Grade Drops with Maclean's," *Niagara Falls Review*, 8 November 2005, A5; Rachel Punch, "Trent Tops in Ontario Rankings: Double Cohort Blamed for School's Slip from Sixth to Eighth Overall," *Peterborough Examiner*, 7 November 2005, A1; Scott Tracey, "U of G Slips in Maclean's '05 Ranking," *Guelph Mercury*, 7 November 2005, A1 and A4; "Rankings Don't Reflect Improvements: [Laurentian University]," *Sudbury Star*, 8 November 2005, A4; Stephanie MacLellan, "[Lakehead University] Enjoys Jump in Maclean's Rankings," *Thunder Bay Chronicle-Journal*, 8 November 2005, A4; Brandi Cramer, "Nipissing Ranked Last by Maclean's: Nipissing Scores Well with Globe and Mail," *North Bay Nugget*, 7 November 2005, A1 and A2; Ian Elliot, "Maclean's Magazine Ranks Queen's Fifth – Again," *Kingston Whig-Standard*, 7 November 2005, 3; Thulasi Srikanthan, "Double Cohort Squeezes Mac's Ranking," *Hamilton Spectator*, 8 November 2005, A5; Bruce ward, "Carleton Nudges Up One Spot, U of O Stands Pat in Ranking," *Ottawa Citizen*, 7 November 2005, C1-C2; Kelly Patrick, "U of [Windsor] Better, But Still No. 11: Last in Rankings," *Windsor Star*, 7 November 2005, A1-A2; April Kemick and Joe Matyas, "UWO nearly Top of Class: Maclean's Magazine Says Western's Third Best Out of 15 Schools with Similar Programs," *London Free Press*, 7 November 2005, C1.

⁴ Between the 2004 and 2005 surveys, Laurier fell by five places, McMaster by three; Trent, Ryerson and York each by two; and Brock, Nipissing, and Guelph each by one.

⁵ Thulasi Srikanthan, "Double Cohort Squeezes Mac's Ranking: Overcrowding Leaves Room for Improvement, But School Touts Top Mark for Innovation," *Hamilton Spectator*, 8 November 2005, A5; Rachel

members of the previous Ontario government articulated a belief that the double cohort students had been accommodated. It now looks as if they were merely squeezed in on some campuses. The remaining seven Ontario universities stayed at the same ranking in 2005 as in 2004, some at the top and others at or near the bottom of their respective tables (Table 1).

Once again, Ontario universities topped both the Comprehensive (Waterloo) and Medical/Doctoral (Toronto) categories, though Toronto was forced to share its lofty perch with McGill this year, a situation some blamed on class size.⁶ At the other extreme, Ontario universities were ranked in last place in both the Primarily Undergraduate and Comprehensive categories. As recently as 2001, no Ontario university was in last place in any of the groupings. Only five of Ontario's seventeen universities (29.4%) were ranked in the top-five in their respective institutional category in 2005, down from six in 2004 (35.3%) and from eight in 1995 (47.1%). Such trends clearly point to a system in decline.

The new money promised to the Ontario post-secondary sector last Spring will come with strings attached. It is almost certain that universities and colleges will be asked to improve the student experience by showing progress in such areas as class size, student/faculty ratios, and the provision of student services. In the remainder of this report, I will attempt to assess the recent performance of Ontario's universities on those *Maclean's* measures that shed light on such matters. Comparisons will be drawn between universities in Ontario and their counterparts in the rest of Canada.

