

L'ÉDUCATION : L'AVENIR DU QUÉBEC

RAPPORT SUR L'ACCÈS À L'ÉDUCATION



PRÉSENTÉ AU MINISTRE DE L'ÉDUCATION,
DU LOISIR ET DU SPORT
OCTOBRE 2005

L'ÉDUCATION : L'AVENIR DU QUÉBEC



RAPPORT

SUR L'ACCÈS À L'ÉDUCATION



PRÉSENTÉ AU MINISTRE DE L'ÉDUCATION,
DU LOISIR ET DU SPORT
OCTOBRE 2005

Education: Quebec's Future

Report on Access to Education

Submitted to the Ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport
October 2005

© Gouvernement du Québec Ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport, 2005 –
05-00539

ISBN 2-550-45433-2 (Version imprimée)

ISBN 2-550-45434-0 (PDF)

Dépôt légal – Bibliothèque nationale du Québec 2005

The Honourable Jean-Marc Fournier, Minister
Ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport
Government of Quebec

Dear Minister:

We wish to thank the Government of Quebec for the confidence that it has placed in us by commissioning us to identify approaches that, given current financial and demographic conditions, will ensure access to quality educational services across the province in the short- and medium-term as well as recommend means that could be implemented in this regard. We hope that our work will provide food for thought and guidance in policy making.

Michel Gervais,
Chairman

Yvan Bordeleau,

Member of the National Assembly for
l'Acadie

Diane Miron,

President
Fédération des comités de parents du
Québec

Gaëtan Boucher,

President and CEO
Fédération des cégeps

Louise Miller,

Union Advisor
Fédération des travailleurs et
travailleuses du Québec

André Caron,

President
Fédération des commissions scolaires du
Québec

Sophie Paquet,

President
Conseil permanent de la jeunesse

Roch Denis,

President
Conférence des recteurs et des
principaux des universités du Québec

Réjean Parent,

President
Centrale des syndicats du Québec

Francine Gaudet

Member of the National Assembly for
Maskinongé

François Vincent,

President
Fédération étudiante universitaire du
Québec

The Honourable Jean-Marc Fournier, Minister
Ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport
Government of Quebec

Dear Minister:

It is my honour to submit the report of the Task Force on the Maintenance of Access to Quality Educational Services duly constituted on December 21, 2004, under Decree 1208-2004 of the Government of Quebec.

This report received the unanimous support of all of the Task Force members.

I wish to emphasise this point.

Our Task Force was made up of individuals from assorted backgrounds and very different perspectives. Several of us were from organisations representing divergent interests. Some of us had even publicly expressed opinions on questions that were part of our mandate. From the very outset, this limited the scope of any possible consensus.

Nevertheless, we agreed on several findings and are unanimous in recommending that the Government of Quebec adopt the new approaches that we propose. The consensus of such a broad cross-section of Quebec society and the world of education should allow the government not only to act, but, given the urgent problems that justified our mandate, to act rapidly.

What united us were a shared conviction and, eventually, a common concern.

Launched in the 1960s, Quebec's vast undertaking to provide the public with an optimal level of educational attainment represented one of its greatest social achievements. We are convinced that this major endeavour, which allowed us to join the ranks of the most highly developed societies, must be pursued with the same vigour if we wish to protect our assets, take full advantage of globalisation, fully participate in the new knowledge-based economy and deal with the increasingly complex challenges faced by our society.

However, the current situation and certain major trends in particular are not headed in this direction. There is every reason to be concerned.

First of all, we find Quebec public opinion disquieting. In 1966, 41% of our fellow citizens considered that making education universally accessible was the one area that the government should consider most important. In 2002, only 5% thought that education should have been the government's top priority. It would seem that Quebecers are convinced that the issue has been solved and that the objective of providing the public with an optimal level of educational attainment has been achieved.

We still have some catching up to do. Moreover, our "competitors" have clearly understood that globalisation has made education more important than ever. They are setting higher educational objectives and are increasing their investment in their children's education as well as in continuing and postsecondary training.

A similar type undertaking does not appear to be forthcoming in Quebec given the state of government finances. Our demographic evolution is both a significant and unavoidable complicating factor.

"If the trend continues", to borrow a phrase familiar to many Quebecers, health will end up absorbing the entire provincial budget. Moreover, a decreasing birth rate, combined with an exodus of youth from so-called "outlying" regions, has already led to and will continue to lead to the closing of many schools. Access to quality educational services throughout Quebec is in serious jeopardy. Furthermore, everyone agrees that our postsecondary educational institutions are severely underfunded.

We must find new solutions at any price. This is what our Task Force set out to do.

First, we must stimulate awareness. It is of the utmost importance that our fellow citizens understand that the future of our youth and society relies more than ever on education, that our gains in this area are now threatened and that, if we are not vigilant and ready to accept change, we run the risk of backsliding into the inferior economic and social conditions that once plagued Quebec.

Minister, such is our initial conclusion as well as our initial recommendation. Our parents and grandparents understood the vital importance of education for the future of their children and our society. They made enormous sacrifices to provide for our education and, when the Government of Quebec put out its call to action in the 1960s, it received massive public support. We believe that a similar effort is imperative today. The challenge is different. It is no longer a question of numbers, but quality, international competition, a better equation between training and labour market needs, empowerment of individuals and communities in matters pertaining to education, in short, a revival, in our agenda and common action

plans, of the objective of providing the public with an optimal level of education. Why would Quebec not have as its objective to be the most highly educated society in North America? Such an objective is not unrealistic and would mobilise many resources. It would, in our opinion, ensure the future of our society on all fronts.

However, in order to achieve this goal and, for that matter, simply protect our assets, important financial resources will be required. Nevertheless, everyone agrees that Quebec is facing a major financial challenge.

We were unable to agree on all of the specific means required to meet this challenge, but we did concur unanimously on the need for a serious public debate, supported by expert and ideologically neutral input, in order that our fellow citizens, who are, in any case, aware of the importance of the issues, may develop their own perspective on these questions and be able to choose among available options or react democratically to propositions that the government may put forward.

However, there was one point regarding the funding issue on which our Task Force was not only unanimous, but expressed a very firm opinion. Indeed, we believe that the Federal Government, which has no role in education under the Constitution, but has nevertheless adopted one because of tax reform linked to the war effort and recourse to the very fragile “spending authority”, is no longer and will be even less able to meet its initial commitments notably to postsecondary education. In this matter, Minister, you can count on our unanimous and vigorous support for Quebec’s claims which, in any case, are the same as those of other Canadian provinces.

Having said that and regardless of the outcome of current negotiations, we believe that the public debate that we are proposing is necessary and must get underway as quickly as possible.

Furthermore, we think that the work required to implement the two courses of action that we propose must also be set in motion immediately.

In short, it appears evident, on the one hand, that the school is the ideal place to integrate youth services simply because it is where nearly all children spend a major part of their time.

On the other hand, it appears to us that regionally-based concerted action is also needed. Regional differences in Quebec regarding education and its problems vary to such an extent that it is impossible to apply homogenous and “across-the-board” solutions. The government must rely on the regions’ vitality and support them in their pursuit of innovative solutions that are adapted to their particular situation while remaining focused on the

common objectives of providing the public with an optimal level of education and maintaining access to quality educational services throughout the province.

In closing, allow me to express my thanks to the members of the Task Force for their sense of purpose, the quality of their commitment to education, their concern for the future of Quebec society and their sense of compromise. Finally, how could I not mention the exceptional contribution of the two-person team that the Ministry made available to us, Messrs. Alain Veilleux and Yannick Routhier?

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michel Gervais". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the beginning.

Michel Gervais, O.C., O.Q., Ph. D.
Chairman of the Task Force

It is not reaching the summit that is difficult, it is staying there.

(Marcus Aurelius)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
1. Education in Quebec: a Stunning Societal Success Story	5
1.1. Success as Measured by School Attendance and Graduation Rates	5
1.2. Success as Measured by Quality of Education	6
2. Education in Quebec: Currently, a Fragile Success Story	8
2.1. Our Asymmetrical Demographic Transition	8
2.2. Financial Constraints	10
2.2.1. Overall Increase in Costs	11
2.2.2. Costs Outpace Revenue	13
2.2.3. A Weaker Sense of Purpose for Education than for Health?	14
2.3. Education’s Place on the Public’s List of Priorities	14
3. At a Time When We Must Confront Major Challenges.....	16
3.1. Increased Need for Schooling and Continuing Education.....	16
3.2. Increasingly Complex Educational Issues.....	17
4. New Avenues.....	18
4.1. Reform Funding Arrangements	20
4.2. Consider New Organisational Arrangements in order to Maintain Government Services for Children Ages 0-17 throughout Quebec.....	22
4.3. Improve Regional Coordination and Delivery of Educational Services, from Preschool through University	24
4.4. Garner Public Support from Quebec Society	25
CONCLUSION	27
LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS	29
APPENDICES.....	30
APPENDIX 1 DEMOGRAPHIC DATA.....	31
1- From the Post-War Era to the 2000s	32
2- The Foreseeable Future	36
3- An Important Cohort Approaching Retirement	42

APPENDIX 2 FINANCIAL DATA.....	43
1- Public Finances	44
2- Total Education Expenditures	44
3- Provincial Education Expenditures	47
4- Funding for the Networks	48
5- Student Financial Aid.....	53
APPENDIX 3 ECONOMIC DATA.....	55
APPENDIX 4 EDUCATIONAL DATA.....	59
1-Increase in Educational Attainment	60
2- Graduation and Quality	60
3- The Levelling-off of Graduation Rates	62
4- Educational Retardation at the Primary Level and Student Success at the Secondary Level	63
5- Pathways and Academic Success.....	64
6- New Social Trends Affecting the School.....	64
7- Educational Attainment by Sex.....	66
8- Educational Attainment by Language	67
9- Educational Attainment among Aboriginal People.....	68
10- Educational Attainment by Parental Income.....	68
11- Educational Attainment by Parental Educational Attainment.....	69
12- Educational Attainment by Region of Origin	70
13- Continuing Education.....	71
14- The Importance of Education.....	71
15- Employment and Academic Success.....	74
BIBLIOGRAPHY	76

INTRODUCTION

In the wake of the *Forum des generations* in the fall of 2004, the Government of Quebec commissioned us to identify approaches that, given current financial and demographic challenges, would ensure the maintenance of access to quality educational services across the province in the short- and medium-term as well as to recommend the means for implementing them. We were also asked to:

- Define what is meant by maintaining access to quality educational services across the province;
- Consider the various teaching institutions as regional assets;
- Examine notably:
 - The complementarity among elementary and secondary schools, adult education centres, vocational education centres, CEGEPs and universities in terms of shared facilities, equipment and services,
 - The development of new forms of collaboration between public and community-based organisations,
 - The development of better linkages among educational centres in order to ensure that students embark on smoother pathways and face fewer gaps and career choices, thus reducing attrition and loss of incentive,
 - Funding and resource allocation arrangements which ensure sustainable financing and a reliable supply of educational services.

In order to accomplish this, we met eight times between February and September of 2005. Some members had to resign or were replaced along the way, but not before submitting relevant comments. They were: Messrs. Pier-André Bouchard Saint-Amand, Outgoing President of *la Fédération étudiante universitaire du Québec*, Geoffrey Kelly, MNA for Jacques-Cartier, Robert Lacroix, Outgoing President of *la Conférence des recteurs et des principaux des universités du Québec*, and Henri-Paul Rousseau, President and CEO of *la Caisse de dépôt et placement du Québec*. Mr. Marcus Tabachnick, President of the Quebec English School Boards Association, did not participate in any of the meetings.

Our education system is facing changes and demands that are of such serious and significant proportions that Quebec must engage in a major debate and explore new avenues.

Every educational network's particular situation is complex. It often puts them in awkward positions vis-à-vis one another. In recent years, one educational group after another has repeatedly sensitised government officials to the problems confronting the world of education, either through committees or parliamentary hearings. Today, we speak with one voice.

We have come to an agreement on the need to develop a common awareness of and action plan for education as well as the necessity to review of our current delivery model which was developed and implemented in the 1960s, a time of demographic growth and ample public funds, a situation that no longer exists today.

Furthermore, the need to participate fully in the knowledge-based economy and confront the complex issues facing modern societies, such as intercultural relations, the environment, health, energy or transportation, to name but a few examples, requires higher levels of educational attainment. If the means that have been deployed so far have allowed Quebec to join the ranks of industrialised nations, our academic success levels seem to be tapering-off and improving them will constitute a major challenge.

The extraordinary advancement in educational attainment levels in the 1960s and 1970s, a period demographic growth in Quebec, was based on the strong convictions and considerable efforts of the government, general public and actors involved in the education system. The challenge that awaits us is, in its own way, just as significant, just as strategic for Quebec's future.

In this report, we assess the progress of Quebec's educational attainment levels since the 1960s and compare our situation with that of neighbouring jurisdictions. We then single out the three new factors that jeopardise our educational success. We identify the major challenges that we are facing and conclude with four avenues that we invite the Government of Quebec to explore.

It should be mentioned that in carrying out our assignment we have merely skimmed over continuing education, which is another field of investigation in and of itself.

This report is based on factual information which is presented in detail in four appendices: demographic, financial, economic and educational. In order to facilitate its reading, only a few tables have been incorporated into the report per se.

We hope, then, that both the general public and the government will become aware of the vulnerability of our education networks, the difficulty in ensuring access to a Quebec-wide education system recognised for the quality of its diplomas and the necessity of exploring new avenues.

1. Education in Quebec: a Stunning Societal Success Story

It was only forty years ago that Quebec undertook an enormous societal endeavour: providing universal access to education. At that time, the objective was to allow the general public to achieve an optimal level of educational attainment thanks to improved accessibility to and quality of educational services as well as the deployment of educational institutions throughout Quebec. This effort bore fruit and led to the creation of a new education system ranging from the elementary to the university levels.¹

1.1. Success as Measured by School Attendance and Graduation Rates

If few of us got beyond the elementary level at the end of the 1950s, nearly 100% of children now attend school until the age of sixteen.

According to Table 1, school board enrolment, expressed in full-time equivalent students (FTEs), has fallen off since the 1960s because of demographic decline. However, enrolment has quadrupled in the CEGEPs and tripled in the universities.

Table 1
Student Enrolment, in FTEs,
by Type of Educational Institution

Institutions	Enrolment	
	1968-1969	2003-2004
School boards (children)	1,519,452	980,403
CEGEPs	35,964	160,235
Universities	64,401	187,083 (est.)

Source: ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport (MELS). School boards also currently admit nearly 100,000 adult FTEs. The number of FTEs is calculated by dividing part-time enrolments by 3.5 and adding them to full-time enrolments, except at the university level where FTEs represent the student body recognised for funding purposes.

Today, more than eight out of ten young people obtain a high-school diploma during their lifetime. Many are slow in doing so and this generates additional pressure on our education system. Six out of ten young people go on to CEGEP directly from secondary school.

Moreover, these patterns are essentially the same for all students regardless of their region of origin.

According to the Canadian Census, the proportion of all Quebecers who have at least thirteen years of education went from 20% to 42% between 1971 and 2001. The proportion of bachelors degrees in the general population went from less than

¹ The detailed data on which this section is based are found in Appendix 4, sections 1, 2, 7 and 12.

5% in 1971 to 14% in 2001, and from less than 3% to 13% among women during the same period.

According to the 2001 census, this proportion will continue to grow because the population's youngest age group is more educated: among persons ages 25 to 29, at least 25% have a bachelors degree. We also find that 23% of this age group have a college certificate or diploma, 14% have a vocational education diploma and some of them will go on to university.

As far as Quebec's graduation rates are concerned, Table 2 shows that, at the secondary and technical education levels, they are comparable to those of neighbouring jurisdictions as well as the principal European and Asian countries of the Organisation for Economic and Cooperative Development (OECD). However, they are lower at the university level.

Table 2
Graduation Rates by Diploma by Jurisdiction (%)

Educational level	Quebec	Canada	United States	Average for OECD countries Europe and Japan
Secondary (1998)	81	72	74	—
Secondary (2002)	83	—	73	81
Technical (1998)	14	6	9	—
University (baccalaureate 1998)	27	27	33	—
University (baccalaureate 2002)	27	—	—	32
University (doctorate 2001)	1.0	—	—	1.2

Sources: OECD, *Education at a Glance*, 2000 and 2004, and DRSI, MELS, *Education Indicators 2005*, tables 5.5 and 5.9. Comparisons at the technical level are tentative because training varies from one jurisdiction to another. One should not compare 1998 and 2001 data because they are based on different methodologies. Denmark, Norway, Germany, Japan, Poland, Switzerland, Finland and Greece have higher secondary level graduation rates than Quebec, whereas Finland, Poland and Japan have higher rates than Quebec for both the secondary and university (baccalaureate) levels.

1.2. Success as Measured by Quality of Education

The challenge to ensure quality has been handled brilliantly. As Table 3 indicates, Quebec's young people generally do well on international tests particularly in the OECD's Program for International Student Assessment (PISA).

Table 3

Ranking of Youth Participating in International Tests, by Jurisdiction ²

	Number of participants	RANK			
		Quebec	Ontario	Canada	United States
PISA 2003 Mathematics	40	5	–	7	28
PISA 2003 Reading	40	4	–	3	18
PISA 2003 Problem solving	40	8	–	9	29
PISA 2003 Science	35	11	–	11	22
PIRLS 2001 Reading	35	12	5	–	9
TEIMS 2003 Mathematics	26	14	13	–	12
TEIMS 2003 Science	26	17	5	–	6

Sources: OECD, *First Results from PISA 2003*; Council of Ministers of Education, Canada, *Measuring Up: Canadian Results of the OECD PISA Study, 2004*; MELS, *Résultats obtenus par les élèves québécois (PIRLS 2001)*; International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement, *International Science Report, Findings from EMM IEA's Trends in International Mathematics and Science at the Fourth and Eighth Grade (TEIMS 2003)*.

Moreover, they perform remarkably well each time they participate in the Canadian Skills Competition whose contestants are final-year vocational and technical students.

As Table 4 indicates, the great majority of employers also rate the competencies of graduates with a vocational or technical diploma or a university degree as average or above average.

