Canadian Graduate and Professional Student Survey

Comparison of Graduate Students with and without Disabilities using 2016 CGPSS Data

Prepared by:
Kathleen Clarke, Ph.D. Candidate
Research Associate, NEADS

NEADS

**National Educational Association
of Disabled Students**
Association nationale des étudiant(e)s
handicapé(e)s au niveau postsecondaire

The National Educational Association of Disabled Students (NEADS) gratefully acknowledges funding support for this research from the Social Development Partnerships Program, Employment and Social Development Canada, the Ontario Human Capital Research and Innovation Fund and the Canadian Education and Research Institute for Counseling.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	4
Introduction	6
Detailed Findings	7
Tables and Graphs Displaying Data	
SECTION 1: PERSONAL DEMOGRAPHICS	17
SECTION 2: DISABILITY	19
SECTION 3- EDUCATIONAL STATUS.....	20
SECTION 4- GENERAL SATISFACTION	23
SECTION 5- SATISFACTION WITH PROGRAM, QUALITY OF INTERACTIONS, AND COURSEWORK.....	26
SECTION 6- PROFESSIONAL SKILLS DEVELOPMENT	29
SECTION 7- RESEARCH EXPERIENCE	35
SECTION 8- PRESENTATIONS AND PUBLICATIONS	38
SECTION 9- ADVISOR AND THESIS/DISSERTATION/RESEARCH PAPER	44
SECTION 10- FINANCIAL SUPPORT	53
SECTION 11- UNIVERSITY RESOURCES AND STUDENT LIFE	58
SECTION 12- SOCIAL LIFE.....	64
SECTION 13- GENERAL ASSESSMENT	67

Executive Summary

- This report focuses on a comparison of graduate students with and without disabilities and is part of a larger research initiative called “The Landscape of Accessibility and Accommodation for Students with Disabilities in Canadian Post-Secondary Education: 2016 – 2018.”
- The focus of this report is secondary analyses that was completed on all questions of the 2016 Canadian Graduate and Professional Student Survey (CGPSS).
- Comparisons are made between graduate students without disabilities (n = 45,251) and with (2,324) disabilities [SWD]
- Several demographic differences were found on gender (more SWD were female), age (SWD were older), citizenship status (SWD more likely to be Canadian citizens), and Aboriginal status (more SWD identified in this way).
- Most common type of disability was mental health (43%); least common was Autism (3%)
- 64% of respondents rated institutional efforts to accommodate them as excellent/very good/good
- Only slight differences between the two groups in terms of type of program, degree level, year of study, program status, and academic load.
- Most common reason for enrolling for both groups was ‘to equip me to start a career, or advance an existing career outside of academia’ (41% of students without and 36% of students with disabilities)
- Select the same university: 71% of students without disabilities and 63% of student with disabilities said they would either ‘Definitely’ or ‘Probably’ select the same university.
- Students without disabilities more likely to recommend their program and university to others.
- Students without disabilities were typically more satisfied with their program, the quality of interactions, and the coursework.
- When asked to rate various types of professional development opportunities, students without disabilities typically rated them more favourably in comparison to students with disabilities
- When asked to rate various items concerning research experience, students without disabilities consistently rated items more favourably
- Participants were asked to indicate whether certain activities focused on presentations and publications occurred in their department, and then how often these activities took place.
 - When identifying whether ‘Seminars/colloquia at which students present their research,’ a difference of 10% between the two groups was found. While 75% of students with disabilities indicated these events occurred only 65% of students without disabilities responded in the same way.
 - When identifying whether they ‘Co-authored in refereed journals with program faculty’ and ‘Published as sole or first author in a refereed journal’ there were differences of 5% and 10% between the two groups.
 - **For co-authorship:** 50% of students without and 40% of students with disabilities indicated they had co-authored with program faculty.
 - **For sole or first authorship:** 47% of students without and 42% of students with disabilities indicated that they had done this.
- In terms of rating their thesis advisor and the tasks that they completed, two key differences were found:
 - **‘Advisor encouraged discussion about current job market/career prospects:** 30% of students without and 38% of students with disabilities indicated they either ‘Disagreed’ or ‘Strongly Disagreed’ with this item. These percentages were the highest for both groups across all ‘disagree’/‘strongly disagree’ items, with other percentages not surpassing 22% of the samples.