Turning first to a consideration of those teaching first-year classes, it is generally thought that it is preferable to use tenured and tenure-stream (or probationary) faculty rather than contract instructors for this purpose. They, after all, are the ones with the greater involvement and stake in the life of the university community. The experience for Ontario undergraduates on this measure was mixed between 2003 and 2005 (Table 2). Over this period, the proportion of first-year classes taught by tenured or tenure-stream faculty rose on nine campuses, including four of the five Ontario universities in the Medical/Doctoral category, and fell on the remaining eight, including slight majorities of both the Primarily Undergraduate and Comprehensive institutions. Overall, the percentage of first-year classes taught by tenured or tenure-stream faculty rose for Ontario's Medical/Doctoral and Comprehensive universities, but declined at the Primarily Undergraduate institutions. For non-Ontario universities, the figure rose between 2003 and 2005 at the Comprehensive universities, but fell at the Medical/Doctoral and Primarily Undergraduate institutions. In 2005, only Trent, Guelph, and Waterloo could claim that at least three-quarters of their first-year classes were being taught by tenured and tenure-stream faculty. On two campuses, Wilfrid Laurier and Carleton, the figures stood at less than forty per cent. Nevertheless, in 2005, the average Ontario figures were higher than those for other Canadian universities in all but the Primarily Undergraduate category. Most Ontario first-year students could at least see a tenured or probationary faculty member at the front of the majority of their classes. The question for them, however, was how

Punch, "Trent Tops in Ontario Rankings: Double Cohort Blamed for School's Slip from Sixth to Eighth Overall," *Peterborough Examiner*, 7 November 2005, A1.

⁶ Kevin Connor, "U of T Classes Too Big: Must Share Coveted No. 1 Ranking," *Toronto Sun*, 7 November 2005, 17.

clearly could they see that professor's face? In other words, how many students were in class with them?

On the matter of class size, the picture is far less positive for Ontario university students. Large classes have been a way of life for undergraduates in their early years for some time. Ontario universities, however, clearly continue to lead the way in Canada on the employment of this strategy. In all three of the university groupings employed by *Maclean's*, Ontario universities displayed a greater use of large classes than did their counterparts in the rest of Canada, usually by a wide margin (Table 3). In each year between 2003 and 2005, on average, about half of the first- and second-year students at Ontario's Comprehensive and Medical/Doctoral universities were in classes of at least 100. Overall, 12 Ontario universities increased their use of such classes between 2003 and 2005, while 5 had reductions.

For Ontario university administrators, the siren song of the large class has proven to be far too enticing. Its economic advantages are crystal clear, and very easy to calculate. At present, the average tuition fee charged to a full-time Ontario undergraduate student is something over \$4,100. That same student takes 10 semester-equivalent courses each academic year, and thus pays \$410 for every such course. For about 94 per cent of Ontario university students, the provincial government contributes operating grant funding using a complicated formula involving weighted basic income units (BIUs). In general terms, the value of a BIU is related to the cost of delivering a program, so undergraduate engineering students are weighted more highly than their social science counterparts, and graduate students, especially at the doctoral level, are given much higher weights. On average, these grants currently are worth about \$6,400 per full-time student, or \$640 for each semester-equivalent course.⁷ A class of 500 students, then, generates \$205,000 in tuition revenues and \$300,800 in provincial grants (assuming 94% are fully funded), for a total of \$505,800 in revenues. A class with 30 students produces just \$12,300 in tuition revenues and \$18,048 in grants, for a total of \$30,348. To be sure, there are certain expenses associated with the delivery of a university course, but only the personnel costs vary in any meaningful way. Regardless of size, all classes have to be maintained and equipped, and while some costs, such as heating and lighting do vary with room size, others, such as the cost of IT equipment are quite constant on a room-by-room basis. On the labour side, costs vary with class size because of the need for teaching assistants for larger classes, and multiple faculty for smaller ones; but the tuition revenues from large classes more than cover any TA expenses.

What are the personnel costs associated with the teaching function? Here our interest is in the direct costs of providing this service. To be sure, there are some indirect costs associated with those who provide services to teaching faculty, such as IT and media specialists, but it seems safe to assume that these do not vary much with class size. Faculty at all universities have three main responsibilities – teaching, research, and service. In most universities, it is assumed that faculty time will be allocated in a particular way – 40% for teaching, 40% for research, and 20% for service. Workloads vary from one institution to another, and even between disciplines at the same university,