Table 4
Employers' Evaluation of the Competency Level of Recent Graduates of Vocational, Technical or University Programs (%)

Educational level	Competency level	1994	1997	2000	2002	2004
Vocational	High or average	89	91	90	—	—
Technical		95	94	—	95	—
University		—	—	—	—	97

Source: MELS, *La formation (professionnelle, technique, universitaire): les employeurs s'expriment, sondages postaux*.

Finally, even though Quebec represents only one-fourth of the total Canadian population, our universities obtain one-third of federal merit-based research funding.

² PISA: fifteen-year olds; PIRLS: ten-year olds; TEIMS: fourth grade elementary students.

2. Education in Quebec: Currently, an Fragile Success Story

It is important to stress that the progress in Quebec's educational attainment level represents a unique North-American phenomenon and a spectacular achievement of which we should be very proud. It is also a key factor in our accession to the ranks of developed societies. Today, this achievement is threatened by three new factors:

- Our asymmetrical demographic transition;
- Financial constraints;
- Education's place on the public's list of priorities.

In this section, we discuss how these factors threaten our education system.

2.1. Our Asymmetrical Demographic Transition

Quebec's strong post-war demographic growth (Quebec's population went from 4 million in 1951 to more than 6 million in 1971, a 50% increase in twenty years) and the need to upgrade the population's educational level were largely responsible for the development of our education system in the 1960s. Half of our population was under twenty-five years of age and, for the most part, was undereducated in comparison to that of neighbouring jurisdictions.

We took strong action³ in order to endow Quebec with an accessible and quality education system. Its principal characteristics are unique in Canada and have remained constant until today. They are:

- A solid presence of all educational levels throughout Quebec: schools, vocational education centres, adult education centres, CEGEPs and universities providing extensive coverage that is not available in many other provinces;
- A shorter general education program at the secondary level;
- A college network that includes a general education component for technical education as well as a pre-university tract;
- Low tuition costs;
- Public funding for private education⁴;
- A centralised loan and bursary program for underprivileged postsecondary students that is more generous than that of the other provinces;
- Adult and vocational education centres which, while separate from secondary schools, remain under the responsibility of school boards.

According to the Census of Canada, Quebec went from strong demographic expansion of 33% between 1956 and 1971 to weaker growth of 12% between 1971 and 1986 and 10% between 1986 and 2001. As indicated in Table 5, we are now witnessing the beginning of demographic decline in outlying regions. In 2001,

³ The data for this section are presented in Appendix 1 (Sections 1 and 2) and Appendix 4 (Section 1).

⁴ Public funding for private education is also available in four western provinces (i.e., British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba) and varies between 35% and 100% of the amount granted to public education.

the under-25-year old group no longer made up half, but merely one-third of Quebec's population.

Table 5
Demographic Trends by 15-year Periods
from 1956 to 2001 (%)

Region	Percentage population change	
	1971-1986	1986-2001
Bas-Saint-Laurent	3	- 5
Saguenay–Lac-Saint-Jean	10	- 3
Capitale-Nationale	14	8
Mauricie	5	1
Estrie	10	10
Montréal	- 7	1
Outaouais	22	23
Abitibi-Témiscamingue	5	- 1
Côte-Nord	3	- 7
Nord-du-Québec	23	6
Gaspésie–Îles-de-la-Madeleine	- 1	- 14
Chaudière-Appalaches	19	7
Laval	28	20
Lanaudière	61	39
Laurentides	36	44
Montérégie	35	17
Centre-du-Québec	13	8
QUEBEC	12	10

Source: MELs compilation of *l'Institut de la statistique du Québec's* data from the Census of Canada (Statistics Canada).

In 1971, there were 3 million persons between the ages of 0 and 24. In 2001, there were only 2.25 million in this age group. According to *l'Institut de la statistique du Québec*, this number should fall to 2.17 million in 2011 and 2.06 million in 2016.

These statistics could lead one to assume that enrolments are about to decline at all levels of education across Quebec. Such is not the case!

- In areas furthest removed from large centres, the school boards and CEGEPs experienced important declines in enrolment over the past decade, often ranging between 20% and 30% and even higher in some cases. University enrolment, however, was down by only a few percentage points.
- In the Estrie, Montérégie (excluding Longueuil) and Capitale-Nationale regions, the decline is well underway in the school boards and some CEGEPs.

- In Longueuil, on the Island of Montreal and in the suburbs north of Montreal, such as Laval, Laurentides and Lanaudière, as well as in the Outaouais region, major declines are occurring only at the primary school level. Many CEGEPs are experiencing considerable growth, often in the 20% to 30% range and even higher, which suggests that Montreal, Laval and Laurentides institutions will exceed their current capacity by 2007. On the university side, almost all of the institutions are expanding and many lack space.

Thus, while many institutions are growing, others have to deal with important declines in enrolment which make organisation of education difficult and jeopardize the capacity to deliver services.

Demographic decline entails other consequences. For instance, in some regions, those in the 55-64 age group will outnumber those who are supposed to replace them. In education, the retirement of teachers and support staff is both a threat, if institutions do not have the resources required to hire qualified replacement personnel, and an opportunity to transform organisation of education.

In order to meet labour market demands and the challenges that our society will confront, we must think of, on the one hand, the importance of our youth's school success and graduation rates and, on the other, the updating of knowledge and retraining of our labour force through continuing education.

It is becoming increasingly important to provide the best possible education to young people living in a society in which their number is dwindling.

2.2. Financial Constraints

Quebecers have contributed a larger proportion of their annual wealth, as expressed by a ratio of total expenditures in this area to the gross domestic product (GDP), than their counterparts in the rest of Canada or the United States. However, as indicated in Table 6, this ratio has declined in Quebec and grown in the United States to point of near parity in 2002, while remaining stable in the rest of Canada.

Table 6
Total Education Expenditures in Relation to GDP since 1981 (%)

Years	Quebec	Rest of Canada	United States
1981-1985	9.0	6.8	6.4
1986-1990	7.9	6.8	6.8
1991-1995	8.7	7.4	7.2
1996-2000	7.7	6.7	7.2
2002	7.5	6.4	7.3

Sources: MELS and Statistics Canada.

It is important to mention that this ratio is higher in Quebec notably because its GDP is smaller than that of other jurisdictions. For instance, as indicated in Table 7, per-student costs are only slightly higher in Quebec than in the rest of Canada and far lower than in the United States.

Table 7
Operating Expenditures per Student, Estimate for 2002-2003 (\$)

	Quebec	Rest of Canada	United States
Primary and Secondary	7,450	7,295	9,552

Source: MELS, *Education Indicators 2005*, Table 1.8.

The funding formulas for our education system were developed in the 1960s, during a period of demographic growth and mass education and at a time when the public purse allowed for major investments. Forces were mobilised at all levels of education in order to ensure their rapid expansion.

Budgets were gradually adjusted on a piecemeal basis to support academic success and deal with emerging issues such as school dropout rates, aid to disadvantaged areas, the problem of remotely located and dispersed equipment or even the development of graduate studies and research. Each level has its own funding arrangement and each institution has its own enrolment-based budget upon which to plan its development.

Many reasons account for the funding constraints that our education system is facing today.⁵

2.2.1. Overall Increase in Costs

To begin with, it should be mentioned that the education system's budgets have increased significantly over the past several years. Some of these funds are

⁵ Detailed data for this section can be found in Appendix 2.

earmarked for the implementation of childcare services and the transition of part- to full-time kindergartens in the school boards.

Moreover, as currently designed, our education system is subject to an overall increase in costs even in the face of lower actual and anticipated enrolment rates in many regions.

On the one hand, the savings potential for institutions with significantly decreasing enrolment rates is limited because the latter do not entail proportionately lower costs. Fewer students do not necessarily translate into fewer teachers or classrooms and, consequently, the cost per student increases as enrolments decrease.

- Thus, in 2003-2004, MELS funding varied between \$4,300 and \$6,800 per student for Francophone school boards (except for those in the Mid North Shore, Magdalen Islands and James Bay areas). The average per student allocation for school boards with fewer than 15,000 students (except for those of the Mid North Shore, Magdalen Islands and James Bay areas) was \$5,500 or \$6,000 in the remotest regions, as compared to \$5,000 per student for Francophone school boards with larger enrolments.⁶ Funding varies along similar lines for Anglophone school boards. It is difficult for the school boards to cut costs inasmuch as they are required to deliver educational services to children between the ages of 5 and 16 regardless of the clientele's geographical distribution. In fact, school attendance is possible at age 5 and mandatory at the age 6. Children can not be required to travel long distances between home and school. Furthermore, local communities are expressing more and more resistance to school closings, even in urban areas. It should be noted that the number of school boards shrunk from 1,600 to seventy-two, thus casting doubt on the possibility of further cost savings at the administrative level.
- MELS CEGEP funding in 2003-2004 averaged \$8,100 per full-time equivalent⁷ and varied between \$6,600 and \$15,700 depending upon the institution. The average for colleges with fewer than 2,000 students, those generally located in remote areas, was \$10,500 per student in comparison to the \$7,720 for larger institutions.

On the other hand, the cost of education continues to swell in regions and institutions that have rising enrolments. This increase will be greater than the

6 The average MELS grant includes all transfers except those for capital spending, debt and contributions to student transportation and pension funds. The remote regions are: Bas-Saint-Laurent, Saguenay–Lac-Saint-Jean, Mauricie, Abitibi-Témiscamingue, Côte-Nord and Gaspésie–Îles-de-la-Madeleine. Francophone school boards with more than 15,000 students are: de la Capitale, des Premières-Seigneuries, du Chemin-du-Roy, de l'Énergie, de la Région-de-Sherbrooke, de la Pointe-de-l'Île, de Montréal, de Marguerite-Bourgeoys, de Beauce-Etchemin, des Navigateurs, de Laval, des Affluents, des Samares, de la Seigneurie-des-Mille-Îles and de la Rivière-du-Nord.

7 CEGEP funding is based on the PES formula or *périodes-élèves-semaines* (translator's note: student hours per week). We have converted it into full-time equivalents (FTEs) by dividing the number of PES by 44 in order to make comparisons with other systems.

decrease predicted for regions and institutions that have lower enrolments. Furthermore, growth is occurring at the postsecondary level, where the cost of education is two to three times higher than at the secondary or primary levels, and where there are needs for additional space, thus requiring capital investment.

In other words, decreasing enrolments in some regions do not generate the kind of cost savings that can compensate for the additional costs engendered in regions and institutions that continue to grow.

2.2.2. Costs Outpace Revenue

Many factors explain why revenue does not keep pace with costs.

To begin with, proceeds from the school tax and tuition fees, which are important autonomous revenue sources for school boards and universities respectively, have been capped for many years.

For their part, CEGEPs have very little own-source revenue capacity. Moreover, the few fees that they do collect are also capped and currently represent 3% of their total income.

Next, the Government of Canada significantly reduced its transfer payments for postsecondary education. In fact, until 1977, Transfer Payment Programs essentially called for a cost-matching arrangement between the two levels of government for postsecondary education, as was the case for health and other social programs. These transfer payments were cut back and, then, between 1995-1996 and 2004-2005, federal transfers for health were increased by \$10 billion while those for social programs, including postsecondary education, were reduced by \$2.2 billion.

Furthermore, the Federal Government gives less to Quebec for education than it does to its neighbours because Quebec's funding policies differ from those of other Canadian provinces. In fact, higher tuition fees or real estate taxes in other provinces give them the right to federal tax allowances that are not available to Quebec.

In spite of a tight financial situation, the Government of Quebec has succeeded in reinvesting significant amounts of money in education in recent years. This reinvestment, however, is insufficient:

- A parliamentary committee reached unanimous agreement on university underfunding which is linked to both a weak revenue stream and the high costs of regional institutions.
- The CEGEPs, whose budgets are essentially provided by the Government of Quebec (86% of their operations were funded by Quebec in 2002-2003), could demonstrate that they do not receive adequate financing.
- Other provinces reinvest significant amounts of money in postsecondary

education: a per annum increase of 6.8% in Ontario through 2009-2010 and a per annum increase of 9.1% in Alberta through 2007-2008.

- Some school boards located in regions that are experiencing the greatest demographic decline are having trouble balancing their budgets.
- The number or weight of cases involving disadvantaged or learning disabled students seems to be growing and engendering additional costs.
- Over the past ten years, institutions have had little choice but to use new tactics to recruit increasingly rare students upon whom depends a major part of their funding. Schools reserve space in high demand programs for students from other school boards; vocational education centres and CEGEPs offer similar types of short training programs; some universities are opening centres and even campuses away from their principal campuses and in close proximity to established universities.

2.2.3. A Weaker Sense of Purpose for Education than for Health?

Education's share of the Quebec budget has steadily declined from 31% in 1985 to 25% today.

Health's allocation, on the other hand, has risen from 32% to 43% and could continue to grow significantly if there are no major technological or demographic changes.

The Government of Quebec is taking on the health issue with a great deal of determination. The same sense of purpose is necessary in order to meet society's regular and continuing education needs.

Table 8
Evolution of Health and Education Expenditures in the Quebec Budget (%)

	Health	Education	Other Sectors
1985-1986	32	31	37
1995-1996	36	28	36
2004-2005	43	25	32

Source: *ministère des Finances du Québec*.

2.3. Education's Place on the Public's List of Priorities

If Quebec made it into the cluster of countries with the highest educational attainment levels within the span of one generation, all evidence points to an important slippage in education's place on its list of priorities. Moreover, education seems to be given less weight in Quebec than in the rest of Canada.⁸

⁸ Detailed data for this section can be found in Appendix 4, Sections 1, 14 and 15.

Just as Quebec was launching its vast education project, a 1966 CROP poll indicated that for 41% of the population “the task to which the government should grant the greatest importance” was that “of making education accessible to all”; thus, the largest number of respondents favoured education.

In an Ad Hoc Research poll conducted in 2002, only 5% of the population considered that “education” should be “the government’s top priority”, while 52% of respondents listed “health” as the main concern.

The difference between these statistics is such that it clearly reflects a change in attitude towards education.

With health currently in the lead, this decline can be attributed to population aging as well as a perception that health is in far greater trouble today than education. The same state of affairs exists in the rest of Canada. However, when we look at a second index which compares the current attitude of Quebecers toward education to that of other Canadians, it seems that education is less prominent in Quebec.

In fact, according to a 2003 Ipsos-Reid poll, 80% of Canadians residing in other provinces, but only 61% of Quebecers thought that it was extremely important to develop a disciplined attitude toward study. Among the respondents, 81%, 53% and 60% of Quebecers thought that it was extremely important to provide good reading, writing and math skills, to acquire the competencies allowing one to attend college or university and to acquire the skills needed to get a good job, respectively; this compares to 94%, 83% and 82% among other Canadians.

Table 9
Proportion of Respondents Who Consider That It Is Extremely Important to... (%)

	Rest of Canada	Quebec
...provide good reading, writing and mathematical skills	94	81
...develop a disciplined attitude toward study	80	61
...acquire the competencies allowing for admission to college or university	83	53
...acquire the skills to get a good job	82	60

Source: Ipsos-Reid and Kumon Math and Reading Centres (2003). “A Good Understanding of the Basics, Top Seven Goals As to What Parents Say Their Children Need for a Successful Education”, in Jean-Pierre Proulx and Jean-Marc Cyr, *Opinéduc 2003*, Montréal, Labriprof, Université de Montréal.

According to a 2002 Statistics Canada survey, 40% of Quebec parents save for their children’s postsecondary studies, the lowest percentage in Canada where it ranges between 50% and 60% (except for Prince Edward Island:45%), depending upon the

province. Furthermore, the \$3,900 that Quebec parents save on average is among the lowest in Canada. Quebec's low tuition fees and student financial aid certainly explain a good part of this phenomenon. However, Quebec's low ranking on the scale could also indicate that education is held in lower esteem.

We also learn, according to Statistics Canada's 2001 Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics, that young Quebecers are less apt to pursue university level studies than are other Canadians in the 18 to 24 age group, regardless, generally speaking, of parental educational attainment or income. The fact that 18 year-olds are more likely to attend CEGEP in Quebec explains part of this variance.

Finally, even though Quebec's Labour Standards Act provides a framework for the kind of work that a school-age child can perform during an academic term, it sets no limit on the number of hours. We can certainly consider that remunerated work constitutes a learning opportunity that complements academic training. Nevertheless, it is likely that, beyond a certain point, academic performance will suffer and that work will be given priority to the detriment of success in school. Furthermore, extended opening hours for businesses and young people's consuming habits make the labour market more available and enticing than ever in the eyes of those who have yet to obtain an initial diploma. One wonders whether the law is not biased towards work. This could be the same predisposition that is responsible for Quebec being the last Canadian province, by several decades, to make school attendance mandatory.

Therefore, consensus regarding the importance of education in Quebec is fragile. This is probably the most difficult aspect of our present situation because it emerges at the very moment when education is more necessary than ever in order for us to position ourselves both socially and economically.

3. At a Time When We Must Confront Major Challenges

3.1. Increased Need for Schooling and Continuing Education

On the one hand, with globalisation comes the offshoring of economic activity beyond the borders of industrialised countries. On the other, complex social, intercultural, environmental, health, energy and transportation issues are surfacing. Quebec's development rests on its capacity to meet these situations head-on, notably to use, adapt and invent practices and technologies that will be more and more knowledge dependent. In this context, education represents a strategic factor in Quebec's future. It follows from this that non-qualified and illiterate persons will be excluded from the labour market.⁹

Having analysed Quebec's industrial policies, both past and present, the economist, Pierre Fortin, published the results of his study in *La Presse* in September of 2004 and stated the following: "Education is Quebec's industrial policy. For all intents and purposes, a country does not need resources in order to develop. It need only put knowledge into the

⁹ Detailed data for this section can be found in Appendix 3.

minds of its children.” To this, we add, “and of the individuals who are in the labour market”, especially that today and for the foreseeable future, it is unlikely that one will keep his/her job during his/her entire lifetime.

Finally, the availability of a qualified labour force constitutes a major and increasingly distinctive asset for attracting companies to produce in Quebec.

Quebec, therefore, is facing greater demands for regular and continuing education.