- Overall, students without disabilities meet with their advisor more often to discuss ongoing research/results and writing of dissertation.
- For sources of financial support, the greatest differences between the two groups were for ‘loans, savings, or family assistance’ (16% difference), ‘university-funded bursaries’ (9% difference), and provincial bursaries (6% difference).
- For amount of debt, graduate students with disabilities have a greater amount of debt at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.
 - **Undergraduate:** 66% of students without disabilities and only 54% of students with disabilities reported they had no undergraduate student debt.
 - **Graduate:** 49% of students without disabilities and only 36% of students with disabilities reported they had no graduate student debt.
- When rating various university resources and student life events, students without disabilities typically rated services in a more positive light (based on responses of Excellent/Very Good/Good)
 - **Differences between students with and without disabilities:** Three of the examined services had a difference of over 10% between the two groups for responses of Excellent/Very Good/Good. These items included: Graduate student work/study space (56% without and 46% with disabilities); research laboratories (42% without and 29% with disabilities); and athletic facilities (53% without and 42% with disabilities).
 - **Disability/Access services:** 40% of students with disabilities rated this service favourably, while 16% rated it as ‘Fair’ or ‘Poor’. Interestingly, 25% of students with disabilities said they did not use this service, and 18% said it was not applicable to them.
- Key differences between the groups on their perceived availability of social events:
 - **Organized social activities within your advisor/research group:** For the ‘Never’ response option, 45% of students with disabilities and 37% of those without said these activities did not occur; a difference of 8%.
 - **Organized social activities within your residence:** For the ‘Never’ response option, 74% of students with disabilities and 65% of those without said these activities did not occur; a difference of 9%.
- **Biggest obstacle to academic progress:** The obstacle that was considered a ‘major obstacle’ by the highest number of respondents for both groups was ‘work/financial commitments’. While 32% of students without disabilities responded that it was a major obstacle, this was much higher for students with disabilities, at 43% (a difference of 11%).

Introduction

The Landscape of Accessibility and Accommodation Project

The Landscape research project is an examination of the current landscape of accessibility, services, accommodations, technical equipment and supports for students with disabilities at publicly-funded post-secondary institutions across Canada.

The objectives of the overall 18-month project include:

1. an assessment of the landscape of academic accommodations;
2. an assessment of the landscape of co-curricular and experiential learning accommodations;
3. an assessment of the landscape of accessibility and accommodation practices in transitional spaces;
4. an assessment of the evolution toward the principles of accessibility and universal design;
5. an understanding of trends in accessibility and accommodation within Canadian postsecondary education;
6. identification of best practices and benchmarks; and
7. establishment of a national collaborative network.

One of the components of the research project involves secondary analyses of existing datasets. The research team examined various outlets such as professional organizations and Statistics Canada for datasets that focused on the post-secondary student population and which asked demographic questions concerning disabilities. The objective was to analyze these datasets and use these findings to supplement the primary data collection that was being done as part of the Landscape project. The research team was granted access to several datasets, one of which was the Canadian Graduate and Professional Student Survey, which is organized and run by the Canadian Association of Graduate Studies (CAGS).

The Canadian Graduate and Professional Student Survey (CGPSS)

Various institutions across Canada disseminated the CGPSS in 2007, 2010, 2013, and 2016. The purpose of the survey is to obtain information about graduate student satisfaction and the student experience. In Canada, it is the largest and most comprehensive source of data concerning these topics. More information about the CGPSS can be found on the website for CAGS (http://www.cags.ca/cgpss_home.php)

Institutional participation in the survey increased from 38 universities in 2010 to 50 in 2016. As participation in data collection has grown, the survey instrument has also undergone several changes. Most relevant to the current analyses is that for the first time since its inception, the 2016 CGPSS survey included questions concerning disability. These inclusions mean that these data are now the biggest source of data about Canadian graduate students with disabilities. Analyses of these data allow for a more comprehensive understanding of this specific population of students.

This Report

This report shares analyses in which students with disabilities ($n = 2,324$) were compared to students without disabilities ($n = 45,251$) in all sections of the CGPSS survey.