⁷ On the shifting values of the per-student grants in Ontario over time see Hugh Mackenzie, *The Tuition Trap* (Toronto: OCUFA, 2005), 5-6. This report is available at www.ocufa.on.ca

but a typical teaching workload in Ontario today would be five semester-equivalent courses per academic year. Under this scenario, then, the amount of a faculty member's salary that can be associated with teaching a one-semester course would be equivalent to one-fifth of 40% of her/his salary, or 8% of that figure. Thus, regardless of size, an Ontario faculty member with a salary of \$75,000 is "paid" \$6,000 to teach a one-semester course. If she/he earns \$100,000 per year, the figure rises to \$8,000, and so on. Then there are TAs to be paid. Rules for hiring and paying such individuals vary from campus to campus. For the sake of argument, if the local rule was one TA for every 50 students, then a class of 500 would need 10 TAs. If each was paid \$2,000, then the total costs to teach the course would be less than \$30,000, which leaves plenty of money to cover other expenses incurred by the institution, such as mortgages and support services, and support for courses that are smaller and/or more costly to deliver because of high equipment costs. Labour costs, of course, can be slightly reduced if contract faculty are used. While TA compensation would remain the same, stipendiary wages for a contract faculty member typically would fall in the \$4,000 to \$6,000 range for a one-semester course.

If the same 500 students discussed above were, instead, handled in five classes of 100 each, they would still contribute the same \$505,800 in tuition and grant revenue. Faculty direct costs, however, would rise to between \$30,000 and \$40,000, with TA costs remaining in the \$20,000 range, leaving considerably less of the revenue generated by this approach to cover other expenses. Using ten classes of 50 students, would add another \$30,000 to \$40,000 to course delivery costs, and bring total labour costs to about \$100,000. Furthermore, delivering courses in this fashion probably means that there are multiple, albeit smaller, classrooms to equip and maintain.

If the economic rationale for the use of large classes can be demonstrated, it still remains unclear why Ontario universities have been so keen to adopt this strategy. On average, Ontario universities are larger than their counterparts in the rest of Canada in all three categories, so they may well have built larger classrooms some time ago.⁸ Perhaps, however, it has been a case of the province's institutions following the money associated with the Ontario Government's Super Build program. Between about 1999 and 2003, there was far more money available for capital projects under this program than was available to hire new faculty. Faced with rising enrolments, especially associated with the double-cohort, most Ontario universities took advantage of what Super Build had to offer, and many built new facilities that contained large classrooms. Clearly, these rooms are being well used.

In 2005, McMaster University, at 72.5%, led all Canadian universities in the use of classes of more than 100 at the first- and second-year levels, while York, at 62.9%, was the leader among all Comprehensive universities. At comparable schools in these groupings that were located outside

⁸ In the Primarily Undergraduate category, the 7 Ontario universities had an average of 8,518 full-time students in 2005, compared with an average of 3,636 for the 14 in the rest of Canada. In the Comprehensive group, Ontario's 5 institutions had an average of 22,414 full-time students, while their 6 counterparts averaged just 12,876. At the Medical/Doctoral level, Ontario's 5 universities had an average of 29,876 students, compared with a figure of 23,323 for their 10 counterparts elsewhere in Canada. Toronto, in fact, is home to the largest university in each category – Ryerson (14,265) in the Primarily Undergraduate, York (40,299) in the Comprehensive, and Toronto (59,870) in the Medical/Doctoral. In each case, the lead is a substantial one.

Ontario, the figures were, on average, between 13 and 18 per cent lower, a slightly smaller gap than had been the case in 2004.

While the proportion of students in classes of at least 100 was lower for those attending Ontario's Primarily Undergraduate universities, there was a sharp rise in the use of such classes between 2003 and 2005, from 28.6% to 33.1% (happily down from 35.2% in 2004), with the latter figure almost three times higher than that for non-Ontario universities in this category. Brock University, at 58.8%, was the clear national leader on this measure. This was more than twice as high as the 28.5% figure recorded for the non-Ontario leader, Mount St. Vincent University. Ontario, in fact, had the top three schools on this measure, with Wilfrid Laurier second at 44.3% and Ryerson third at 30.9%. While only three non-Ontario Primarily Undergraduate universities scored above 25% on this measure, only one Ontario institution, Nipissing University, stood below that figure, and it stood just below it at 23.7%.