3.2. Increasingly Complex Educational Issues

The objective of increasing or merely maintaining present school success levels seems to be leading us towards increasingly complex issues and sophisticated approaches.¹⁰

To begin with, we find that secondary school graduation rates, which increased from the 1970s onward, have levelled off at 65% in the under-20 age group and around 15% in the over-20 category since the beginning of the 1990s. The 2003-2004 rate was 70% for persons under 20 years of age.

Graduation rates seem to have levelled off at the college and university levels since the beginning of the 1990s: 25% in pre-university programs, 15% in technical education, 28% at the bachelors level and 8% and 1% at the masters and Ph.D. levels respectively. Only vocational education graduation rates have been increasing.

Finally, dropout rates among 17, 18 and 19 year olds, which were decreasing since the beginning of the 1980s, have flattened out over the past ten years, but at levels that are a cause for concern, i.e., 11%, 17% and 19% respectively.

Moreover, reorientations and delays are frequent. Thus:

- Nearly 20% of high-school graduates are at least 20 years old upon graduation;
- Nearly half of newly enrolled adult education students are under 20 years of age;
- The over-25 age group represents 40% of new registrations in vocational education, which is accessible immediately after high-school, and 15% of these new enrollees have attended a CEGEP;
- Less than half of CEGEP students obtain their diploma within the prescribed timeframe and approximately one-third change programs during their college studies;
- Nearly 20% of young people never obtain a diploma during their lifetime;
- Approximately 20% of young people obtain only a secondary level diploma;
- Only 60% of young people obtain a bachelors degree, a technical education diploma or a vocational education diploma during their lifetime;
- As mentioned in Section 2.3, in spite of the efforts that have been deployed so far, the proportion of young people between the ages of 18 and 24 who attend university in Quebec remains inferior to that in the rest of Canada regardless of parental education or income; this situation is partially attributable to the fact that 18 year olds are more

¹⁰ Detailed data for this section can be found in Appendix 4, Sections 4 to 11 and Table 23.

- apt to attend CEGEP than university in Quebec;
- In spite of increased participation, Quebecers are still less apt to enrol in continuing education courses than are other Canadians.

Beyond these general findings, we observe more specifically that:

- School success is not what it should be for those who fall behind at an early age and, even though we acknowledge the presence of educational programs in early childhood care centres, it seems to us that not only an early, but also a sustained and continuous school readiness program is called for;
- The children of parents who are less educated and less apt to be employed are not as successful as others;
- The success rate for boys has not improved at the same pace as that for girls over the past decades and is currently lower than that for girls;
- Secondary level students whose language of instruction is French have a lower success rate than those who are taught in English;
- University attendance in the 18 to 24 age group is lower among Francophones than Anglophones in Quebec;¹¹
- Aboriginals have a lower success rate than non-Aboriginals;
- Families in which both parents work are now the norm and their children spend more time at school (although not necessarily in the classroom) than in the past;
- The number of single parent families is increasing;
- The number of immigrants is on the rise and that creates special challenges in terms of integration and recognition of prior learning.

4. New Avenues

We have seen that Quebec's educational attainment level made significant strides when there was full demographic growth.

We have also seen that we are now in an asymmetric demographic transition.

Some institutions must accommodate more students and do not have the required space to do so, thus entailing further investment; others, usually those located in regions furthest removed from large centres, are experiencing what are at times dramatic declines in enrolment, thus driving up the cost per student, something that is proving to be more and more difficult to sustain.

The education system is facing financial constraints which, in the short term, will jeopardise both the development of institutions that are expanding and the survival of programs and even institutions that are contracting.

All told, our capacity to maintain a quality and accessible education system and deliver services and be present throughout the province is at risk. The world of education is aware of this state of affairs; young people, who fear that they will lose out on the preceding generation's access to quality education, are also cognisant of the situation; regional

¹¹ We do not have data on CEGEP success and attendance rates by language of instruction.

development leaders are openly expressing their concern.

Further educational requirements come into play in all industrialised countries that must convert to the knowledge economy. The means that have been deployed up to now in Quebec have allowed us to join the ranks of these other countries, but our results in terms of school success seem to be levelling off and improving them will not be an easy task: the issues are multifaceted, complex and require sophisticated solutions.

That is why we propose four avenues that, taken together, would allow for, on the one hand, an awareness of education and, on the other, a restructuring of our present approach to the delivery of educational services.

They deal with the funding of the education system, the organisation of government youth services, the development of a regionally integrated educational service offering and, finally, enhanced public support.

4.1. Reform Funding Arrangements

Fiscal belt tightening in the education system has led to a general improvement in the efficiency and effectiveness of our management methods. However, current funding formulas and levels are making access to quality educational services more questionable.

On the one hand, in areas experiencing important enrolment declines, per-student funding is an impediment to the organisation of educational services and we have to resign ourselves to an inevitable increase in the cost per student.

On the other hand, postsecondary institutions have to deal with underfunding. Moreover, many among them are still growing.

As a backdrop to all of this, education plays a strategic role in Quebec's social and economic development, just as it does in the rest of Canada and other industrialised countries. Besides, some provinces are reinvesting heavily in education.

At the August 12, 2005 meeting of the Council of the Federation, the provincial premiers issued a communiqué in which they expressed their intention to hold a summit on postsecondary and vocational education which would require the participation of all the partners in education, including institutions, labour unions, students and businesses. At the same time, they stressed that, during the last decade, federal transfers for postsecondary education in the framework of the Canada Social Transfer did not keep pace with needs and that these payments would have to be immediately restored to the 1994-1995 level. They invited the Prime Minister of Canada to meet with them in November concerning the latter question in particular.

The Premier of Quebec added that the federal government should increase funding for postsecondary education by 15% to 25%. He indicated, finally, that the latter should fully respect Quebec's jurisdictional authority.

We believe that the Premier of Quebec must be able to count on broad and solid public support in this matter. It is also necessary to find ways of recouping the money of which Quebec is deprived because of the Government of Canada's taxation rules which lead it to award more generous funding for education to provinces where tuition fees and school taxes are higher than those in Quebec.

At the same time, we cannot avoid holding an open and complete debate on the funding of education, a debate that concerns more than the groups represented on our Task Force. Different levers are available; it is necessary that, as a society, we determine which ones should be used and to what extent, while never losing sight of the principle of equity as it applies not only on the economic, but also on the interregional and intergenerational fronts.

Quebec's current general taxation is, via the government's budget, the principal source of funding for education. One-third of the provincial budget was once dedicated to education; today, that proportion is one-fourth. We believe that it is high time to halt this downward

trend.

Can or should property owners, who help to fund school boards through their school taxes that have been capped for several years, contribute still more to the financing of these institutions, indeed, even vocational training? Should businesses contribute more to the funding of vocational and postsecondary education through this or some other type of mechanism?

Unlike the rest of Canada, Quebec has opted for no or low tuition fees as well as substantial needs-based financial aid in order to ensure access to postsecondary study for the greatest number of its citizens.

The Government of Quebec has committed itself to a tuition freeze during its current term of office; this must be honoured. According to some, this option must be maintained for the following reasons: it takes into account the student's economic situation, represents an investment in society, ensures accessibility and the alternative does not constitute a solution for university underfunding. Moreover, the increase in tuition fees in the rest of Canada has widened the gap between the haves and have-nots in terms of enrolment.¹²

According to others, we should see to it that our tuition fees catch up with the Canadian average while improving the financial aid system in order that increased tuition be considered admissible for bursaries for the less affluent, encouraging parents to save more for their children's education and promoting graduation rates through tax and financial incentives. According to this group, the current situation constitutes a regressive tax that works in favour of the more affluent.

In Canada, five provincial governments do not provide private schools with public financing. Quebec is one of the provinces that grant partial government funding for private education. According to some, eliminating this aid would lead to an annual savings of approximately \$75 million. Furthermore, it would help to counter an academic and social selection process exercised by private schools to the detriment of public institutions. The latter could then be reinforced and able to offer better services as well as a broader range of programs and teaching venues to students.

According to others, eliminating this funding would entail costs for the Government of Quebec. Moreover, in their eyes, academic and social selection is becoming an increasingly rare phenomenon which one would have to assess before concluding that it is detrimental to the public system. Competition between the two systems leads them to outdo one another and the maintenance of a group of partially funded private schools provides choice for parents who are willing to contribute an additional amount to their children's education over and above the taxes that they already pay as citizens.

The debate on tuition fees, funding for private education, the real estate tax or the proportion of the provincial budget that should be dedicated to education cannot be resolved easily and quickly. It is important that these questions be part of a broad ranging

12 M. Coelli, *Tuition Increases and Inequality in Post-Secondary Education Attendance*, University of British Columbia, May 2004.

debate on the financing of education and it is fundamental that it be conducted openly in order that all citizens may know the ins and outs of this important issue and that all interested parties be able to express their point of view. It will also be an opportunity for all to adhere to the consensus that might emerge from these discussions.

Finally, we are of the opinion that the funding formulas for educational networks should not be based solely on the number of students. Furthermore, the formulas for the different educational networks should take into account their willingness to promote regional collaboration among themselves.

Therefore, we recommend:

- That the partners in education support the Premier of Quebec in his effort to claim a substantial increase in federal transfer payments for education and that the Premier also attempt to ensure that Quebec's education funding not be penalised by the federal taxation system.
- That this increase be unconditional and that these amounts be devoted to postsecondary education.
- That, acting on our Task Force's arguments, the Government of Quebec place on its current term's agenda a rigorous public debate focused on education and that it call upon experts for their opinions on, notably:
 - The proportion of the provincial budget that should be dedicated to education in order to maintain access to quality educational services;
 - The contribution of citizens and businesses to the financing of vocational and technical training by means of school taxes or other mechanisms;
 - The implementation of tax incentives in order to encourage the private sector to contribute to postsecondary education;
 - Various scenarios for tuition fees at the university level and even for vocational and technical training;
 - Various scenarios for public funding for private schools.
- That the funding formulas for educational networks be re-examined, get away from per student funding and promote, notably, collaboration among the different educational levels.

4.2. Consider New Organisational Arrangements in order to Maintain Province-wide Government Services for Children Ages 0-17

Several ministries and public or community organisations have established a broad range of age- and location-specific services that contribute to young people's development, support them in their pathways and assist them when they face problems. In addition to education, these services deal with early childhood development, the promotion of healthy lifestyle habits, violence and substance abuse prevention, sex education, sports, leisure and public safety.

The distinctive characteristic of all children is that they inevitably attend school. They spend most of their time there between the ages of 5 and 17.

However, early childhood care centres are rarely found in schools. The board of governors of one is distinct from that of the other even though, in small institutions, the same

individuals may sit on both. These centres offer educational programs in which the *ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport* has not been involved. Formal links between these centres and the schools are extremely rare when children cross over from one to the other. Yet, stimulation and preparation for school will be determining factors in the academic success of many children. High-school school dropout rates are often related to academic retardation among younger children. Finally, the guidelines for establishing one of these centres often work against less densely populated areas and could be simplified if schools and centres could share services.

Parallel to this, public health organisations begin their problem screening programs during early childhood. They intervene in early childhood care centres and even more in the schools via educational and awareness programs for all children by maintaining links particularly with complementary services. However, these activities can also take place outside of the school, neighbourhood or village.

Even though the persons responsible for these services communicate with one another and their ministries may have even established management agreements among themselves, they tend to plan their activities in relation to their own mission. Local, and often regional and provincial, administrative structures are responsible for a proliferation of youth services and venues. One wonders whether children and their parents are aware of all of the services that are available to them.

It is not easy to integrate service delivery. However, the demographic decline in several regions requires that we face up to this challenge.

In fact, because of demographic decline, every organisation is required to rationalise. Smaller staffs are servicing vast territories. We believe that, in order to maintain a critical mass of personnel and programs allowing for access to quality educational services, a new organisational approach is required, at least as far as early childhood care, education and public health are concerned and that the school board and the school are the linchpins for the convergence of all youth services.

The school board is a stable and decentralised organisation capable of combining and coordinating a variety of services for children ages 0 to 17. The school boards are present throughout Quebec and are governed by elected officials who could adopt a comprehensive vision for youth development.

A new organisational approach will allow for a greater complementarity and optimisation of resources that will ensure the maintenance of services in demographically fragile areas by allowing for the sharing of space and expertise. It will also ensure greater continuity in government efforts to promote success in school.

This new organisational approach should in not affect the school's educational mission which is to teach, socialise and certify.

Therefore, we recommend:

- That an ad hoc committee, made up of Members of the National Assembly, with

support from civil servants, propose new organisational approaches aimed at pulling together or better integrating services for young people in order to contribute more effectively to their development, assist them in their pathways and provide them with assistance in time of need.

- That this committee also propose an implementation plan.
- That these new approaches rely on the school boards and their schools, allow for the maintenance of a critical mass of staff and services and leave the school's educational mission intact, i.e., to teach, socialise and certify.
- That these new approaches be pilot tested initially in some regions.

4.3. Improve Regional Coordination and Delivery of Educational Services, from Preschool through University

The fact that schools and programs in many of regions of Quebec have smaller staffs than in the past makes one worry about closings or diminished quality of educational services.

The government must react to this trend and bank on regional cooperation committees, so-called "interlevel committees",¹³ which bring together regional representatives from all of levels of education (i.e., school boards, CEGEPs and, if applicable, universities) in order to improve the coordination and delivery of educational services in a spirit of complementarity and resource optimisation.

At the same, the private sector's needs for available and qualified labour are changing rapidly and it seems to us that the correspondence between available training and these needs could be better worked out on a regional basis.

This effort would also be an opportunity to aim for improved cultural and social development.

The Government of Quebec, therefore, must allow for the further empowerment of interlevel committees in order that they play this role and establish cooperation with other concerned and interested regional bodies.

The committees that accept this responsibility must propose a five-year plan to the Minister of Education for optimising educational services in their region.

Relying on regional partnership initiatives among the different levels of education, the goal of these committees would be to design a service offering corresponding to the region's needs and create one or more centres of excellence.

These committees will have to be able to count on the Minister of Education's support and, if necessary, that of the Minister of *l'Emploi et de la Solidarité sociale*, in order to carry out their responsibilities, as well as on the assurance that any resulting cost savings will be placed at the disposal of the region's educational institutions.

¹³ Tables interordres (translator's note).

Therefore, we recommend:

- That interlevel committees, which currently bring together representatives from school boards, CEGEPs and, if applicable, universities, be mandated to improve the organisation and delivery of educational services, from preschool to university, in order to achieve complementarity and resource optimisation and better cultural and social development as well as provide a better response to labour market needs.
- That the Minister of Education, on the one hand, invite those regions in which it is currently necessary to undertake this exercise to accept this responsibility and, on the other hand, receive and process similar types of regional proposals.
- That these committees become legally incorporated entities capable of carrying out this type of mandate.
- That the mandates and responsibilities, cooperation with other concerned and interested regional bodies, mechanisms for consulting associations recognised by members of civil society (parents, students, workers) and even, if necessary, the addition of new members be spelled out.
- That these committees propose a five-year plan for the realignment of educational services to the Minister of Education, obtain his support and, if necessary, that of the Minister of *l'Emploi et de la Solidarité sociale* for the realisation of their mandate and get the assurance that cost savings resulting from their efforts will remain at the disposal of the region's educational institutions in order to improve service delivery in their area.
- That a transition budget be made available to these committees allowing them to implement their plan once it has been agreed upon.

4.4. Garner Public Support from Quebec Society

We believe that consensus on the need for and importance of education in Quebec is a matter of considerable concern.

Some may think that the battle has been won, that upgrading educational attainment levels is a thing of the past and that our performance is perfectly adequate in order to face up to the challenges of the knowledge-based economy.

It is true that we have acceded to the ranks of modern societies. But is this a definitive achievement? Nothing could be less certain...

We are convinced that the 1960s slogan, "*Qui s'instruit s'enrichit*"¹⁴ is truer now than ever before on the individual as well as on the societal, economic, social and cultural fronts.

It is not only imprudent, but also irresponsible to accept that a young person leave the education system without a diploma that matches his/her aptitudes or that a person pursuing a career not be allowed to up-date and expand his/her professional skills.

Are we sufficiently resolute in this matter? Is it normal that one person in five drops out without a diploma? Is it acceptable that thousands obtain their first diploma after the age

¹⁴ Education leads to wealth (translator's note).

of twenty?

The school is an important tool in the struggle against poverty and social exclusion and it helps to safeguard Quebec's place among modern societies. Quebec's strategic development and prosperity rely on education. All of the actors in the education system are convinced of this; all are devoted to this task; all are also ready to examine their own practices and have done so many times in the past.

The public must also be involved in promoting education and even making it a value that sets us apart: it must support teachers, say no to failure and dropping out of school, provide school boards with every chance to succeed, put pressure on the government to act appropriately.

Access to educational services depends on a concrete program offering, but it also relies on the determination and effort of children, their parents and their communities to engage and succeed and on the school's capacity to offer a full gamut of activities and programs allowing young people to achieve.

Even though the state and the school provide leadership, they cannot do it alone.

Families, local communities, municipalities and businesses must combine their efforts in order to support youth as well as the employed and unemployed in their training pathways.

Therefore, we recommend:

- That the *ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport* in cooperation with the *ministère de l'Emploi et de la Solidarité sociale*, *ministère de la Famille, des Aînés et de la Condition féminine* and the *ministère du Développement économique, de l'Innovation et de l'Exportation* develop a plan for the promotion of education that is solidly based on the knowledge of the partners in education as well as on research into the attitudes of Quebecers and Quebec-based companies on education and continuing education.
- That this plan be implemented on provincial and regional levels.

CONCLUSION

Generally speaking, the vast reform of Quebec's education system that was launched in the 1960s in the wake of the *Rapport Parent* proved to be an extraordinary societal success story. Inspired by our parents' and grandparents' acute awareness of the vital importance of education for their children's success as well as the development of our people, it mobilised the general public and called for major government investments. It produced spectacular results for individuals as well as society as a whole, as measured in both quantitative and qualitative terms. Education was primarily responsible for allowing Quebec's accession to the ranks of the most culturally, socially and economically developed nations.

However, this great movement currently seems to be stalled. It would seem that Quebec society is taking this success for granted and is intent on moving on to other matters and priorities, notably health.