In this report, a description of the findings for each section is provided first. Following this, tables and figures presenting the data are then provided.

Findings

RESEARCH POPULATION

- In response to “Do you identify as having a disability,” 2,324 participants responded ‘Yes’.
 - This 2,324 represents 5.14% of the total population of respondents (N = 45,251)
 - 42,924 participants responded ‘No’ and 1,727 participants responded that they “Prefer not to Answer.” These participants were excluded from the analyses.

SECTION 1: PERSONAL DEMOGRAPHICS

(Pages 14-15)

- **Gender:** More respondents with disabilities identified as female (67%) in comparison to those without disabilities (58%)
- **Age:** Students with disabilities were typically older. While 45% of respondents with disabilities identified as being 31 years old or older, only 37% of respondents without disabilities identified in the same way.
- **Current Residence:** Similar rates of students with and without disabilities live in off-campus housing not owned by the university (94% and 93%).
- **Marital Status:** Similar rates of students with and without disabilities identify as being with a domestic partner (16% of students without disabilities and 18% with disabilities). While 30% of those without disabilities identified as being married, 25% of students with disabilities identified in this way.
- **Number of Children:** Similar rates of students with and without disabilities responded they did not have any children or that this question was not applicable to them (78% of those without and 80% of those with disabilities).
- **Citizenship Status:** Students with disabilities more likely to be Canadian citizens (90%) in comparison to students without disabilities (69%). Many more students without disabilities responded that they were citizens of another country with a student visa or other non-immigrant visa (25%) in comparison to students with disabilities (8%).
- **Self-identification with Visible Minority Groups.** More students with disabilities identified as being ‘mixed origin’ (8% versus 3%). While 70% of students with disabilities did not identify with any of the listed minority groups, only 56% of those without disabilities did.
- **Self-identification as Aboriginal (status or non-status Indian, Métis or Inuit).** Eight percent (n = 189) of students with disabilities self-identified as Aboriginal and 3% (n = 1,265) of students without disabilities identified in the same way.

SECTION 2: DISABILITY

(Page 16)

- **Type of Disability:**
 - Most common was ‘mental health’: 43% (n = 991)
 - Second most common was ‘learning disability’: 30% (n = 693)
 - Least common was ‘Autism spectrum’: 3.44% (n = 80)
- **Institutional Efforts to Accommodate:** Respondents rated institutional efforts favorably. While 64% rated institutional efforts as Excellent, Very Good, or Good, 36% rated as Fair or Poor.

SECTION 3- EDUCATIONAL STATUS

(Pages 17-19)

- **Type of Program:** Most students in both samples were in a research-based program and already had a research director/advisor (62% of students without and 63% of students with disabilities). Slightly more students with disabilities still did not have a research director/advisor (6% versus 3%).
- **Degree Level:** Similar rates of respondent from both groups were in master's (65% without and 68% with disabilities) versus doctoral programs (35% without and 32% with disabilities), according to data provided by participating universities.
- **With and Without Thesis:** Slightly more students with disabilities (38%) were in master's programs with a thesis component, in comparison to students without disabilities (33%).
- **Discipline:**
 - Most frequently reported disciplines for students with disabilities were 'Social Sciences' (20%), 'Humanities' (14%), 'Health science' (12%), and 'Education' (11%).
 - Most frequently reported disciplines for students without disabilities were 'Engineering' (15%), 'Health Science' (14%), 'Social Sciences' (11%), and 'Education' 10%).
- **Year of Study:** Most students in both samples were in 1st year (41% in each group) and 28% of students without disabilities and 26% of students with disabilities were in 2nd year. For students with disabilities, 12% were in 5th year or above, and this value was 10% for students without disabilities.
- **Program Status:** Most students in both samples were still taking courses (54% of those and 55% of those with disabilities). For both groups, 21% of the respondents had completed their coursework but had not yet passed their qualifying exams/paper.
- **Reason for Enrolling:** For both groups of students, the most common reason for enrolling in the current program was: 'to equip me to start a career, or advance an existing career outside of academia'; 41% of students without disabilities and 36% of students with disabilities recorded this response. The second most common response for both groups was: 'to equip me to start a career, or advance an existing career in academia'; 32% of respondents in both groups recorded this response option.
- **Academic Load:** Most students in both groups were enrolled full-time, with 82% of students without and 85% of students with disabilities indicating this.
- **Expect to Graduate:** Students without disabilities were slightly more likely to respond that they were expecting to graduate this year (39%), in comparison to students with disabilities (34%).