As in 2003 and 2004, 16 of Ontario's 17 universities (94.1%) offered first- and/or second-year classes with at least 250 students in 2005, and 7 (41.2%) offered classes with more than 500 students in them, up from 6 in the previous two years.⁹ In the rest of the country, 19 of the 30 universities (63.3%) offered classes with at least 250 students in first and/or second year, but just 3 (10.0%) used classes with more than 500 students in 2005, down from 4 in 2004.¹⁰ The student experience in such environments, of course, is another matter entirely, but the experience probably is no worse in a class of 500 than it is in a class of 200.

The most recent data for the senior undergraduate years are no more encouraging. While fewer students sit in large classes at this level, Ontario universities remain well in the vanguard on the use of this teaching/learning format, regardless of university type. Moreover, the percentage of upper year students in large classes increased significantly between 2003 and 2005 at Ontario's Primarily Undergraduate, Comprehensive, and Medical/Doctoral universities. The use of senior undergraduate classes with more than 100 students increased on 11 Ontario campuses between 2003 and 2005, and fell or remained the same at just 6 schools. Not surprisingly, the use of larger classes in the senior years in 2005 remained substantially higher in Ontario's universities than in other Canadian institutions – 269% higher for the Primarily Undergraduate group, 120% higher for the Comprehensive schools, and 82% higher among Medical/Doctoral universities. Ontario, moreover, produced the clear and unquestioned national leaders in all three *Maclean's* categories in the use of classes of at least 100 students at this level – Ryerson (12.5%), Guelph (15.2%), and McMaster (33.8%). Furthermore, Ontario universities seem to be pulling ahead on this measure. In 2003, Ontario was home to five of the twelve Canadian universities (42%) offering classes of more than 250 at this level, six of the thirteen (46%) doing so in 2004, and six of the twelve (50%) doing so in 2005. Sadly, Ontario broke new ground this year when one of its universities, the University of Toronto, began to use classes of more than 500 students at the senior undergraduate level. The Province should take no pride in this milestone.

⁹ Ryerson was the new member of this group.

¹⁰ UBC fell off this list in 2005.

Turning next to a more positive situation, the proportion of the operating budget devoted to the provision of student services rose on 12 of the 17 Ontario university campuses between 2003 and 2005; it declined on five campuses (Table 4). On this measure, Ontario's Primarily Undergraduate institutions continued to lag behind their Canadian counterparts, but its universities were ahead of them in the other two categories. It is not clear from the published *Maclean's* data what is included in student services expenditures. Nevertheless, if some of the new funding promised in the 2005 Ontario Budget is to be tied to improving the student experience at Ontario's universities, most institutions already seem to be moving their budgets in the right direction. As always, results will be tied to the wisdom of the spending decisions on individual campuses. Such wisdom will be needed if Ontario universities are to score well when they become full participants in the annual National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE).

Not surprisingly, given the mandated 30 % set-aside associated with tuition increases in Ontario after the 1998 de-regulation of fees for professional, high-tech, and graduate programs, the proportion of Ontario university operating budgets devoted to scholarships and bursaries rose at all 17 of the province's universities between 1995 and 2003 (Table 5). For the period from 2003 to 2005, the proportion continued to rise on 9 campuses. It fell at six universities, and remained the same at two others. Ontario universities continued to devote more of their operating budgets to this purpose than was the case elsewhere in Canada, but the gap in all three university categories narrowed between 2003 and 2005. In 2003, the McGuinty Government announced a two-year freeze on tuition fees at Ontario's universities and community colleges. As a result, scholarship and bursary funds will not grow through the 30% set-aside during this period; any augmentation will have to come from fundraising and/or budget reallocations.