Made up of members with different and, at times, divergent interests, our Task Force was nevertheless unanimous in considering this to be a grave mistake. Its principal message to both the general public and the government is the following: it is education that got us out of our collective condition of virtual underdevelopment; it is education that will allow us to maintain our current rank among developed societies and position ourselves in North America and throughout the world. Education must also take up its rightful place among the main concerns of our fellow citizens and government, that is, to be among the very first.

Why?

- 1) If the development of our education system was, for the most part, a major success, grey zones remained and we can demonstrate, statistics in hand, that there are still shortcomings and gaps to be filled.
- 2) Marking time would be disastrous for us when other societies with whom we compare ourselves and against whom we compete have understood the necessity of doing more for the education of their children and continuing education.
- 3) In a context characterised by a shift towards a "knowledge-based economy", major challenges stemming from globalisation, and complex social issues such as intercultural relations, health, energy or transportation, everyone agrees that the societies that will come out ahead are those that will have successfully invested in education, research and innovation, and will be able to bank on a better educated youth, a more qualified labour force, scientific and technological breakthroughs and a capacity for smart production. In the face of these new demands, slowing down or even maintaining the status quo in our collective educational effort would represent a direction (or lack thereof) that would prove to be nothing less than suicidal for Quebec.
- 4) All of this is happening at a time when Quebec's education system is facing, if not threats, then certainly major challenges which require immediate attention and necessitate the implementation of innovative solutions.

These challenges are the very same ones that led to the creation of our Task Force. They are related, on the one hand, to the demographic evolution that threatens access to quality educational services across the province and, on the other, to the state of and, more precisely, the disquieting trend in Quebec's public sector finances.

We have attempted to clearly describe these challenges in our report and to document them as completely as possible in the appendices.

In addition to these major challenges, we have added one that appears to be perhaps the most troubling of them all: a sort of apathy towards education or, at very least, a decline in its position among Quebec's priorities.

Furthermore, since we were commissioned to do so, we have explored possible solutions. They call for:

- A reform of funding arrangements;
- Alternate organisational structures and a better integration of youth services;
- Improved regional service delivery;
- Greater support from Quebec society.

Our report has its limits. These are due to the relatively short time that we were allotted and that obviously did not allow us to explore the possible solutions that we identified in as much as depth as we would have liked. A considerable amount of additional work will be required before the Government of Quebec can convert them into clear and firm political decisions. However, it seems to us that both this work and a public debate are urgent.

It must be acknowledged that the Task Force's composition also limited the scope of its consensus. We did not agree on every point and we did not go as far as a more homogenous group could have. This will surprise no one. However, in our opinion, the fact that we were able to concur on several points and recommendations adds to their weight and credibility.

We believe that we will have fulfilled our mandate if we have succeeded in arousing an awareness that education is more vital than ever and that it is necessary to maintain and even intensify Quebec's effort in this mission while demonstrating the courage to change certain conditions for its realisation.

LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Reform funding arrangements:

- That the partners in education support the Premier of Quebec in his effort to claim a substantial increase in federal transfer payments for education and that the Premier also attempt to ensure that Quebec's education funding not be penalised by the federal taxation system.
- That this increase be unconditional and that these amounts be devoted to postsecondary education.
- That, acting on our Task Force's arguments, the Government of Quebec place on its current term's agenda a rigorous public debate focused on education and that it call upon experts for their opinions on, notably:
 - The proportion of the provincial budget that should be dedicated to education in order to maintain access to quality educational services;
 - The contribution of citizens and businesses to the financing of vocational and technical training by means of school taxes or other mechanisms;
 - The implementation of tax incentives in order to encourage the private sector to contribute to postsecondary education;
 - Various scenarios for tuition fees at the university level and even for vocational and technical training;
 - Various scenarios for public funding for private schools.
- That the funding formulas for educational networks be re-examined, get away from per student funding and promote, notably, collaboration among the different educational levels.

Consider New Organisational Arrangements in order to Maintain Province-wide Government Services for Children Ages 0-17:

- That an ad hoc committee, made up of Members of the National Assembly, with support from civil servants, propose new organisational approaches aimed at pulling together or better integrating services for young people in order to contribute more effectively to their development, assist them in their pathways and provide them with assistance in time of need.
- That this committee also propose an implementation plan.
- That these new approaches rely on the school boards and their schools, allow for the maintenance of a critical mass of staff and services and leave the school's educational mission intact, i.e., to teach, socialise and certify.
- That these new approaches be pilot tested initially in some regions.

Improve Regional Coordination and Delivery of Educational Services, from Preschool through University:

- That interlevel committees, which currently bring together representatives from school boards, CEGEPs and, if applicable, universities, be mandated to improve the organisation and delivery of educational services, from preschool to university, in order to achieve complementarity and resource optimisation and better cultural and social development as well as provide a better response to labour market needs.
- That the Minister of Education, on the one hand, invite those regions in which it is currently necessary to undertake this exercise to accept this responsibility and, on the

other hand, receive and process similar types of regional proposals.

- That these committees become legally incorporated entities capable of carrying out this type of mandate.
- That the mandates and responsibilities, cooperation with other concerned and interested regional bodies, mechanisms for consulting associations recognised by members of civil society (parents, students, workers) and even, if necessary, the addition of new members be spelled out.
- That these committees propose a five-year plan for the realignment of educational services to the Minister of Education, obtain his support and, if necessary, that of the Minister of l'Emploi et de la Solidarité sociale for the realisation of their mandate and get the assurance that cost savings resulting from their efforts will remain at the disposal of the region's educational institutions in order to improve service delivery in their area.
- That a transition budget be made available to these committees allowing them to implement their plan once it has been agreed upon.

Garner Public Support from Quebec Society:

- That the ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport in cooperation with the ministère de l'Emploi et de la Solidarité sociale, ministère de la Famille, des Aînés et de la Condition féminine and the ministère du Développement économique, de l'Innovation et de l'Exportation develop a plan for the promotion of education that is solidly based on the knowledge of the partners in education as well as on research into the attitudes of Quebecers and Quebec-based companies on education and continuing education.
- That this plan be implemented on provincial and regional levels.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1
DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

1- From the Post-War Era to the 2000s

As indicated in Table 1, Quebec's population grew from four million in 1951 to more than six million in 1971, an increase of over 50%.

Table 1
Population of Quebec, 1951 to 1971

Year	Population
1951	4,055,681
1961	5,259,211
1971	6,137,306

Source: Statistics Canada, Censuses.

Table 2 shows that there was 30% population growth between 1951 and 1961 and nearly 17% between 1961 and 1971. During this time, young people represented half of the population.

Table 2
**Quebec's Population Growth by Decade, from 1951 to 1971, and
Percentage of Population Ages 0-24 (%)**

Year	Population growth in relation to the previous decade	Percentage in 0-24 age group
1951	—	50
1961	30	51
1971	17	49

Source: Statistics Canada, censuses. In 1961, 47% of the population was between the ages of 0 and 24.

It is in this demographic context and the wake of the *Rapport Parent*¹⁵ that Quebec established an education system that was designed to be accessible and deliver quality services as well as be a driving force in the creation and distribution of wealth.

At the beginning of the 1970s, the school boards were operating nearly 3,000 schools, there were forty-five CEGEPs and almost all of the present-day universities were already established in Quebec.

Table 3 demonstrates that Quebec's pre-1971 rate of demographic growth declined in subsequent years and the 0 to 24 age group, which once represented half of the population, fell to one-third by 1991.

¹⁵ Gouvernement du Québec, *Rapport de la Commission royale d'enquête sur l'enseignement dans la province de Québec*, 1965

Table 3
Quebec's Population Growth by Decade, from 1971 to 2001, and
Percentage of Population Ages 0-24 (%)

Year	Population growth in relation to the previous decade	Percentage in 0-24 age group
1971	17	49
1981	7	41
1991	8	33
2001	5	31

Source: Statistics Canada, Censuses.

Since the mid-1960s, enrolments, as expressed in full-time equivalents (FTEs), have declined at the school board level and have grown in the CEGEPs and universities, as shown in Table 4.

Table 4
Enrolments, in FTEs,
by Type of Educational Institution

Institutions	Enrolments	
	1968-1969	2003 -2004
School Boards (children)	1,519,452	980,403
CEGEPs	35,964	160,235
Universities	64,401	187,083 (est.)

Source: DRIS, *ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport* (MELS). Today, school boards currently admit nearly 100,000 adult FTEs. FTEs are calculated by dividing part-time enrolments by 3.5 and adding them to full-time enrolments, except at the university level where FTEs represent the student body recognised for funding purposes.

Attendance, as measured in FTEs, peaked at the end of the 1960s in the school boards, at the beginning of the 1990s in the CEGEPs and is currently reaching unparalleled numbers in the universities. This is illustrated in table 5.

Table 5
Maximum Enrolments, in FTEs, by Type of Educational Institution

Institutions	Maximum Enrolment	
	Year	FTEs
School Boards	1968-1969	1,519,452
CEGEPs	1993-1994	181,071
Universities	2003-2004	187,083 (est.)

Source: DRSI, MELS. At the CEGEP level FTEs are calculated by dividing part-time enrolments by 3.5 and adding them to full-time enrolments. At the university level, FTEs represent the student body recognised for funding purposes. There is also another way of calculating CEGEP enrolment, i.e., the PES formula or *périodes-élèves-semaines* (translator's note: student hours per week) generally used by the CEGEPs and the MELS for funding purposes.

The number of public schools (and vocational or adult education centres) has remained relatively stable since 1971. However, from 1998-1999 to 2005-2006, the number of primary and secondary schools went from 2,556 to 2,434, a six-year loss of 122 schools or 4.8%, the number of adult education centres shrunk from 228 to 200, a 12% decline, while vocational education centres dropped from 201 to 196.

The number of CEGEPs increased from forty-five to forty-eight, approximately twenty college-level off-campus centres have been opened since 1971 and two branches have been added to the University of Quebec's system.

Thus, Quebec has a public system that was developed when there was strong population growth. The number of service centres has not diminished at the same rate as the decline in the 0 to 24 age group which, as Table 6 indicates, was smaller in 2001 than in 1961.

Table 6
Number of Persons, Ages 0-24, in Quebec from 1951 to 2016

Year	Number, ages 0-24
1951	2,044,511
1961	2,700,454
1971	2,956,240
1981	2,659,495
1991	2,303,920
2001	2,241,060
2011 (projection)	2,172,421
2016 (projection)	2,058,060

Sources: Statistics Canada, Censuses, and for projections: Institut de la statistique du Québec, *Si la tendance se maintient, perspectives démographiques Québec et régions, 2001-2051*, 2003.

This situation is due to the obligation of offering educational services to all children between the ages of five and sixteen and for whom school attendance is compulsory beginning at age six, to a higher level of educational attainment (this will be dealt with in the following section) and to an increased enrolment rate in urban centres. In fact, as demonstrated in Table 7, from the 1970s through the

1990s, population declined in several regions of Quebec where educational services had to be maintained, while the Greater Montreal area (Laval, Laurentides, Lanaudière and Montérégie) as well as the Outaouais region were experiencing considerable growth.

Table 7
Population Change, by Fifteen-year Periods, from 1971 to 2001 (%)

Region	Percentage population change	
	1971-1986	1986-2001
Bas-Saint-Laurent	3	- 5
Saguenay–Lac-Saint-Jean	10	- 3
Capitale-Nationale	14	8
Mauricie	5	1
Estrie	10	10
Montréal	- 7	1
Outaouais	22	23
Abitibi-Témiscamingue	5	- 1
Côte-Nord	3	- 7
Nord-du-Québec	23	6
Gaspésie–Îles-de-la-Madeleine	- 1	- 14
Chaudière-Appalaches	19	7
Laval	28	20
Lanaudière	61	39
Laurentides	36	44
Montérégie	35	17
Centre-du-Québec	13	8
QUÉBEC	12	10

Source: DRSI, MELS, based on data from the Institut de la statistique du Québec and produced by the Census of Canada (Statistics Canada). Earlier data by region were not available. Quebec's population grew by 33% between 1956 and 1971.

2- The Foreseeable Future

Table 8 shows that demographic decline will become even more pronounced between now and 2016. The number of children ages 0-14 will diminish in every region, except Montreal, as will the 15-34 year olds, except in Montreal and its surrounding area and the Outaouais region.

Table 8
Evolution of 0-14 and 15-34 Age Groups, by Percentage, by Region, from 2001-2006 (%)

Region	Ages 0-14	Ages 15-34
Bas-Saint-Laurent	- 29	- 21
Saguenay–Lac-Saint-Jean	- 30	- 24
Capitale-Nationale	- 17	- 12
Mauricie	- 27	- 15
Estrie	- 11	- 2
Montréal	3	1
Outaouais	- 14	8
Abitibi-Témiscamingue	- 36	- 20
Côte-Nord	- 38	- 26
Nord-du-Québec	- 20	- 9
Gaspésie–Îles-de-la-Madeleine	- 45	- 28
Chaudière-Appalaches	- 18	- 13
Laval	- 8	5
Lanaudière	- 16	8
Laurentides	- 6	15
Montérégie	- 15	0
Centre-du-Québec	- 16	- 8
QUÉBEC	15	6

Source: Statistics Canada for 2000 and Institut de la statistique du Québec for 2016.

Between 2000 and 2010, the MELS expects that all Francophone school boards will experience a decline in their full-time numbers, with the exception of the des Trois-Lacs School Board. The average variation will be -15%. The Anglophone school boards will decline by an average of approximately -5%. Table 9 provides detailed data.

Table 9
Forecast of the Evolution of Full-time Student Enrolment
between 2000-2001 and 2010-2011 (%)

Francophone School Boards			
Bas-Saint-Laurent		Saguenay–Lac-Saint-Jean	
des Monts-et-Marées	- 32	du Pays-des-Bleuets	- 35
des Phares	- 20	du Lac-Saint-Jean	- 27
du Fleuve-et-des-Lacs	- 32	des Rives-du-Saguenay	- 34
de Kamouraska–Riv.-du-Loup	- 21	De La Jonquière	- 26
Capitale-Nationale		Mauricie	
de Charlevoix	- 28	du Chemin-du-Roy	- 23
de la Capitale	- 20	de l'Énergie	- 28
des Découvreurs	- 17		
des Premières-Seigneuries	- 15		
de Portneuf	- 22		
Estrie		Montréal	
des Hauts-Cantons	- 24	de la Pointe-de-l'Île	- 11
de la Région-de-Sherbrooke	- 7	de Montréal	- 11
des Sommets	- 16	Marguerite-Bourgeoys	- 4
Outaouais		Abitibi-Témiscamingue	
des Draveurs	- 14	du Lac-Témiscamingue	- 28
des Portages-de-l'Outaouais	- 1	de Rouyn-Noranda	- 26
au Cœur-des-Vallées	- 14	Harricana	- 32
des Hauts-Bois-de-l'Outaouais	- 21	de l'Or-et-des-Bois	- 27
		du Lac-Abitibi	- 30
Côte-Nord		Nord-du-Québec	
de l'Estuaire	- 33	de la Baie-James	- 38
du Fer	- 16		
de la Moyenne-Côte-Nord	- 25		
Gaspésie–Îles-de-la-Madeleine		Chaudière-Appalaches	
des Îles	- 31	de la Côte-du-Sud	- 28
des Chic-Chocs	- 38	de L'Amiante	- 24
René-Lévesque	- 33	de la Beauce-Etchemin	- 22
		des Navigateurs	- 17
Laval		Lanaudière	
de Laval	- 10	des Affluents	- 15
		des Samares	- 17
Laurentides		Montérégie	
de la Seigneurie-des-Mille-Îles	- 4	de Sorel-Tracy	- 19
de la Rivière-du-Nord	- 4	de Saint-Hyacinthe	- 18
des Laurentides	- 9	des Hautes-Rivières	- 13
Pierre-Neveu	- 19	Marie-Victorin	- 16
		des Patriotes	- 9
Centre-du-Québec		du Val-des-Cerfs	
de la Riveraine	- 26	des Grandes-Seigneuries	- 10
des Bois-Francs	- 20	de la Vallée-des-Tisserands	- 24
des Chênes	- 8	des Trois-Lacs	+ 9

Anglophone School Boards			
Central Quebec	+ 15	Western Quebec	- 20
Eastern Shore	- 15	English Montréal	- 11
Eastern Townships	- 4	Lester B. Pearson	- 6
Riverside	- 3	New Frontiers	- 20
Sir Wilfrid Laurier	+ 19		

Source: DRSI, MELS.

According to data compiled by the MELS, 15% of primary schools (441) had 100 students or less. Approximately 100 of these schools had sixty students or less. In almost one-third of Quebec's regions, over one-half of the schools had 100 students or less, notably in the Bas-Saint-Laurent, Mauricie, Abitibi-Témiscamingue, Gaspésie, Chaudière-Appalaches and Centre-du-Québec regions. In vocational education, 15% of authorised programs are not offered because of insufficient numbers, a situation that occurs more frequently in the Côte-Nord and Abitibi-Témiscamingue regions. Table 10 provides detailed information.

Table 10
Percentage of Primary Schools with 100 Students or Less and
Vocational Education Programs That Were not Offered Due to a Lack of Students, 2003-2004
(%)

Regions	Percentage of primary schools with 100 students or less	Percentage of vocational education programs not offered
Bas-Saint-Laurent	68	13
Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean	17	4
Capitale-Nationale	10	11
Mauricie	29	10
Estrie	24	17
Montréal	0	19
Outaouais	18	30
Abitibi-Témiscamingue	49	22
Côte-Nord	16	32
Nord-du-Québec	0	66
Gaspésie-Îles-de-la-Madeleine	39	30
Chaudière-Appalaches	28	6
Laval	0	12
Lanaudière	9	22
Laurentides	13	11
Montérégie	5	13
Centre-du-Québec	29	12
LE QUÉBEC	15	15

Source: DGFE and FPTFC-DG, MELS.

Based on the 13m² per student standard, the MELS estimates that, in 2003-2004, most school boards had excess space, except for those in the Outaouais, Laval, Laurentides, Lanaudière and Montérégie areas.

The MELS expects that the number of CEGEP students will increase by an average of 6% between 2000 and 2010, but that there could be sharp declines in the outlying regions and considerable growth in the Greater Montreal area. This is demonstrated in Table 11.