SECTION 4- GENERAL SATISFACTION

(Pages 20-22)

- Students without disabilities appear to be more likely to select the same university and field of study if they were to start their graduate careers over, in comparison to students with disabilities.
 - **Select same university:** 71% of students without disabilities and 63% of student with disabilities said they would either 'Definitely' or 'Probably' select the same university.

- **Select same field of study:** 81% of students without disabilities and 78% of students with disabilities said they would ‘Definitely’ or ‘Probably’ select the same field of study.
- Students without disabilities appear to be more likely to recommend their program and university to others.
 - **Recommend program to others:** 75% of students without disabilities and 66% of students with disabilities said they would ‘Definitely’ or ‘Probably’ recommend their university to someone considering their program.
 - **Recommend university to others:** 63% of students without disabilities and 54% of student with disabilities said they would ‘Definitely’ or ‘Probably’ recommend their university to someone in another field.

SECTION 5- SATISFACTION WITH PROGRAM, QUALITY OF INTERACTIONS, AND COURSEWORK

(Pages 23-25)

- **Overall Pattern:** Students without disabilities consistently rated all examined items more favourably (based on responses of ‘Excellent’, ‘Very Good’, ‘Good’) in comparison to students without disabilities. However, some items were rated more favourably than others.
- **Rated Most Favourably:** The two items that were rated the most favourably (based on responses of ‘Excellent’, ‘Very Good’, and ‘Good’) were 1) Intellectual quality of the faculty; and 2) Intellectual quality of fellow students.
 - **Similarity in responses:** Responses for these items were generally similar for students with and without disabilities.
 - **Intellectual quality of faculty:** Similar rates of students without and with disabilities indicated the intellectual quality of the faculty was ‘Excellent’, ‘Very Good’, or ‘Good’, with 96% of those without and 95% of those with disabilities responding in this way.
 - **Intellectual quality of fellow students:** Similar rates of students without and with disabilities indicated the intellectual quality of their peers was ‘Excellent’, ‘Very Good’, or ‘Good’, with 91% of those without and 90% of those with disabilities responding in this way.
- **Rated Least Favourably:** The two items that were rated the least favourably (based on responses of ‘Fair’ and ‘Poor’) were 1) Advice on the availability of financial support; and 2) Opportunities to take coursework outside own department.
 - **Difference in responses:** Responses for these items were quite different, with a difference of 10% on the first item and 8% on the second.
 - **Advice on availability of financial support:** While 36% of students without disabilities indicated advice about financial support was ‘Fair’ or ‘Poor’, many more students with disabilities (46%) responded this way.
 - **Coursework outside of department:** 30% of students without disabilities and 38% of students with disabilities indicated the opportunities to take coursework outside their department were ‘Fair’ or ‘Poor’.

SECTION 6- PROFESSIONAL SKILLS DEVELOPMENT

(Pages 26-31)

Graph One

- **Overall Pattern:** Students without disabilities consistently rated all examined items more favourably (based on responses of 'Excellent', 'Very Good', 'Good') in comparison to students with disabilities. However, some items were rated more favourably than others.
- **Rated Most Favourably:** For both groups, respondents rated the quality of support and training they received for 'Feedback on research' most favourably. 71% of students without and 65% of students with disabilities reported the feedback they received on their research was 'Excellent', 'Very Good', or 'Good.'
- **Rated Least Favourably:**
 - **For students without disabilities:** The item rated least favourably was 'Advice/workshops on job searching,' where 26% of respondents indicated the support/training for this was 'Fair' or 'Poor'.
 - **For students with disabilities:** The item rated least favourably was 'Advice/workshops on publishing your work,' where 34% of respondents indicated the support/training on this was 'Fair' or 'Poor.'
- **'Did not participate' Response Option:** Approximately 25% of respondents in both groups indicated they did not participate in four of the examined support/training opportunities including: 1) Advice/workshops on standards for academic writing in your field; 2) Advice/workshops on standards for writing grant proposals; 3) Advice/workshops on publishing your work; and 4) Advice/workshops on job searching.