If proportional spending was up for some lines in Ontario university operating budgets, those gains had to come from one or more other lines. Sadly, one of the negative lines was associated with the proportion of their operating budgets devoted to university libraries (Table 6). Between 1995 and 2003, only the University of Windsor and the University of Toronto increased the proportion of the budget devoted to such expenditures. For the period between 2003 and 2005, only four Ontario universities increased the proportion of their operating budgets devoted to their libraries, while twelve reduced that share and it remained the same at one institution. Ontario universities in both the Primarily Undergraduate and Comprehensive categories continued to lag behind their counterparts elsewhere in Canada on this measure, while the Province's Medical/Doctoral universities remained ahead of their counterparts in this regard.

Overall, then, the performance of Ontario's universities in the 2005 version of the *Maclean's* rankings is hardly surprising. While some administrators might complain, the results are a reasonable reflection of some of the difficult decisions they have been forced to make in the face of almost two decades of chronic under-funding. Ontario students have suffered as a consequence, but without adequate comparative experiences, most probably remain unaware of the very different environments enjoyed by their predecessors. It will take money and sound decisions to turn this situation around. Many years will be needed to correct the consequences of governmental neglect of the Ontario post-secondary system since the 1980s. Given the promises in the 2005 Ontario Budget, brighter days should be ahead; just don't expect to see much change in the 2006 *Maclean's* rankings. The new money cannot start flowing soon enough, or fast enough.

Table 1
Maclean's Rankings for Ontario Universities, 1995-2005

University	Category	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000	1999	1998	1997	1996	1995	Avg. Rank
Trent	U	8	6	5	6	3	4	3	4	3	3	2	4.3
Wilfrid Laurier	U	10	5	6	5	7	5	5	5	5	4	4	5.5
Brock	U	14	13	12	14	12	15	19	17	14	14	13	14.3
Lakehead	U	16	17	17	17	13	21	20	18	15	17	16	17.0
Ryerson	U	18	16	18	16	19	19	17	19	19	19	18	18.0
Laurentian	U	19	19	19	18	18	17	15	16	17	18	17	17.5
Nipissing	U	21	20	20	19	17	14	18	21	20	16	15	18.3
Total Rankings		106	96	97	95	89	95	97	100	93	91	85	
Average Ranking		15.1	13.7	13.9	13.6	12.7	13.6	13.9	14.3	13.3	13.0	12.1	
Guelph	C	3	2	1	1	3	2	1	2	2	4	4	2.3
Waterloo	C	1	1	2	2	1	3	2	3	4	2	3	2.2
York	C	10	8	8	6	6	5	5	5	5	5	5	6.2
Carleton	C	8	9	10	9	8	8	7	7	7	9	8	8.2
Windsor	C	11	11	11	11	9	7	8	8	8	7	7	8.9
Total Rankings		33	31	32	29	27	25	23	25	26	27	27	
Average Ranking		6.6	6.2	6.4	5.8	5.4	5	4.6	5	5.2	5.4	5.4	
Toronto	M/D	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.0
Queen's	M/D	5	5	3	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2.8
Western	M/D	3	3	3	3	6	5	5	5	9	6	7	5.0
McMaster	M/D	11	8	11	10	8	7	6	6	5	5	5	7.5
Ottawa	M/D	12	12	12	9	10	9	12	11	11	10	9	10.6
Total Rankings		32	29	30	25	28	25	26	25	28	24	24	
Average Ranking		6.4	5.8	6	5	5.6	5	5.2	5	5.6	4.8	4.8	
Overall Totals		171	156	159	149	144	145	146	150	147	142	136	
Average Ranking - All		10.1	9.2	9.4	8.8	8.5	8.5	8.6	8.8	8.6	8.4	8.0	

Table 2
Per Cent of First-Year Classes Taught
by Tenured or Tenure-Track Faculty
1995, 2003, and 2004