Table 11
Forecast of Full-time Regular Student CEGEP Enrolment between 2000 and 2010 (%)

Bas-Saint-Laurent		Abitibi-Témiscamingue	
Rimouski	- 15	Abitibi-Témiscamingue	- 9
Rivière-du-Loup	- 22	Côte-Nord	
La Pocatière	- 19	Baie-Comeau	- 18
Matane	- 21	Sept-Îles	- 27
Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean		Gaspésie-Îles-de-la-Madeleine	
Chicoutimi	- 23	Gaspésie et des Îles	- 18
Jonquières	- 16		
Alma	- 27		
Saint-Félicien	- 26	Chaudière-Appalaches	
Capitale-Nationale		Lévis-Lauzon	- 7
Limoilou	- 1	Beauce-Appalaches	- 34
Sainte-Foy	+ 5	Amiante	- 34
François-Xavier-Garneau	- 3	Laval	
Champlain — St. Lawrence	- 2	Montmorency	+ 26
Mauricie		Lanaudière	
Trois-Rivières	- 6	Lanaudière — Joliette	+ 8
Shawinigan	- 24	Lanaudière — Assomption	+ 71
Estrie		Lanaudière — Terrebonne ¹⁶	+ 333
Sherbrooke	+ 7	Laurentides	
Champlain — Lennoxville	- 6	Lionel-Groulx	+ 25
Montréal		Saint-Jérôme	+ 16
Saint-Laurent	+ 16	Montérégie	
Ahuntsic	+ 15	Granby-H.-Yamaska	- 6
Bois-de-Boulogne	+ 13	Sorel-Tracy	- 22
Rosemont	+ 21	Saint-Hyacinthe	- 3
Maisonneuve	+ 10	Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu	+ 18
Vieux Montréal	+ 16	Édouard-Montpetit	+ 20
André-Laurendeau	+ 23	Champlain — St-Lambert	+ 9
Gérald-Godin	+ 57	Valleyfield	- 13%
Dawson	+ 21	Centre-du-Québec	
Vanier	+ 35	Drummondville	-10
John Abbott	+ 32	Victoriaville	- 17
Marie-Victorin	+ 15		
Outaouais			
Outaouais	+31		
Heritage	+8		

Source: DRSI, MELS.

¹⁶ This sharp growth is due to the fact that there were only 126 students at the Terrebonne campus in 2000.

According to 2003 MELS data, Montreal, Laval and Laurentides CEGEPs will exceed their overall capacity to accommodate students by 2007.

Table 12 indicates that, in 2003-2004, roughly one-third of CEGEP-level technical programs offered during the previous three years have enrolments of less than sixty students. In many regions, the proportion is above 50%.

Table 12
Percentage of CEGEP-level Technical Programs Offered with Fewer than 60 Enrolled Students during the Previous Three Years , 2003-2004 (%)

Region	Percentage of technical programs with fewer than 60 students
Bas-Saint-Laurent	47
Saguenay–Lac-Saint-Jean	28
Capitale-Nationale	8
Mauricie	35
Estrie	28
Montréal	18
Outaouais	54
Abitibi-Témiscamingue	46
Côte-Nord	69
Nord-du-Québec	N/A
Gaspésie–Îles-de-la-Madeleine	83
Chaudière-Appalaches	48
Laval	21
Lanaudière	53
Laurentides	32
Montérégie	23
Centre-du-Québec	46
QUEBEC	31

Source: FPTFC-DG, MELS.

The MELS predicts that university-level student enrolment (FTEs) will increase by an average of 6% between 2000 and 2010, a forecast that the university rectors and principals¹⁷ deem conservative. As indicated in Table 13, enrolments will vary considerably from one institution to another.

¹⁷ Conférence des recteurs et des principaux des universités du Québec, CRÉPUQ (translator's note).

Table 13
Projected University Student Enrolment (FTEs) between 2000 and 2010 (%)

Universities	Student enrolment
Laval	- 5
Montréal	+ 13
Hautes études commerciales	+ 17
Polytechnique	+ 6
Sherbrooke	+ 3
McGill	+ 4
Concordia	+ 19
Bishop's	+ 1
Université du Québec à Montréal	+ 7
Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières	+ 1
Université du Québec à Chicoutimi	- 12
Université du Québec à Rimouski	0
Université du Québec en Outaouais	+20
Université du Québec en Abitibi-Témiscamingue	- 6
École nationale d'administration publique	+ 25
École nationale de la recherche scientifique	- 4
École de technologie supérieure	+ 49
Télé-université	+ 6
QUEBEC	+ 6

Source: DRSI, MELS.

According to MELS data, Concordia, École des hautes études commerciales, Université du Québec à Montréal, Université du Québec en Outaouais, Télé-université and École de technologie supérieure will face a research space shortfall in excess of 10% of their current total net space.

3- An Important Cohort Approaching Retirement

As Baby Boomers age, a major segment of the population is nearing retirement. According to Table 14, the 55 to 64 age group will outnumber the 20 to 29 age group between now and the end of the current decade in all regions of the province except for the Nord-du-Québec region and the Island of Montreal.

Table 14
Demographic Trends for the 20-29 and 55-64 Age Groups, Quebec

Region	Replacement index (ages 20-29 / ages 55-64) x 100		Year in which the 55-64 age group will outnumber the 20-29 age group
	2001	2026	
Bas-Saint-Laurent	107	58	2004
Saguenay–Lac-Saint-Jean	121	61	2006
Capitale Nationale	126	70	2007
Mauricie	97	58	2001
Estrie	122	73	2007
Montréal	166	103	2026 +
Outaouais	133	73	2010
Abitibi-Témiscamingue	127	65	2007
Côte-Nord	122	63	2006
Nord-du-Québec	266	133	2026 +
Gaspésie–Îles-de-la-Madeleine	83	44	2001
Chaudière-Appalaches	125	67	2007
Laval	120	80	2009
Lanaudière	103	66	2003
Laurentides	109	69	2005
Montérégie	115	73	2006
Centre-du-Québec	122	71	2007
QUEBEC	129	77	2008

Source: Institut de la statistique du Québec, *Si la tendance se maintient, perspectives démographiques Québec et régions, 2001-2051, 2003, table 5, p. 27.*

The fear of widespread labour shortages, at least for highly qualified talent, that market analysts nurtured during the 1990s has since been attenuated. In its recent discussion paper on a policy for harmonising work and family life, the *ministère de l'Emploi et de la Solidarité sociale* makes no mention of shortages or even scarcities, but rather of “a projected decline in labour”.¹⁸ Even if the number of retirements does not necessarily translate into an equivalent number of new jobs, it is probable that manpower needs will be felt in many regions, as it will in education.

¹⁸ Ministère de l'Emploi, de la Solidarité sociale et de la Famille (MESSF), *Vers une politique gouvernementale de conciliation travail-famille, document de consultation, version complète, 2004, p. 19.*

APPENDIX 2

FINANCIAL DATA

1- Public Finances

As measured by the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita, Quebec's wealth is lower than the average for the rest of Canada. Quebec's debt and tax burden as a proportion of GDP are higher than those in the rest of the country, as demonstrated in Table 1.

Table 1
GDP per capita, Debt as a Proportion of GDP and Tax Burden as a Proportion of GDP

	GDP per capita 2003 (\$)	Provincial debt as a percentage of GDP 2003 (%)	Tax burden as a percentage of GDP 2000 (%)
Quebec	33,936	45	39
Nova Scotia	39,657	40	35
Newfoundland, Labrador		35	33
Ontario		29	37
Saskatchewan		23	31
New Brunswick		23	33
Prince Edward Island		23	36
Manitoba		17	34
British Columbia		11	34
Alberta		3	28

Source: ministère des Finances du Québec, *Fardeau fiscal : recettes totales des administrations fédérale, provinciale et locale*.

Furthermore, the Government of Canada has considerably reduced transfer payments for postsecondary education. In fact, until 1977, the Transfer Payment Programs essentially called for both levels of government to share equally in assuming the costs of not only postsecondary education, but also health and other social programs. These payments have been reduced and, between 1995-1996 and 2004-2005, those for health increased by \$10 billion while those for social programs, including postsecondary education, fell by \$2.2 billion.¹⁹

2- Total Education Expenditures

Statistics Canada and the OECD include all of the financial resources that are devoted to education when calculating total expenditures for this area: operating expenses, capital investments, ministerial administration, government contributions to retirement funds, student financial aid, research grants. Table 2 shows that, in 2002-2003, Quebec's total education expenditures were \$18.5 billion, \$11.1 of which came from the *ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport* (MELS).

¹⁹ Presentation by Michel Audet, Quebec's Finance Minister, to the House of Commons Subcommittee on Fiscal Imbalance, April 11, 2005 (<http://www.finances.gouv.qc.ca/fr/ministre/Allocutions.asp>).

Table 2
Quebec's Total Education Expenditures, 2002-2003

Source	Billions of dollars
MELS	11.1
School taxes	1.1
Tuition and ancillary fees	0.9
Other school board revenue	0.7
Other private school revenue	0.2
Other CEGEP and private college revenue	0.2
University research grants (other than from the MELS)	1.0
Other university revenue	0.6
Alternative training, provincial funding	1.1
Alternative training, federal funding	0.4
Alternative training, other sources	0.5
Student financial aid (other than from the MELS)	0.3
Other expenses	0.4
TOTAL	18.5

Source: DRSI, MELS, based on Statistics Canada's method. Alternative training programs offered outside of the networks financed by the Government of Quebec are, for example, those of *Emploi-Québec* or Quebec's penitentiaries. Those that are funded by the Government of Canada are, for instance, those of Human Resources and Social Development Canada or the federal penitentiaries. Those financed by other sources rely on tuition fees established by specialised trade, art, music, etc. schools.

Since 1976, Quebecers have annually contributed more of their wealth to education, as expressed by a ratio of total expenditures in education to GDP, than have other Canadians and Americans.

However, as indicated in Table 3, this ratio decreased in Quebec and increased in the United States, between 1981 and 2000, to such an extent that it was virtually the same in both jurisdictions in 2002. It remained stable in the rest of Canada.

Table 3
Education Expenditures by GDP (%)

Years	Quebec	Rest of Canada	United States
1981-1985	9.0	6.8	6.4
1986-1990	7.9	6.8	6.8
1991-1995	8.7	7.4	7.2
1996-2000	7.7	6.7	7.2
2002	7.5	6.4	7.3

Sources: DRSI, MELS and Statistics Canada.

One must take into account, however, that GDP per capita is lower in Quebec than in the rest of Canada and the United States and that its expenditures per student are not necessarily greater than those of other jurisdictions.

For example, as indicated in Table 4, operational costs per student are only slightly higher in Quebec than in the rest of Canada and well below those in the United States.

Table 4
Expenditures per Student, 2002-2003 (est.) (\$)

	Quebec	Rest of Canada	United States
Primary and Secondary	7,450	7,295	9,552

Source: MELS, *Education Indicators 2005*, Table 1.8.

According to the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), whose methodology differs slightly from that of Statistics Canada, only three countries (Korea, the United States and Denmark) had a higher ratio of education expenditures to GDP than Quebec in 2001; this is demonstrated in Table 5. Quebec's ratio was 7.0% whereas the average for the twenty-two countries involved in the study was 5.8%. According to the MELS, the difference of +1.2 percentage points between the Quebec ratio and that of the other OECD countries is due essentially to greater expenditures per student (+1.4), a lower GDP (+0.2), a higher attendance rate (+0.1) and a lower proportion of children in the general population (-0.4).

Table 5
Education Expenditures by GDP in OECD Countries, 2001 (%)

Quebec	Rest of Canada	United States	Average for OECD countries
7.0	5.9	7.3	5.8

Sources: OECD, *Education at a Glance* and, for Quebec and the rest of Canada: DRIS, MELS. Countries included: Korea, Denmark, the United-States, Iceland, Sweden, Norway, Belgium, France, Australia, Canada, Portugal, Finland, Austria, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, Switzerland, Italy, Germany, the Netherlands, Spain, Japan and Ireland.

Table 6 indicates that funding for education in Quebec is provided primarily by the government and, therefore, by the provincial budget; this is less true in Ontario and the United States.

Table 6
Direct Sources (est.) of Funds for the Financing of
Education Expenditures, 2002-2003 (%)

Sources	Preschool, primary and secondary schools			College (CEGEPs and colleges)			Universities		
	QC	ON	USA	QC	ON	USA	QC	ON	USA
Provincial	76	57	50	78	59	--	54	39	--
Federal	2	1	7	10, most of which is for student financial aid	5%	--	17, most of which is for student financial aid	13	--
Local	12	36	43	0	0	--	0	0	--
Tuition	0	0	0	3	28	--	10	27	--
Other	10	6	0	9	8	--	19	21	--

Sources: DRSI, MELS and Statistics Canada. Federal funding that is sent to the provinces and then allotted to education, such as money provided by the Canadian Transfer Programs for health and social services, is listed here as a provincial contribution. It most likely represents a number of percentage points. The federal contribution to Quebec presented in this table for preschool, primary and secondary education comes essentially from Indian and Northern Affairs Canada.

3- Provincial Education Expenditures

Education's share of the Quebec budget is shown in Table 7. It has shrunk constantly since 1985-1986, going from almost one-third to one-quarter of the budget in 2004-2005, a drop of 25 %. However, the proportion of the budget devoted to health has grown and could continue to increase significantly if there are no major technological or demographic changes.

Table 7
Evolution of Health and Education Expenditures in Quebec's Budget (%)

	Health	Education	Other sectors
1985-1986	32	31	37
1995-1996	36	28	36
2004-2005	43	25	32

Source: ministère des Finances du Québec.

For its part, the Government of Ontario has placed education at the forefront of its most recent budget. It states that "*The McGuinty Government understands that, in today's knowledge economy, education is the prerequisite for prosperity.*"²⁰ Without neglecting the primary and secondary levels, which will get increased funding of 4.1% between now and 2007-2008, postsecondary education's funding will grow at an annual average rate of 6.8% until 2009-2010.²¹ In 2005-2006 alone, the education budget will increase by 8% for the postsecondary level as compared to 6% for health.

Another provincial government is projecting a significant increase in spending for education. In fact,

20 Ministry of Finance Of Ontario, "Paper A: Reaching Higher: The McGuinty Government Plan for Postsecondary Education," 2005 Ontario Budget, May 11, 2005.

21 Seventy percent of this growth will be in grants to colleges and universities. These grants will increase from \$3.2 to \$4.4 billion annually, between 2004-2005 and 2009-2010. There will also be increased funding for student aid (25%), apprenticeship and other types of training. It should be noted, however, that an election will likely be called in 2007.

Alberta's budget, *Investing in the Next Alberta*, includes a 13.4% hike in spending as of 2005-2006 and an average annual increase of 9.1% between now and 2007-2008 for postsecondary education as well as a 7.1% increase for primary and secondary levels in 2005-2006. The health budget will grow by 8.6% in 2005-2006.

In 2005-2006, spending on education will increase by 4.2% in Quebec, 3.5% in British Columbia and 3.3% in New Brunswick.

4- Funding for the Networks

The funding formulas were developed when the Ministry of Education and the education networks were created in the 1960s. They have been adjusted over time.

Funding is essentially based on a per-student amount, but also includes allocations for various emerging issues and support for success in school. Money is also granted for daycare services and school transportation.

In 2003-2004, the MELS' average annual per student allocation varied, depending upon the school board, between \$4,287 and \$12,742 for general education in the youth sector and included all transfers except for those covering capital investment, debt, school transportation and contributions to retirement funds. This information is found in Table 8.

The average per student allocation for all of the school boards was \$5,281. Distance, low population density and aid to the underprivileged explain the variance.

Table 8
MELS' Average Annual Per Student Allocation for General Education (Youth Sector) Including All Transfers Except for Capital Investment, Debt, School Transportation and Contributions to Retirement Funds, by School Board, 2003-2004 (\$)

Francophone School Boards			
Bas-Saint-Laurent		Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean	
des Monts-et-Marées	6,161	du Pays-des-Bleuets	5,851
des Phares	5,517	du Lac-Saint-Jean	5,496
du Fleuve-et-des-Lacs	6,788	des Rives-du-Saguenay	5,426
de Kamouraska-Rivière-du-Loup	5,841	De La Jonquière	5,243
Capitale-Nationale		Mauricie	
de Charlevoix	6,101	du Chemin-du-Roy	5,147
de la Capitale	5,246	de l'Énergie	5,368
des Découvreurs	4,703		
des Premières-Seigneuries	5,109		
de Portneuf	5,257		

Estrie		Montréal	
des Hauts-Cantons	5,240	de la Pointe-de-l'Île	4,731
de la Région-de-Sherbrooke	5,063	de Montréal	5,395
des Sommets	4,930	Marguerite-Bourgeoys	4,771
Outaouais		Abitibi-Témiscamingue	
des Draveurs	4,748	du Lac-Témiscamingue	6,998
des Portages-de-l'Outaouais	4,549	de Rouyn-Noranda	5,390
au Cœur-des-Vallées	4,901	Harricana	6,194
des Hauts-Bois-de-l'Outaouais	6,081	de l'Or-et-des-Bois	5,558
		du Lac-Abitibi	6,676
Côte-Nord		Nord-du-Québec	
de l'Estuaire	5,962	de la Baie-James	8,028
du Fer	6,455		
de la Moyenne-Côte-Nord	12,742		
Gaspésie-Îles-de-la-Madeleine		Chaudière-Appalaches	
des Îles	7,592	de la Côte-du-Sud	5,485
des Chic-Chocs	6,829	de L'Amiante	5,459
René-Lévesque	6,266	de la Beauce-Etchemin	5,269
		des Navigateurs	4,930
Laval		Lanaudière	
de Laval	4,768	des Affluents	4,886
		des Samares	4,898
Laurentides		Montérégie	
de la Seigneurie-des-Mille-Îles	4,758	de Sorel-Tracy	5,221
de la Rivière-du-Nord	4,891	de Saint-Hyacinthe	4,990
des Laurentides	4,287	des Hautes-Rivières	4,717
Pierre-Neveu	5,591	Marie-Victorin	4,908
		des Patriotes	4,343
Centre-du-Québec		du Val-des-Cerfs	
de la Riveraine	5,360	des Grandes-Seigneuries	4,755
des Bois-Francs	5,110	de la Vallée-des-Tisserands	5,018
des Chênes	5,140	des Trois-Lacs	4,550
Anglophone School Boards			
Central Quebec	6,109	Western Quebec	5,230
Eastern Shore	9,422	English Montréal	4,951
Eastern Townships	5,225	Lester B. Pearson	4,572
Riverside	5,060	New Frontiers	5,753
Sir Wilfrid Laurier	5,043		

Source: Réseaux-DGFE, MELS. In this table, additional allocations and those linked to service delivery have been integrated into general education for the youth sector even if they sometimes apply to vocational education.