Graph Two

- **Overall Pattern:** Students without disabilities consistently rated all examined items more favourably (based on responses of 'Excellent', 'Very Good', 'Good') in comparison to students with disabilities.
- **Rated Most Favourably:** For students with and without disabilities, the item rated most favourably was 'Advice/workshops about research ethics in human subject research. Similar rates of students from both groups indicated this was 'Excellent', 'Very Good', or 'Good', with 41% of students without and 40% of students with disabilities responding in this way.
- **Rated Least Favourably:** For most of the items, percentages of respondents indicating the advice/workshops were 'Fair' were similar across students with and without disabilities. However, when looking at the percentages for 'Poor,' some large differences are found.
 - **Advice/workshops about research positions:** While 27% of respondents with disabilities rated this as 'Poor', only 16% of respondents without disabilities responded this way, which is a difference of 11%.
 - **Advice/workshops on career options outside of academia:** While 27% of respondents with disabilities rated this as 'Poor', only 17% of respondents without disabilities responded this way, which is a difference of 10%.
- **'Did not participate' Response Option:** For all items, students without disabilities had higher percentages for this response options, indicating that students with disabilities do participate in these types of workshops.
- **'Not applicable' Response Option:** For the most part, percentages were similar across students with and without disabilities.

- The greatest difference between the two groups was 12%, for ‘Advice/workshops about research ethics in the use of animals.’ For this item, 53% of students with disabilities responded that it was not applicable, while only 41% of students without disabilities responded in the same way.

Graph Three

- **Similar Favourable Responses (Excellent/Very Good/Good):** For four out of six items in this section, percentages of students across the two groups are considered similar, with a difference of 3% or less. The items with similar favourable ratings include: ‘Advice/workshops on career options’; ‘Advice/workshops on job preparation and professional practice’; ‘Advice/workshops on professional ethics’; and ‘Opportunities for contact with practicing professionals’
- **Rated Most Favourably:** For students with and without disabilities, ‘Opportunities for contact with practicing professionals’ was rated the most favourably with 67% of students without and 68% of students with disabilities responding with either ‘Excellent’, ‘Very Good’, or ‘Good’.
- **Rated Least Favourably:** For students with and without disabilities, ‘Advice/workshops on career options’ was rated the least favourably with 25% of students without and 31% of students with disabilities responding with ‘Fair’ or ‘Poor’.
 - **Greatest difference:** between the two groups when looking at the ‘Fair’ and ‘Poor’ response options was for the item ‘Advice/workshops on the standards for writing in your profession,’ where 16% of students without and 24% of students with disabilities responded in this way (a difference of 8%).
- **‘Did not participate’ and ‘Not applicable’:** Percentages of respondents for both of these respondents were quite similar, with differences of 3% or less between the two groups.

SECTION 7- RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

(Pages 32-34)

- **Overall Pattern:** Students without disabilities consistently rated all items more favourably (based on responses of ‘Excellent’, ‘Very Good’, and ‘Good’) in comparison to students without disabilities.
- **Rated Most Favourably:** Items rated most favourably by both samples were: 1) Conducting independent research since starting your graduate program; and 2) Faculty guidance in formulating a research topic.
 - **Conducting independent research:** 64% of students without and 57% of students with disabilities responded that the quality/availability of support for conducting independent research was ‘Excellent’, ‘Very Good’, or ‘Good’.
 - **Faculty guidance in formulating a research topic:** 63% of students without and 57% of students with disabilities responded that the quality/availability of faculty support for formulating a research topic was ‘Excellent’, ‘Very Good’, or ‘Good’.
- **Rated Least Favourably:** The item rated least favourably by students with disabilities was ‘Training in research methods before beginning your own research.’
 - **Training in research methods:** 25% of students without and 33% of students with disabilities responded that their training in research methods (before beginning research) was ‘Fair’ or ‘Poor’.