University	% 1995	% 2003	%2004	%2005
Primarily Undergraduate:				
Brock	61.0	66.1	53.2	56.9
Lakehead	57.9	70.2	68.2	72.3
Laurentian	59.7	64.8	59.7	60.9
Nipissing	61.0	68.3	71.2	41.2
Ryerson	67.0	65.4	62.1	57.6
Trent	60.4	71.5	71.5	80.5
Wilfrid Laurier	41.4	36.0	33.5	37.0
Ontario Average	58.3	63.2	59.9	58.1
Non-Ontario Average	67.4	62.9	61.5	62.7
Comprehensive:				
Carleton	48.5	35.8	35.0	33.8
Guelph	65.7	74.1	74.8	75.2
Waterloo	52.8	80.0	77.2	78.8
Windsor	67.9	56.7	56.0	67.9
York	86.7	61.9	57.9	57.9
Ontario Average	64.3	61.7	60.2	62.7
Non-Ontario Average	50.3	49.7	51.0	49.9
Medical/Doctoral:				
McMaster	75.9	55.1	57.9	58.5
Ottawa	62.9	52.6	58.7	62.9
Queen's	41.0	58.1	62.1	62.7
Toronto	62.1	71.9	68.9	68.3
Western	65.8	72.8	73.0	74.1
Ontario Average	61.5	62.1	64.1	65.3
Non-Ontario Average	60.1	56.2	56.4	55.4

Source: *Maclean's* annual rankings for 1995, 2003, 2004, 2005.

Table 3
Percentage of Students in Classes of >100
2003, 2004, and 2005

University	First-Year and Second-Year			Third-Year and Fourth-Year		
	% 2003	%2004	%2005	%2003	%2004	%2005
Primarily Undergraduate:						
Brock	46.7*	53.3*	58.8*	8.0	4.9	5.8
Lakehead	30.9*	30.0*	25.1*	1.1	2.4	5.6
Laurentian	23.5*	32.9*	24.6*	2.3	0.0	3.3
Nipissing	20.7	32.7	23.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ryerson	24.5*	29.1*	30.9*	9.7	11.9	12.5
Trent	21.6*	27.7*	24.6*	0.0	1.7	4.8
Wilfrid Laurier	32.5*	40.7*	44.3*	1.0	1.9	1.9
Ontario Average	28.6	35.2	33.1	3.2	3.3	4.8
Non-Ontario Avg.	10.5	12.7	12.3	1.1	0.9	1.3
Comprehensive:						
Carleton	51.8*	49.8*	51.9*	17.1*	15.1*	13.6*
Guelph	43.6*	47.4*	42.6*	13.3*	16.8*	15.2*
Waterloo	29.2*	30.3*	29.6*	9.9*	12.7*	12.7*
Windsor	53.3*	61.4*	55.5*	5.9	3.2	7.9
York	63.2*	64.4*	62.9*	12.1	10.8	11.3
Ontario Average	48.2	50.7	48.5	11.7	11.7	12.1
Non-Ontario Avg.	28.7	27.5	29.9	6.5	5.9	5.5
Medical/Doctoral:						
McMaster	68.0*	71.3*	72.5*	27.2	29.4*	33.8*
Ottawa	38.2*	43.3*	38.0*	8.9	8.7	9.5
Queen's	60.7*	61.1*	56.2*	21.0*	18.9*	19.0*
Toronto	63.3*	64.7*	65.8*	13.4*	16.9*	16.8*
Western	29.2*	31.6*	31.2*	5.2	7.1	7.3
Ontario Average	51.9	54.4	52.8	15.1	16.2	17.3
Non-Ontario Avg.	37.9	38.5	39.5	9.2	9.4	9.5

* indicates universities with classes of >250 at this level

Source: *Maclean's* annual rankings for 2002, 2003, and 2004.

Table 4
Percentage of the Operating Budget Devoted to
Student Services, 1995, 2003, 2004, and 2005