Depending upon the institution, the MELS' average annual allocation for the regular CEGEP program ranged between \$6,604 and \$15,689 per FTE, excluding capital investment, debt and contributions to

retirement funds. These numbers are found in Table 9. The average CEGEP allocation as a whole was \$8,104 per FTE. Distance, the size of the institution and, to a lesser extent, the proportion of students enrolled in technical programs explain the variance.

Table 9
MELS' Average Allocation per FTE for Regular the CEGEP Program, Including All Transfers Except for Capital Investment, Debt and Contributions to Retirement Funds, by CEGEP, 2003-2004 (\$)

* CEGEPs with at least 2,000 FTEs. ** At least 50% of students enrolled in technical programs.

Bas-Saint-Laurent		Outaouais	
Rimouski**	9,677	Outaouais	7,956
Rivière-du-Loup* **	9,353	Héritage*	10,007
La Pocatière* **	10,932	Abitibi-Témiscamingue	
Matane* **	14,738	Abitibi-Témiscamingue**	9,251
Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean		Côte-Nord	
Chicoutimi**	10,231	Baie-Comeau* **	13,830
Jonquières**	8,307	Sept-Îles* **	15,453
Alma*	9,292	Gaspésie-Îles-de-la-Madeleine	
Saint-Félicien* **	9,742	Gaspésie et des Îles* **	15,689
Capitale-Nationale		Chaudière-Appalaches	
Limoilou**	7,897	Lévis-Lauzon**	8,240
Sainte-Foy	7,458	Beauce-Appalaches* **	8,037
François-Xavier-Garneau	6,640	Amiante* **	11,472
Champlain — St. Lawrence	7,586	Laval	
Mauricie		Montmorency**	7,186
Trois-Rivières**	7,975	Lanaudière	
Sahwinigan**	9,989	Lanaudière – Joliette	} 7,960
Estrie		Lanaudière – Assomption	
Sherbrooke**	7,975	Lanaudière – Terrebonne	
Champlain — Lennoxville	7,586	Laurentides	
Montréal		Lionel-Groulx	7,653
Saint-Laurent	9,731	Saint-Jérôme**	8,270
Ahuntsic**	6,892	Montérégie	
Bois-de-Boulogne	7,522	Champlain — St-Lambert	7,586
Rosemont**	8,205	Granby-Haute-Yamaska*	8,481
Maisonneuve	7,307	Sorel-Tracy* **	10,229
Vieux Montréal**	7,798	Saint-Hyacinthe**	8,476
André-Laurendeau**	7,885	Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu**	8,004
Gérald-Godin*	8,907	Édouard-Montpetit	7,619
Dawson	6,640	Valleyfield* **	9,102
Vanier College	6,692	Centre-du-Québec	
John Abbott	6,604	Drummondville*	9,633
Marie-Victorin**	8,828	Victoriaville* **	10,598

Source: ES-DGFE, MELS. CEGEP funding is based on the PES formula or *périodes-élèves-semaines* (translator's note: student hours per week). We have converted it into full-time equivalents (FTEs) by dividing the number of PES by 44 in order to compare to other systems.

In comparison to the rest of Canada, Quebec has implemented special measures for promoting access to education; these include free or low-cost tuition.

Quebec is one of five Canadian provinces to fund private education.²²

Quebec is also the only Canadian province to offer tuition-free college education even though these fees have increased elsewhere in Canada to a current average of close to \$2,000. It should be noted, however, that young people complete their secondary education one year earlier in Quebec than in the other provinces, which explains why college is tuition-free at least for the first year.

University tuition fees have long been frozen and are currently \$1,668 at the bachelors level for Quebec residents. They have increased progressively elsewhere in Canada to reach a current average of \$4,800.²³ Considerably higher fees are also required in engineering, business administration, law, medicine and dentistry in the rest of Canada.

Tuition fees are generally charged for vocational education in the rest of Canada; such is not the case in Quebec.

It should be mentioned that, in some provinces, the amount being charged for tuition is being called into question, particularly in the light of Quebec's policy. According to a 2003 Ipsos-Reid survey,²⁴ 45% of respondents from other Canadian provinces entirely agreed that the cost of postsecondary education made it inaccessible to their children; 30% of Quebecers agreed with this statement.

School boards can generate their own revenue through school taxes (limited to 35¢ per \$100 assessed real estate value), rental fees and parental contributions to the purchase of materials and additional activities.

CEGEPs have few ways of generating income: ancillary fees which are approximately \$200 per student, tuition for continuing education, rental fees, etc.

The maximum amount that publicly funded private schools can charge for educational services, including admission or registration and other similar fees, is equal to the MELS' base allocation per student.²⁵ In 2003-2004, this came to \$2,886 for preschool, \$2,488 for primary and \$3,421 for secondary levels. However, on average, private schools charge less than the maximum allowed or \$1,650, \$1,724 and \$2,122 for each level respectively. The MELS also grants an allocation in lieu of rental value to private schools (\$91 per student at the primary level, \$136 per student at the secondary level).

In 2003-2004, private colleges received:

- \$4,447.87 for preuniversity programs;
- Between \$4,714 and \$7,121.87 for technical education, depending upon the program.

Finally, universities can raise funds by charging tuition and other ancillary fees.

MELS' transfers, excluding capital investment, to various educational institutions adds up to at least hundreds of millions of dollars a year per region. For instance, in the Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean area,

22 Four western provinces also provided public funding for private education which ranges between 35% and 100% of the allocation for public education, depending upon the type of school.

23 Statistics Canada, *Survey of Tuition and Additional Compulsory Fees*, 2003.

24 Ipsos-Reid et Scotia Bank (2003), "Eight in Ten Canadian Parents Concerned About Increase in Costs of a Post-secondary Education", in J.-P. Proulx and J.-M. Cyr, *Opinédudq* 2003, Montréal, Labriprof, Université de Montréal; a survey conducted among 658 parents of children under 18 years of age, of whom 134 resided in Quebec.

25 MELS and data derived from private schools' financial statements.

they amount to nearly \$430 million as demonstrated in Table 10.

Table 10
MELS Contributions to Operating Budgets
in the Saguenay–Lac-Saint-Jean Region, 2003-2004

Francophone School Boards <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Youth sector: \$168M ▪ Vocational sector: \$34M ▪ Adult sector: \$12M ▪ School transportation, daycare services, auxiliary services, special grants: \$68M 	\$283M
Anglophone School Boards <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Youth sector, prorated estimate of the number of the region's children in this school board whose territory exceeds the region's boundaries. 	\$3M
Private Education	\$8M
CEGEPs	\$90M
Universities	\$45M
TOTAL	\$429M

Source: ES-DGFE, Réseaux-DGFE, MELS.

Table 11 shows that all three of Quebec's public education networks ended 2002-2003 with a surplus that was equivalent to about \$10 per student. However, the universities were carrying an accumulated deficit of approximately \$218M.

Table 11
Financial Situation of the Public Education Networks in Millions of Dollars,
2002-2003

	Current surplus (deficit)	Accumulated surplus (deficit)
School boards	\$81MM	\$264MM
CEGEPs	\$4MM	\$39MM
Universities	\$24MM	(\$218MM)

Source: ES-DGFE and Réseaux-DGFE, MELS.

The universities, CEGEPs and school boards all agree that there is a mismatch between needs and funding. Because they are in search of additional revenue as their enrolment figures fall, some institutions in the public education networks have adopted new practices.

Thus, some schools offer specialised programs for which demand exceeds supply and reserve space for students coming from neighbouring schools or schools boards.

Short programs with similar content are offered by both vocational training centres and CEGEPs.

Finally, universities are opening off-campus locations in close proximity to existing institutions. For example, l'Université du Québec à Rimouski has a centre in Lévis which has approximately 1,200 FTEs. The University of Sherbrooke has done the same thing in Longueuil where there are about

5,000 FTEs.

5- Student Financial Aid

Quebec has a student financial aid program designed to compensate for a lack of financial resources. Table 12 indicates that the degree of participation in this program varies by level of education.

Table 12
Proportion of Students Benefiting from Financial Aid in Quebec, 2003-2004 (%)

Vocational education	22
Technical education	32
Preuniversity education	14
University education	37

Source: AFE, MELS.

Table 13 shows that Quebec's system is unique in Canada because, on the one hand, it is a centralised, one-stop-shop for a student in need and, on the other hand, its bursaries are more generous than those offered in other Canadian provinces, even when taking into account those awarded by universities.

Table 13
Maximum Government Financial Aid Awarded in 2003-2004
to a Single, Full-time Student with No Dependents and
Bursaries Based on Need or on Academic or Athletic Achievement Awarded by Universities (\$)

Provinces	Government Aid			University bursaries 2002-2003
	Maximum loan	Maximum bursary	Maximum aid	
British Columbia	9,350	3,740	9,350	878
Alberta	14,300	3,000	14,300	574
Saskatchewan	9,350	0	9,350	605
Manitoba	9,350	6,800	13,090	366
Ontario	9,350	3,000	9,350	1,276
Quebec (CEGEP)	2,005	12,787	14,792	N/A
Québec (baccalaureate)	2,460	14,853	17,293	302
New Brunswick	9,350	3,060	12,410	418
Prince Edward Island	11,220	0	11,390	576
Nova Scotia	10,710	0	10,710	537
Newfoundland, Labrador	9,350	1,750	12,444	617

Sources: Canada Millennium Scholarships Foundation for government aid and MELS-CAUBO-Statistics Canada for university bursaries. In some provinces, part of a loan can be awarded as a bursary and the two amounts remain separate. In other provinces, bursaries are awarded to handicapped persons or individuals with dependents. In Ontario, a university must offer needs-based bursaries for up to 30% of tuition fees that are over \$2,250 per full-time trimester.

The average debt load for a student who assumed his/her debt at the end of the bachelors level in 2001-2002 was lower in Quebec, at \$13,000, than in the rest of Canada where it was a little over \$20,000. The data are found in Table 14.

Table 14
Average Debt Load of a Student Having Assumed His/her Government or Third-party Loans at the End of His/her Bachelor-level Studies, 2001-2002 (\$)

Regions of Canada	Total
Atlantic	22,400
Quebec	13,100
Ontario	22,700
West	20,300

Source: Canada Millennium Scholarships Foundation. According to the MELS (AFE), the debt owed to the Government of Quebec was \$10,800.

Even if debt load is lower in Quebec, those who have contracted it will take several years to liquidate it. According to the MELS, only a small minority (10%) of financial aid beneficiaries reimburse all of their loans within six months of having completed their studies.

According to Table 15, students residing in outlying areas, except for those in the Saguenay–Lac-Saint-Jean region, are more apt to have recourse to financial aid and carry the highest debt load.

Table 15
Ratio of Graduates Carrying Financial Aid Debt to the Number of Persons Ages 20-24 in the Region, and Average Debt Load of Graduates from Technical Programs and University Bachelors Programs, 2003-2004

Region	Ratio with Debt Load (%)	Debt Load of Graduates	
		Technical (\$)	Bachelors Level (\$)
Bas-Saint-Laurent	13	6,800	12,300
Saguenay–Lac-Saint-Jean	13	5,900	10,500
Capitale-Nationale	8	6,500	10,000
Mauricie	11	6,900	10,600
Estrie	8	6,000	10,300
Montréal	6	6,500	8,800
Outaouais	5	5,800	10,300
Abitibi-Témiscamingue	12	5,800	11,500
Côte-Nord	9	6,100	10,300
Nord-du-Québec	4	6,800	11,100
Gaspésie–Îles-de-la-Madeleine	17	8,000	13,100
Chaudière-Appalaches	10	6,400	11,300
Laval	5	5,600	8,900
Lanaudière	6	5,700	9,900
Laurentides	6	5,700	9,200
Montérégie	6	5,900	9,300
Centre-du-Québec	12	6,300	11,600
AVERAGE	7	6,300	9,900

Sources: Institut de la statistique du Québec, for the population ages 20-24, and AFE, MELS.

APPENDIX 3

ECONOMIC DATA

The economy is changing. In fact, part of our economic activity is shifting to Mexico, Eastern Europe and Asia. Today and for the foreseeable future, it is less likely that one will keep his/her job throughout his/her lifetime.

Future development rests on our capacity to produce in high value-added sectors and to use, adapt and invent technologies that are increasingly knowledge-intensive.

Consequently, the nonqualified and illiterate are more likely to be excluded from the labour market:

“Canada, like other OECD countries, has evolved into a knowledge-based economy – one that places a premium on literacy, numeracy and problem-solving skills which are now regarded as essential skills for many jobs in today’s labour market. But such skills are important not only from the point of view of the labour market, they are increasingly seen as important for an individual’s ability to participate fully in modern society. According to the OECD, completion of high school is the minimum standard for successful labour market entry and continued employability.”²⁶

Having analysed Quebec’s past and present industrial policies, the economist, Pierre Fortin, stated in *La Presse* in September of 2004: *“Education is Quebec’s industrial policy. For all intents and purposes, a country does not need resources for its development. It need only put knowledge into the minds of its children.”*

Highly specialised employment has at least doubled in Quebec since the beginning of the 1960s and today represents one-third of all jobs, a phenomenon that can be observed in other industrialised countries. At the same time, “more jobs are being created in the large, more populated centres than in the outlying regions, and highly specialised employment is no exception to this rule, in spite of the great hopes founded upon information and communications technology.”²⁷

Since 1990, the number of jobs for the more highly educated has grown, a trend that stands in stark contrast to what is happening to individuals with less schooling. Mean revenue is also directly correlated with educational attainment.

Table 1
Evolution in the Number of Jobs in Quebec between 1990 and 2004
by Workers’ Level of Education and
Earners’ Average Annual Income, 2000

	1990 ('000)	2004 ('000)	Variance 1990-2003 (%)	Average annual income 2000 (\$)
Without a diploma	927	604	- 35	18,900
Secondary school diploma	632	592	- 6	25,900
Partial postsecondary studies	257	317	23	20,400
Successfully completed postsecondary studies	910	1,439	58	29,700
University degree	416	755	81	48,000

Sources: ministère de l’Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport (MELS), *Education Indicators 2005*, Table 6.1, average annual income is based on data from Statistics Canada, and l’Institut de la statistique du Québec.

The *ministère de l’Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport* (MELS) found that, taking into account the cost of

²⁶ Statistics Canada, “Literacy, numeracy and problem-solving skills – Foundation skills for a knowledge-based economy” *Education Matters*, June 2005.

²⁷ N. Roy et al., *Les travailleurs hautement qualifiés au Québec, portrait dynamique du marché du travail*, Centre d’études sur l’emploi et la technologie, Emploi-Québec, 2004.

their education, the income of earners with a bachelors degree corresponds to an annual net yield of 10.5%, in comparison to that of secondary school graduates. The rate of return is 10.9% for the state allowing for its share of the cost of education and the revenue that it derives from taxes.²⁸ Another study shows that the personal rate of return in Canada varies by field of study since one-fifth of those with a bachelors degree earns at a rate of over 30% while another fifth is in negative numbers.²⁹

“[The] new technology that has swept through the economic landscape is very knowledge-intensive. If we are not able to rapidly educate a labour force that will make effective use of this technology, our society faces a possible split..., on the one hand, between highly qualified and very well paid workers and, on the other, under-qualified and under-paid workers... In our society, a lack of education among workers is more and more conducive to exclusion.”³⁰

In 2003, the unemployment rate for persons in the 15 to 24 age group was higher than it was for graduates, a few months after their graduation. Moreover, a higher level of education was synonymous with better remuneration.

Table 2
Unemployment Rate and Average Gross Weekly Salary of
Youth and Recent Graduates, Quebec, 2003

	Unemployment rate (%)	Average gross weekly salary (\$)
Ages 15-19	20	—
Ages 20-24	13	—
Vocational education	12	520
Technical education	6	540
Bachelors degree	5	750

Sources: Statistics Canada (youth unemployment) and MELS, *Enquêtes Relance*.

Increasing the level of educational attainment is profitable not only for the educated person: “...*Current economic research provides a clear qualitative answer: an increase in the public’s average educational level has a positive and tangible effect on the wealth of the entire nation... Recent studies allow us to clearly determine the aggregate and absolute effect of education.*”³¹

A Statistics Canada study indicates that: “*Direct measures of human capital based on literacy scores [i.e., the capacity to read and write] have a positive and significant effect on the transitory growth path, and on the long run levels of GDP per capita and labour productivity [more so than the indicators based more broadly on educational attainment]... The key economic policy implication that comes out of this result is that...human capital accumulation matters for the long run wellbeing of developed nations.*”³²

According to the OECD: “*The creation of knowledge, skills, competencies and aptitudes relevant to economic activity affect not only performance at work but also social behaviour. “Spin-off” benefits may*

28 M. Demers, « La rentabilité du baccalauréat », *Bulletin statistique de l’éducation*, 1999, and *Document de travail* 2003, MELS.

29 D. Boothby and G. Rowe, *Rate of Return to Education: A Distributional Analysis Using the LifePaths Model*, HRDC, June 2002.

30 P. Fortin, *La contribution de l’éducation à l’économie, texte préparé pour le Conseil supérieur de l’éducation*, février 2001, p. 5.

31 P. Fortin, *La contribution de l’éducation à l’économie*, p. 5.

32 S. Coulombe, J.-F. Tremblay et S. Marchand, *International Adult Literacy Survey: Literacy Scores, Human Capital and Growth across Fourteen OECD Countries*, Statistics Canada, June 2004.

affect public health, crime, the environment, parenting, political and community participation and social cohesion, which in turn feed back into economic well-being... Education may generate effects in three ways: by changing individuals' preferences, by changing the constraints that individuals face, or by augmenting the knowledge or information on which individuals base their behaviour."³³

³³ OECD, *Human Capital Investment: An International Comparison, Centre for Educational Research and Innovation*, 1998, pp. 66, 68. Examples from Quebec and Canada are presented in M. Demers, "La rentabilité du baccalauréat".

APPENDIX 4

EDUCATIONAL DATA

1-Increase in Educational Attainment

In 1943, Quebec was the last Canadian province to adopt legislation calling for mandatory school attendance. Except for Newfoundland, all of the other provinces had done so between 1871 and 1916.³⁴ However, in the wake of the *Rapport Parent*,³⁵ Quebec's educational attainment level caught up with that of other societies.

According to the *ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport* (MELS), 96% of 16 year-old children in Quebec attended school in 1995-1996; the rate was 97% in 2000-2001.

Today, the percentage of Quebec's total population with less than thirteen years of education is considerably lower, while that with a bachelors degree has tripled since 1971. Table 1 illustrates this trend.

Table 1
Trend in Educational Attainment Levels between 1971 and 2001 (%)

Year	Proportion of population 15 years of age or older	
	Less than 13 years of education	With a bachelors degree
1971	80	4.6
2001	58	14

Source: Statistics Canada, Censuses.

According to the 2001 Canadian Census, 25% of the 25 to 29 age group in Quebec had a least a bachelors degree.

"...Quebec has experienced a major educational revolution since 1965. Numbers...show that 33 year-old Quebecers have five more years of education than 73 year-olds. Having started at the same educational attainment level as Black Americans over forty years ago, we have advanced more rapidly than any other group...[in North America]."³⁶

2- Graduation and Quality

As indicated in Table 2, secondary school and technical education graduation rates seem to be on a par with those of neighbouring jurisdictions and principal European and Asian OECD countries. However, they are lower at the university level.

34 P. Oreopoulous, *Canadian Compulsory School Laws and Their Impact on Educational Attainment and Future Earnings*, Statistics Canada, May 2004.

35 Government of Quebec, *Rapport de la Commission royale d'enquête sur l'enseignement dans la province de Québec*, 1965.

36 P. Fortin, *La contribution de l'éducation à l'économie*, document written for the *Conseil supérieur de l'éducation*, February 2001, p. 4.

Table 2
Graduation Rates by Jurisdiction and Level of Education (%)

Level of education	Quebec	Canada	United States	Average for European and Asian OECD countries
Secondary (1998)	81	72	74	—
Secondary (2002)	83	—	73	81
Technical (1998)	14	6	9	—
University (baccalaureate 1998)	27	27	33	—
University (baccalaureate 2002)	27	—	—	32
University (doctorate 2001)	1.0	—	—	1.2

Sources: OECD, *Education at a Glance 2000 and 2004*, and DRSI, MELs, *Education Indicators 2005*, Tables 5.5 and 5.9. Comparing technical education is tentative because uncertain data. The 1998 and 2001 data are based on different methodologies and are not comparable. Denmark, Norway, Germany, Japan, Poland, Switzerland, Finland and Greece have a higher secondary school graduation rate than Quebec; Finland, Poland and Japan have higher rates than Quebec at both the secondary and university levels.

According to Table 3, Quebec students do well on international examinations and enjoy a success rate comparable to that of Ontario, Canada or the United States.

Table 3
Student Ranking on International Examinations by Jurisdiction³⁷

	Number of participants	RANK			
		Quebec	Ontario	Canada	United States
PISA 2003 Mathematics	40	5		7	28
PISA 2003 Reading	40	4		3	18
PISA 2003 Problem solving	40	8		9	29
PISA 2003 Science	35	11		11	22
PIRLS 2001 Reading	35	12	5	—	9
TEIMS 2003 Mathematics	26	14	13	—	12
TEIMS 2003 Science	26	17	5		6

Sources: OECD, *First Results from PISA 2003*; Council of Ministers of Education of Canada, *Measuring Up: Canadian Results of the OECD PISA Study, 2004*; MELs, *Résultats obtenus par les élèves québécois (PIRLS 2001)* and International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement, *International Science Report, Findings from EMM IEA's Trends in International Mathematics and Science at the Fourth and Eight Grade (TEIMS 2003)*.

³⁷ PISA: 15 year olds; PIRLS: 10 year olds; TEIMS: 4th year elementary school students.

We do not have comparative data for performance on international postsecondary level tests. However, we do know that the great majority of employers have rated the competencies of vocational, technical and university level graduates as “high” or “average”, as indicated in Table 4.

Table 4
Employer Evaluation of the Competency Level of Recent Graduates from Vocational, Technical or University Programs (%)

Educational level	Competency level	1994	1997	2000	2002	2004
Vocational	High	37	41	39	—	—
	Average	52	50	51	—	—
	Low	11	9	10	—	—
Technical	High	51	52	—	51	—
	Average	44	42	—	44	—
	Low	5	6	—	5	—
University	High	—	—	—	—	69
	Average	—	—	—	—	28
	Low	—	—	—	—	3

Source: MELS, *La formation (professionnelle, technique, universitaire) : les employeurs s'expriment, sondages postaux*.

Quebec participates in the biennial International Skills Competition which tests the competencies of under 23-year old graduates from vocational and technical programs. Quebec contestants have been crowned champion in the last five Canadian Skills Competitions in which they have participated. In 2004, they won thirty-eight medals of which twenty-three were gold. British Columbia came in second with eighteen medals, of which four were gold. At the Helsinki International Skills Competition in 2005, Quebecers won three gold medals.

Finally, Quebec universities' share of federal, merit-based research grants went from 23% at the beginning of the 1980s to 29% at the end of the 1990s. By 1999, Quebec represented only 24% of the Canadian general population. The proportion of grants awarded to Quebec universities has since remained superior to Quebec's share of the total Canadian population and was 28% in 2002-2003.³⁸

3- The Levelling-off of Graduation Rates

Graduation rates at the secondary school level, which had been growing since the 1970s, reached a plateau of 65% at the beginning of the 1990s in the under 20-years of age category and approximately 15% for the over 20 age group.³⁹ The projected 2003-2004 rate, however, is 70% for the under 20s.

Since the 1990s, college and university graduation rates appear to have levelled off with rates of 25 % in preuniversity programs, 15% in technical education, 28% at the bachelors level and 8% and 1% at the masters and doctoral levels respectively. Graduation rates are increasing only in vocational

³⁸ Data compiled by the MELS (DRSI) based on data supplied by Statistics Canada.

³⁹ MELS, *Education Indicators 2005*, Chart 5.2.

education.⁴⁰

Finally, the drop out rate among young people ages 17, 18 and 19, which had been falling since the beginning of the 1980s, has levelled off over the past ten years even though it remains an area of concern with rates of 11%, 17% and 19% for each age group respectively.⁴¹

4- Educational Retardation at the Primary Level and Student Success at the Secondary Level

Table 5 indicates that the number of primary school students experiencing educational retardation increases with each passing year. By the first year of secondary school, nearly 30% of children are educationally retarded; boys represent 60% of this group.

Table 5
Percentage of Educationally Retarded Students by Expected Age,
Primary School and 1st year of Secondary School, 2003-2004 (%)

Primary school year	Percentage of educationally retarded students	Percentage of boys among educationally retarded students
1	3	—
2	10	—
3	8	—
4	12	—
5	12	—
6	14	—
1 st year of secondary school	27	58

Sources: MELS, *Education Indicators 2005*, Table 2.7 and *Education Statistics, Système AGIR*, 2004.

“It is hard to offset academic failure once it has set in. There are those who maintain that after the third year of primary school, remedial programs have little or no effect. It is for this reason that prevention is now considered the best way to forestall academic failure... Research indicates that preschool experiences significantly influence academic learning. ...Better cooperation among professionals, managers and institutions and a better integration of health, social and other services are necessary in order to improve the quality of services rendered to children and young people... Preventive intervention among children and young people is needed before problems begin to surface. [It] must be carried out promptly and swiftly. Its chance of success depend on whether it is executed assiduously, resolutely and continuously and whether it is adapted to the characteristics and living conditions of children or young people, their parents and families.”⁴²

As illustrated in Table 6, students who were educationally retarded prior to entering secondary school performed less well than students who did not have a similar history.

40 Ibid., Chart 5.6 and Tables 5.4 and 5.7.

41 Ibid., Chart 2.6.

42 F. Vitaro, C. Gagnon, et al., *Prévention des problèmes d'adaptation chez les enfants et les adolescents*, Vol. II, *Les problèmes externalisés*, Presses de l'Université du Québec, 2000, p. 7 and 16.

Table 6
Success in Secondary School of 100 Students with No Prior Educational Retardation and
100 Students with Prior Educational Retardation,
Mean for 1994-1995, 1995-1996 and 1996-1997 Cohorts

Outcome	Distribution of 100 students with no prior educational retardation	Distribution of 100 students with prior educational retardation
Secondary diploma within 5 years	72	23
Secondary diploma within 7 years	10	11
In general adult education	6	24
In vocational education, no diploma	2	3
Dropped out	10	39

Source: DRSI, MELS.

5- Pathways and Academic Success

If the trend observed by the MELS in 2000-2001 were to persist, of the 100 students who enter primary school, seventeen would not graduate. Furthermore, twenty-one would permanently drop out of the education system with neither a vocational or technical diploma, nor a bachelors degree.⁴³

Nearly 20% of secondary school graduates are at least twenty years of age.

Nearly 50% of recently enrolled students in adult education centres are nineteen years of age or less, which suggests that these adolescents are enrolled in an academic remedial program.

Most of the newly enrolled students in vocational education do not come directly from secondary school; 40% of them are 25-years of age or older and nearly 15% come from CEGEPs.

At the CEGEP level, 40% of students who enter directly from secondary school graduate on schedule. Moreover, seven out of ten preuniversity students obtain their diploma, three of whom requiring more than the prescribed amount of time to do so. In technical education which is one year longer than the preuniversity program, five out of ten students obtain a diploma, two of whom requiring extra time to do so. Finally, about one-third of students change programs during their CEGEP years.

6- New Social Trends Affecting the School

The great majority of mothers with children between the ages 6 and 15 are either employed or actively seeking employment. Table 7 shows that their percentage has almost doubled since 1976. The result is that children spend more non-classroom time at school, on average.

⁴³ MELS, *Le cheminement des élèves du secondaire à l'entrée à l'université*, 2004.

Table 7
Employment Rate of Mothers in Quebec, Ages 20 to 44,
with Children between Ages 6 and 15 (%)

Year	Employment rate	
	Two parent families	Single parent families
1976	44	54
1996	74	73
2002	83	84

Source: Statistics Canada, *Labour Force Survey*.

Table 8 indicates that the proportion of children ages 0 to 19 who live in a family where the partners are married is declining. The percentage of common-law marriages with at least one child and single parent families has increased

Table 8
Proportion of Children Ages 0 to 19, by Type of Family (%)

Year	Married couples	Common-law partnerships	Single parent families
1981	85	3	12
2001	55	24	20

Source: Statistics Canada, Censuses.

It is likely that “*the children of single-parent families [are] more susceptible to social adjustment problems. This susceptibility can be explained in part by the stress experienced by parents who are the sole head of household ... However, it is because of single parenting’s link with poverty that the former becomes a risk factor in childhood adjustment. In fact, nearly one-quarter of all children live in a poor family. In female single parent families, 59% of children and adolescents are poor. ... [In Quebec] in 1991, 19.7% of children were poor. ... In 1996, 22.2% of children were poor.*”⁴⁴

According to the *MELS*, in 2003-2004, approximately 10% of preschool children and primary and secondary level students, except those with a handicap, a major behavioural problem or living in a reception centre (these three categories cover about 2% of the total number), required special assistance in order to continue on their educational pathway. Education professionals estimate that the number and complexity of cases involving special needs students are growing.

Immigration is increasing in Quebec. It grew by 62% between 1995 and 2004, and this trend should continue. Immigrants come for all corners of the globe and at least one-quarter of them know neither French nor English.

As indicated in Table 9, Quebec welcomed approximately 44,000 immigrants in 2004, of which approximately one-third were less than twenty-five years of age, while, according to the *Institut de la statistique du Québec*, 74,000 births were projected.

44 F. Vitaro, C. Gagnon, et al., *Prévention des problèmes d’adaptation chez les enfants et les adolescents*, Vol. II, *Les problèmes externalisés*, Presses de l’Université du Québec, 2000, p. 16.

Table 9
Immigration to Quebec

Year	Number	Main country of origin	Proportion knowing neither French nor English (%)
1995	27,222	France	41
2000	32,502	France	32
2004 (est.)	44,226	China	24
2007 (forecast)	48,000	—	—

Sources : ministère de l'Immigration et des Communautés culturelles, *Tableaux sur l'immigration au Québec, 1995-1999, 2000-2004; Plan d'immigration du Québec pour l'année 2005.*

7- Educational Attainment by Sex

Table 10 shows that, over the past thirty years, women's educational attainment increased significantly. Moreover, the proportion of women holding a bachelors degree increased fivefold during this period.

Table 10
Trend in Educational Attainment among Women, 1971 to 2001 (%)

Year	Proportion of women ages 15 or older in the population	
	With less than 13 years of education	With a bachelors degree
1971	83	2.7
2001	59	13.3

Source: Statistics Canada, Censuses.

According to Table 11, more women than men are currently graduating with a diploma, particularly with a bachelors degree.

Table 11
Graduation Rates by Sex, 2002-2003 (%)

	Women	Men
Secondary School	87	73
Vocational Education	23	29
Technical Education (est.)	19	12
Baccalaureate (2003)	34	21
Masters (2003)	8.5	8.5
Doctorate (2003)	0.9	1.2

Source: MELs, *Education Indicators 2005*, section 5.

Over the past decades, educational attainment increased across the board, but it was especially strong among women as demonstrated in Table 12.

Table 12
Distribution of 100 Women and 100 Men Leaving the Education System, by Last Diploma

	1976		2000		2003	
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
With no secondary level diploma (DES) ⁴⁵	37	49	10	23	13	27
Secondary level diploma (DES)	23	17	21	20	14	14
Vocational or technical education	27	17	37	35	39	37
Bachelors degree	13	17	37	22	34	21

Source: *MELS, Education Indicators 2005*, section 5.1.

8- Educational Attainment by Language

According to *MELS* data, students whose language of instruction is French perform less well than those whose language of instruction is English. Table 13 shows that the secondary school graduation rate, seven years after a cohort's first year of secondary school, is 80% among students whose language of instruction is English and a little over 70% among youth whose language of instruction is French.

Table 13
Graduation Rates Seven Years after Entering Secondary School, by Cohort and Language of Instruction (%)

Cohort	Language of Instruction	
	French	English
1990-1991	73	84
1992-1993	72	82
1994-1995	72	80
1996-1997	71	79

Source: *DRSI, MELS*.

This situation is replicated at the university level where attendance rates among Anglophone Quebecers between the ages of 18 and 24 is 50% higher than among Francophone Quebecers in the same age group. This is born out by the statistics in Table 14

⁴⁵ Diplôme d'études secondaires (translator's note).

Table 14
University Attendance Rates among Persons Ages 18-24 in Quebec,
Fall Term (FTEs/total population of 18-24 year olds) by Maternal Tongue (%)

Year	Anglophones	Francophones
2000	15.8	12.5
2001	17.5	11.3
2002	18.3	13.0
2003	18.9	13.3
2004	19.6	13.4

Sources: *DRSI, MELS et Institut de la statistique du Québec.*

9- Educational Attainment among Aboriginal People

The success rate among Aboriginal People is lower than among non-Aboriginals. According to the 2001 Census, 42% of persons in the 25 to 44 age group and identifying themselves as Aboriginals did not have a secondary school diploma as compared to 18 % among non-Aboriginals. Only 6% of Aboriginals have a bachelors degree as compared to 21% of non-Aboriginals. These data are presented in Table 15.

We do not have data on graduation rates among young people. It should be mentioned that a majority of Aboriginals are not enrolled in Quebec's education system.

Table 15
Distribution of a 20% Sample of Quebec's Population, Ages 25-44,
Self-declared as Aboriginal or non-Aboriginal,
by Level of Education, 2001 Census (%)

	Aboriginal	Non-Aboriginal
No diploma	42	18
Secondary school diploma	11	16
Vocational or postsecondary	41	45
University degree	6	21

Source: Statistics Canada, Census.

10- Educational Attainment by Parental Income

Other than in the case of parents with a gross annual income of \$25,000 or less, parental income is not a predictor of CEGEP attendance among young people ages 18 to 24. University attendance is two to three times higher among young people whose parents earn an annual gross income of over \$75,000 than among those whose parents earn less. These data are found in Table 16.

Table 16
CEGEP and University Attendance, Ages 18-24, by Parental Income, 2001 (%)

Parental income	Proportion pursuing studies, ages 18-24	
	CEGEP	University
Less than \$25,000	35	18
\$25,000 to \$49,999	52	13
\$50,000 to \$74,999	48	22
\$75,000 to \$99,999	48	40
\$100,000 or more	50	37

Source: Statistics Canada, special compilation, *Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics*.

11- Educational Attainment by Parental Educational Attainment

A recent MELS study demonstrates a clear correlation between young people's socioeconomic backgrounds, as defined by mother's educational attainment and proportion of parents with full-time employment, and their academic success. In 2001-2002, 86% of girls from more privileged families graduated from secondary school; the number dropped to 74% for boys. Levels were lower, 72% and 58% for girls and boys respectively, among children from less privileged backgrounds.⁴⁶

As demonstrated in Table 17, parental educational attainment does not influence college enrolment among young people ages 18 to 24. However, it is highly correlated with university attendance.

Table 17
CEGEP and University Attendance Rates, Ages 18-24,
by Parental Educational Attainment (%)

Highest level of parental educational attainment	Proportion of 18-24 years olds having pursued studies	
	CEGEP	University
Secondary level or less	46	14
CEGEP certificate or diploma	51	25
University degree	44	46

Source: Statistics Canada, special compilation, *Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics*.