University	% 1995	%2003	%2004	%2005
Primarily Undergraduate:				
Brock	3.7	7.1	7.2	7.4
Lakehead	4.3	5.4	5.5	5.3
Laurentian	3.2	4.5	5.0	5.3
Nipissing	5.5	5.8	5.9	6.3
Ryerson	3.0	6.4	6.8	6.6
Trent	4.5	5.7	5.3	6.0
Wilfrid Laurier	3.7	7.7	7.4	6.4
Ontario Average	4.0	6.1	6.2	6.2
Non-Ontario Average	5.3	6.9	6.9	7.1
Comprehensive:				
Carleton	5.2	5.7	5.9	5.9
Guelph	4.7	7.2	6.9	6.9
Waterloo	5.2	5.2	5.2	5.6
Windsor	5.8	5.3	7.0	6.9
York	4.3	6.5	6.4	6.2
Ontario Average	5.0	6.0	6.3	6.3
Non-Ontario Average	3.3	4.4	4.7	5.0
Medical/Doctoral:				
McMaster	2.9	4.4	6.5	6.5
Ottawa	4.5	5.5	5.7	6.8
Queen's	4.2	4.4	4.6	5.3
Toronto	5.0	7.2	7.4	7.3
Western	3.8	5.4	5.2	4.9
Ontario Average	4.1	5.4	5.9	6.2
Non-Ontario Average	3.2	4.7	4.8	4.9

Source: *Maclean's* annual rankings for 1995, 2003, 2004, 2005.

Table 5
Percentage of the Operating Budget Devoted to
Scholarships and Bursaries, 1995, 2003, and 2004

University	% 1995	%2003	%2004	%2005
Primarily Undergraduate:				
Brock	1.1	6.0	6.2	7.1
Lakehead	2.3	8.3	8.6	8.9
Laurentian	0.8	8.1	8.5	7.8
Nipissing	2.1	6.7	6.7	5.6
Ryerson	0.6	5.1	5.9	5.3
Trent	1.9	9.7	9.8	9.7
Wilfrid Laurier	2.3	9.0	8.9	7.3
Ontario Average	1.6	7.6	7.8	7.4
Non-Ontario Average	2.2	3.9	4.4	4.4
Comprehensive:				
Carleton	2.6	11.1	12.0	10.8
Guelph	2.0	7.5	8.2	7.0
Waterloo	2.7	8.8	8.9	9.7
Windsor	1.7	6.5	6.7	6.9
York	2.6	9.6	10.5	9.6
Ontario Average	2.3	8.7	9.3	8.8
Non-Ontario Average	3.0	5.8	6.2	6.8
Medical/Doctoral:				
McMaster	2.6	8.2	11.5	11.2
Ottawa	4.4	8.8	10.5	11.8
Queen's	7.0	14.5	14.0	13.2
Toronto	7.7	12.7	13.3	12.9
Western	3.1	13.5	15.9	15.8
Ontario Average	5.0	11.5	13.0	13.0
Non-Ontario Average	4.2	9.1	9.7	10.2

Source: *Maclean's* annual rankings for 1995, 2003, 2004, 2005.

Table 6
Percentage of the Operating Budget Devoted to
Library Services, 1995, 2003, 2004, and 2005

University	% 1995	%2003	%2004	%2005
Primarily Undergraduate:				
Brock	6.9	5.8	5.1	4.9
Lakehead	5.9	5.7	5.4	5.1
Laurentian	6.2	4.9	4.8	4.5
Nipissing	6.8	4.1	3.8	4.0
Ryerson	3.8	3.6	3.8	4.2
Trent	7.9	5.5	5.3	4.6
Wilfrid Laurier	6.0	5.7	5.2	4.7
Ontario Average	6.2	5.0	4.8	4.6
Non-Ontario Average	6.1	5.5	5.4	5.2
Comprehensive:				
Carleton	7.5	6.6	5.9	5.8
Guelph	6.1	5.8	5.4	5.5
Waterloo	6.7	5.5	5.6	4.8
Windsor	6.3	6.4	5.7	5.7
York	5.8	5.4	5.5	5.1
Ontario Average	6.5	5.9	5.6	5.4
Non-Ontario Average	6.4	6.1	5.9	5.9
Medical/Doctoral:				
McMaster	6.8	4.7	5.3	4.8
Ottawa	6.2	4.9	5.1	5.0
Queen's	7.5	7.0	6.8	6.5
Toronto	8.6	8.9	8.3	8.9
Western	7.4	7.2	7.7	7.7
Ontario Average	7.3	6.5	6.6	6.6
Non-Ontario Average	6.4	6.5	6.3	5.9

Source: *Maclean's* annual rankings for 1995, 2003, 2004, 2005.