According to a Statistics Canada study, access to postsecondary study is clearly correlated more with the parents' educational attainment than with their income level.⁴⁷

46 MELS, La réussite scolaire des garçons et des filles, l'influence du milieu socioéconomique, 2005, Table 6.

47 R. Finnie, E. Lacelles and A. Sweetman, *Who Goes? The Direct and Indirect Effects of Family Background on Access to Post-secondary Education*, Statistics Canada, January 2005.

12- Educational Attainment by Region of Origin

Given that, in comparison to the large urban centres, the outlying regions have more young people whose language of instruction is French, more Aboriginals and more parents with lower income and less education, there is no indication that region of origin has an impact on educational attainment.⁴⁸

According to Table 18, secondary school graduation rates in southern Quebec varied little by region in 2002-2003; the highest rates were in the Saguenay–Lac-Saint-Jean (92%), Capitale-Nationale and Gaspésie (86%) as well as Bas-Saint-Laurent and Chaudière-Appalaches (84%) regions. CEGEP matriculation rates were generally at the 60% level except in the Laurentides, Côte-Nord and Abitibi-Témiscamingue regions where the rate was roughly 50%.⁴⁹ We have no data on university matriculation.

Table 18
Secondary School Graduation Rates, 2002-2003, and
Proportion of Youth Enrolled Full-time in Secondary 5, in Public and Private Sectors, and Who
Enrolled in a CEGEP the Following Year (average for 2000-2004) (%)

Region	Graduation rates all ages	Graduation rates under 20	CEGEP enrolment rates
Bas-Saint-Laurent	84	69	58
Saguenay–Lac-Saint-Jean	92	71	60
Capitale-Nationale	86	74	62
Mauricie	80	66	62
Estrie	81	70	54
Montréal	79	66	62
Outaouais	74	60	48
Abitibi-Témiscamingue	82	63	45
Côte-Nord	75	57	50
Nord-du-Québec	62	44	28
Gaspésie–Îles-de-la-Madeleine	86	61	62
Chaudière-Appalaches	84	72	58
Laval	82	69	60
Lanaudière	76	64	60
Laurentides	75	60	52
Montérégie	79	68	58
Centre-du-Québec	81	69	55
QUEBEC	80	67	58

Sources: MELs, *Education Indicators 2005*, Table 5.3; Compilation by MELs (DRSI) for CEGEP enrolment.

48 According to the Institut de la statistique du Québec's data, the outlying areas (Abitibi-Témiscamingue, Côte-Nord, Gaspésie–Îles-de-la-Madeleine and Saguenay–Lac-Saint-Jean) have fewer persons in the 15 or older age group with a secondary school diploma (62% versus 69% in the southern regions of Quebec) and lower personal income per capita (\$22,000 versus \$27,000 in the southern regions of Quebec).

49 The lower rate observed in the Outaouais region is probably due to enrolment in Ontario universities.

13- Continuing Education

According to statistics compiled by the MELS, the number of adults registered in school boards (FTEs) has increased sevenfold over the past twenty-five years, from 13,500 to 94,000 (FTEs). There are nearly 200,000 students enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in the school boards' adult education centres. Seventy percent of newly enrolled vocational education students are over 20 years of age. Moreover, almost 20,000 college level students are at least 30 years of age. There are also 70,000 students over the age of 30 registered at the university level.

According to Statistics Canada, about 20% of Quebecers, ages 25 to 54, participated in work-related training activities offered in the education system, companies, private training centres, community centres or municipalities during the last decade. Table 19 indicates that other Canadians are more apt to participate in this type of activity than are Quebecers.

Table 19
Rate of Participation of Persons Ages 25-64 in Work-related Training Activities (%)

Year	Quebec	Canada
1993	20	26
1997	17	24
2002	27	30

Source: V. Peters, *Working and Training: First Results of the 2003 Adult Education and Training Survey*, Statistics Canada and Human Resources and Social Development Canada, April 2004. This covers the percentage of the population ages 25 to 64 participating in employment-related training activities (i.e., degree programs, courses, seminars, workshops, conferences or other activities related to the respondents' current or future employment).

“Regardless of the numbers, all of the studies that have been analysed confirm the historical pattern of lower participation rates in continuing education activities in Quebec than in the rest of Canada. ...The participation rate in continuing education activities for all occupational categories, types of companies and sectors is lower in Quebec than in the rest of Canada.”⁵⁰

14- The Importance of Education

According to the survey data summarised in Table 20, public opinion has shifted between 1966 and 2002 granting less importance to education than health which is now perceived to be the number one priority.

50 C. Pagé et al., *Cap sur l'apprentissage tout au long de la vie : rapport du comité d'experts sur le financement de la formation continue*, Study commissioned by the Government of Quebec, February 2004, p. 48.

Table 20
Percentage of the Population Surveyed that Perceives Education or Health
as the Government's Top Priority (%)

Year	Education	Health
1966 (To which activity should the government grant the greatest importance?)	41 (Making education more accessible to everyone)	14 (Developing a universal healthcare plan)
2000 (What should be the government's top priority?)	9	40
2001	9	32
2002	5	52

Source: CROP - Ministère de l'Éducation (1966), *Sondage sur l'éducation* : 2,482 Francophones respondents under the age of 65 having studied or having at least one child who had studied in French in Quebec; Ad hoc recherche - *Les Affaires* (2000, 2001 et 2002), *Omnibus Survey: 500 Quebec Adults Queried*, in J.-P. Proulx et J.-M. Cyr, *Opinéduq 2003*, Montréal, Labriprof, University of Montreal.

As demonstrated in Table 21, Quebecers also clearly seem to give less importance to various facets of education than do Canadians in the other provinces.

Table 21
Percentage of Persons Surveyed Who Consider That It Is Important... (%)

	Rest of Canada	Quebec
...to provide a good knowledge of reading, writing and mathematics	94	81
...to develop a disciplined attitude toward study	80	61
...to acquire the skills allowing for CEGEP or university attendance	83	53
...to acquire the skills to get a good job	82	60

Source: Ipsos-Reid - Kumon Math and Reading Centres (2003), "A Good Understanding of the Basics, Top Seven Goals As to What Parents Say Their Children Need for a Successful Education", in J.-P. Proulx and J. -M. Cyr, *Opinéduq 2003*.

Furthermore, Table 22 shows that Quebec parents save less for their children's postsecondary studies than do other Canadians even though the former are not the least affluent in the country. In fact, according to Statistics Canada (provincial economic accounts), Quebec is ranked fifth among Canadian provinces in terms of gross domestic product (GDP) per capita (2002).

Table 22
Percentage of Parents Who Expected That Their Children, Ages 0-18, Would Successfully Complete Secondary School and for Whom They Had Saved, 2002 (%)

Provinces	Proportion of parents who had saved (%)	Average amount saved by parents (\$)
Saskatchewan	59	5,970
Manitoba	56	3,900
Ontario	54	4,970
Newfoundland, Labrador	53	4,610
Alberta	53	4,830
Nova Scotia	52	3,880
New-Brunswick	52	2,910
British Columbia	50	4,890
Prince Edward Island	45	4,180
Quebec	40	3,900

Sources: K. Zeman, T. Knighton and P. Bussière, *Education and Labour Market Pathways of Young Canadians Between Age 20 and 22: An Overview*, Youth in Transition Survey, Statistics Canada, 2004, Table B1; L. Shipley, S. Ouellette and F. Cartwright, *Planning and Preparation: First Results from the Survey of Approaches to Educational Planning (SAEP), 2002*, Statistics Canada, 2003.

According to Table 23, regardless of parental educational attainment, young Quebecers, ages 18 to 24, are less apt to attend university than their counterparts in the rest of Canada (except for those whose parents earn between \$75,000 and \$99,999 per year). It should be mentioned however that at age 18, Quebecers are more likely to attend a CEGEP than a university, which partially explains this variance.

Table 23
Percentage of the Population Ages 18-24 Who Attended University in Canada and Quebec, by Parental Educational Attainment and Income, 2001 (%)

Highest level of educational attainment of one or the other of the parents and total average annual parental income	Percentage of 18-24 years olds attending university	
	Canada	Quebec
Secondary school studies or less	18	14
CEGEP certificate or diploma	29	25
University degree	51	46
Less than \$25,000	20	18
\$25,000 to \$49,999	27	13
\$50,000 to \$74,999	27	22
\$75,000 to \$99,999	38	40
Over \$100,000	48	37

Source: Statistics Canada, special compilation, *Survey of Income and Labour Dynamics*.

15- Employment and Academic Success

Students in the Labour Force in Quebec

The Labour Standards Act currently determines the type of work that school-age youth can perform. However, it does not set any limits on the number of hours that a student may work.

We have no employment data on Quebec students enrolled in either general or adult education.

According to a 2002 survey conducted by the MELS among CEGEP and university students,⁵¹ approximately one out of two works during the academic year; indeed, two out of three CEGEP and university students who are not receiving loans and bursaries are employed. On average, students work between fifteen and twenty hours per week.

According to Arnaud Sales' 1994 survey on the living conditions of university students, approximately 50% worked part-time during the academic year, being employed an average of ten hours.⁵²

A comparison of these two surveys suggests that while the percentage of employed university students remained unchanged between 1994 and 2002, the number of hours worked did increase significantly. However, Sales states that "until the end of the 1970s, few students worked while pursuing their studies. The phenomenon took on larger proportions in the 1980s" (p.167).

Canadian Students

In its 2004 study, *The Price of Knowledge 2004: Access and Student Finance in Canada*, the Canadian Millennium Scholarship Foundation shows that, according to Statistics Canada's Labour Force Survey, the proportion of Canadian college students ages 15 to 29 who worked during the school year went from 39% in 1976 to 56% in 2002. At the university level, this rate went from 39% to 45%. Thus, the proportion of students who were active in the labour market increased.

Citing data published in Ekos' 2001 study, *Making Ends Meet*, the Foundation also demonstrates that work is more prevalent among college and university students in Western Canada than in Quebec or the Atlantic Provinces, with Ontario falling within the Canadian average.

Furthermore, Statistics Canada and Human Resources and Social Development Canada's *Youth in Transition Survey*⁵³ indicates that in December 1999, during their last year of secondary school, nearly 60% of students had a job and that 17% were working between twenty and twenty-nine hours per week with 7% working more than thirty hours per week. These proportions are no doubt lower in Quebec given that secondary school is of shorter duration and final year students are younger.

Work and Academic Success

Arnaud Sales' survey shows that holding down a job, while taking away from study time, did not have any notable impact on grades among Quebec university students in the mid-1990s.⁵⁴

51 MELS, Enquête sur les conditions de vie des étudiants de la formation professionnelle au secondaire, du collégial et de l'université, 2002.

52 A. Sales et al., *Le monde étudiant à la fin du 20e siècle, rapport final sur les conditions de vie des étudiants universitaires dans les années 90*, University of Montreal, May, 1996.

53 J. W. Bowlby et K. McMullen, *At a Crossroads: First Results for the 18-20-year-old Cohort of the Youth in Transition Survey*, Statistics Canada and Human Resources and Social Development Canada, January 2002.

54 A. Sales et autres, *Le monde étudiant à la fin du 20e siècle: rapport final sur les conditions de vie des étudiants universitaires dans les années 90*.

Based on Ekos' 2001 data, the Canadian Millennium Scholarship Foundation maintains that employment does not appear to have a major impact on student grades at the college and university levels since students who work longer hours tend to reduce their course load.

The *Youth in Transitions Survey* indicates that the highest drop out rates in the final year of secondary school were found among students who worked more than thirty hours a week (21%) and did not work at all (14%).⁵⁵

A more detailed analysis of these data⁵⁶ shows that factors other than work also influence attrition, variables linked to demographic characteristics, family situation and secondary school experience.

55 J. W. Bowlby et K. McMullen, *At a Crossroads: First Results for the 18-20-year-old Cohort of the Youth in Transition Survey*, Statistics Canada and Human Resources and Skills Development Canada, January 2002.

56 T. Bushnik, *Learning Earning and Leaving: The Relationship between Working in High School and Dropping Out*, Statistics Canada, May 2003

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ad hoc recherche - Les Affaires (2000, 2001 et 2002). « Sondage Omnibus », dans J.-P. Proulx et J.-M. Cyr, *Opinéduq 2003*, Montréal, Labriprof, Université de Montréal.

Audet, M. Allocution du ministre des Finances du Québec au sous-comité sur le déséquilibre fiscal de la Chambre des communes, le 11 avril 2005
(<http://www.finances.gouv.qc.ca/fr/ministre/Allocutions.asp>).

Boothby, D. et G. Rowe (2002). *Rate of Return to Education: A Distributional Analysis Using the LifePaths Model*, HRDC.

Bowlby, J.W. et K. McMullen (2002). *At a Crossroads: First Results for the 18-20-year-old Cohort of the Youth in Transition Survey*, Statistics Canada and Human Resources and Social Development Canada.

Canadian Millennium Scholarship Foundation (2004). *The Price of Knowledge*.

Coelli, M. (2004). *Tuition Increases and Inequality in Post-Secondary Education Attendance*. University of British Columbia.

Council of Ministers of Education, Canada (2004). *Measuring Up: Canadian Results of the OECD PISA Study*.

Coulombe, S., J.-F. Tremblay and S. Marchand (2004). *Literacy scores, human capital and growth across fourteen OECD countries*. Statistics Canada.

CROP - Ministère de l'Éducation (1966). « Sondage sur l'éducation », dans J.-P. Proulx et J.-M. Cyr, *Opinéduq 2003*, Montréal, Labriprof, Université de Montréal.

Demers, M. (1999). « La rentabilité du baccalauréat », *Bulletin statistique de l'éducation* et Document de travail (2003), ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport.

Finnie, R. E. Lacelles and A. Sweetman (2005). *Who Goes? The Direct and Indirect Effects of Family Background on Access to Post-secondary Education*, Statistics Canada.

Fortin, P. (2001). *La contribution de l'éducation à l'économie*. Texte préparé pour le Conseil supérieur de l'éducation.

Gouvernement du Québec (1965). *Rapport de la Commission royale d'enquête sur l'enseignement dans la province de Québec*.

Institut de la statistique du Québec (2003). *Si la tendance se maintient, perspectives démographiques Québec et régions, 2001-2051*.

International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (2003). *International Science Report, Findings from EMM IEA's Trends in International Mathematics and Science at the Fourth and Eight Grade*.

Ipsos-Reid - Kumon Math and Reading Centres (2003). "A Good Understanding of the Basics, Top Seven Goals As to What Parents Say Their Children Need for a Successful Education", in Jean-Pierre Proulx et Jean-Marc Cyr, *Opinéduq 2003* Montréal, Labriprof, Université de Montréal.

Ipsos-Reid et Socia Bank (2003). "Eight in Ten Canadian Parents Concerned About Increase in Costs of a Post-secondary Education", dans J.-P. Proulx et J.-M. Cyr, *Opinéduq 2003*, Montréal, Labriprof, Université de Montréal.

Ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport (2002). *Enquête sur les conditions de vie des étudiants de la formation professionnelle au secondaire, du collégial et de l'université.*

Ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport (2004). *Indicateurs nationaux, Système AGIR.*

Ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport (1994, 1997, 2000, 2002 et 2004). *La formation (professionnelle, technique, universitaire) : les employeurs s'expriment.*

Ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport (2003). MELS, *La relance au secondaire en formation professionnelle; La relance au collégial en formation technique et La relance à l'université.*

Ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport (2005). *La réussite scolaire des garçons et des filles, l'influence du milieu socioéconomique.*

Ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport (2004). *Le cheminement des élèves du secondaire à l'entrée à l'université.*

Ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport (2005). *Les indicateurs de l'éducation.*

Ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport (2002). *Résultats obtenus par les élèves québécois (PIRLS 2001).*

Ministère de l'Emploi, de la Solidarité sociale et de la Famille (2004). *Vers une politique gouvernementale de conciliation travail-famille, document de consultation, version complète.*

Ministère de l'Immigration et des Communautés culturelles (2004). *Plan d'immigration du Québec pour l'année 2005.*

Ministère de l'Immigration et des Communautés culturelles (2004). *Tableaux sur l'immigration au Québec, 1995-1999, 2000-2004.*

Ministry of Finance of Ontario (2005). Ministry of Finance of Ontario, "Paper A: Reaching Higher: The McGuinty Government Plan for Postsecondary Education" and "Better Learning for Student Success", *Budget of Ontario 2005.*

Oreopoulos, P. (2005). *Canadian Compulsory School Laws and Their Impact on Educational Attainment and Future Earnings.* Statistics Canada.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2004). *First Results from PISA 2003.*

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (1998). *Human Capital Investment: An international Comparison*. Centre for Educational Research and Innovation.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2000, 2004). *Education at a Glance*.

Pagé, C. et autres (2004). *Cap sur l'apprentissage tout au long de la vie, rapport du comité d'experts sur le financement de la formation continue*. Mandat du gouvernement du Québec.

Peters, V. (2004). *Working and Training: First Results of the 2003 Adult Education and Training Survey*. Statistics Canada and Human Resources and Social Development Canada.

Roy, N. et autres, *Les travailleurs hautement qualifiés au Québec, portrait dynamique du marché du travail*. Centre d'études sur l'emploi et la technologie, Emploi-Québec.

Sales A. et autres (1996). *Le monde étudiant à la fin du 20e siècle, rapport final sur les conditions de vie des étudiants universitaires dans les années 90*. Université de Montréal.

Shiple, L., S. Ouellette et F. Cartwright (2003). *Planning and Preparation: First Results from the Survey of Approaches to Educational Planning (SAEP) (2002)*. Statistics Canada.

Statistics Canada (2005), *Literacy, numeracy and problem-solving skills - Foundation skills for a knowledge-based economy*, *Education Matters*.

Statistics Canada (2001). *Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics (SLID)*.

Statistics Canada, *Labour Force Survey (LFS)*.

Statistics Canada (2003). *Survey of Tuition and Additional Compulsory Fees*.

Statistics Canada, *Censuses*.

Vitaro, F., C. Gagnon et autres (2000). *Prévention des problèmes d'adaptation chez les enfants et les adolescents, tome II, Les problèmes externalisés*. Presses de l'Université du Québec.

Zeman, K., T. Knighton and P. Bussière (2004). *Education and Labour Market Pathways of Young Canadians between Age 20 and 22: An Overview, Youth in Transition Survey*. Statistics Canada.