- **Collaboration with faculty in writing a grant proposal.** For students with and without disabilities, the rates of respondents for both ‘Did not participate’ and ‘Not applicable’ were highest for this question.
 - **For ‘Did not participate’:** 25% of students without and 22% of students with disabilities responded in this way. This is much higher than the 5-11% of those who responded, ‘Did not participate’ on the other questions in this section.
 - **For ‘Not applicable’:** 18% of students without and 21% of students with disabilities responded in this way.

SECTION 8- PRESENTATIONS AND PUBLICATIONS

(Pages 35-40)

- **Occurrence – Similarities:**
 - When identifying whether items occurred in their department, similar percentages of respondents indicated ‘departmental funding for students to attend national/regional meetings’ and ‘attend national scholarly meetings.’ For students with and without disabilities, approximately 50% of respondents from both groups responses that these two items occurred.
 - When identifying whether ‘Deliver any papers or present a poster at national scholarly meetings’ occurred in their department, similar rates of students from each group indicated that they did. 67% of students without disabilities and 66% of students with disabilities responded that these opportunities did occur.
- **Occurrence – Differences:**
 - When identifying whether ‘Seminars/colloquia at which students present their research,’ a difference of 10% between the two groups was found. While 75% of students with disabilities indicated these events occurred only 65% of students without disabilities responded in the same way.
 - When identifying whether they ‘Co-authored in refereed journals with program faculty’ and ‘Published as sole or first author in a refereed journal’ there were differences of 5% and 10% between the two groups.
 - **For co-authorship:** 50% of students without and 40% of students with disabilities indicated they had co-authored with program faculty.
 - **For sole or first authorship:** 47% of students without and 42% of students with disabilities indicated that they had done this.

SECTION 9- ADVISOR AND THESIS/DISSERTATION/RESEARCH PAPER

(Pages 41-49)

- **Level of Agreement with Advisor Behaviours:** The overall pattern is that in general, more students without disabilities typically responded with ‘Strongly Agree’ or ‘Agree’ in comparison to students with disabilities.
 - **Differences between two groups on ‘Strongly Agree’/ ‘Agree’:** Differences ranged from 3% (advisor gave constructive feedback on work; advisor returned work promptly; advisor was available for regular meetings) to 8% (advisor promoted my professional development; advisor encouraged discussions about job markets and career prospects)
 - **‘Advisor encouraged discussion about current job market/career prospects:** 30% of students without and 38% of students with disabilities indicated they either ‘Disagreed’ or ‘Strongly Disagreed’ with this item. These percentages were

the highest for both groups across all ‘disagree’/‘strongly disagree’ items, with other percentages not surpassing 22% of the samples.

- **Most-to-least agreed upon statements for students with disabilities:**
 - 75% or more respondents indicated that ‘agreed’/‘strongly agreed’ for all items except ‘my advisor encouraged discussions about current job market and career prospects,’ where only 62% responded in the same way.
 - The top two most agreed upon statements were ‘my advisor gave me constructive feedback on my work’ (90% said ‘agree’ or ‘strongly agree’) and ‘my advisor served as my advocate when necessary’ (88% said ‘agree’ or ‘strongly agree’)
- **Meeting and Communicating with Advisor:** Overall, students without disabilities meet with their advisor more often to discuss ongoing research/results and writing of dissertation. Also, students from both groups do not meet with their advisor to discuss dissertation writing as often as they meet to discuss ongoing research and results.
 - **Ongoing research results:** There was a difference of 10% for meeting ‘Four or more times per month’ with 36% of students without and 26% of students with disabilities responding in this way. While 19% of students without disabilities said they meet their advisor less than once a month, this was much higher for students with disabilities, where 27% indicated they met less than once per month.
 - **Writing of the dissertation draft:** There was a difference of 7% for meeting ‘Four or more times per month’ with 20% of students without and 1% of students with disabilities meeting this often. While 36% of students without disabilities indicated they met less than once a month to discuss dissertation writing, this value was 41% for students with disabilities.
- **Advisory Committee:**
 - **Existence of Committee:** Similar rates of students from both groups indicated they had an advisory committee, with 32% of students without and 34% of students with disabilities responding this way.
 - **Committee expectations:** Of those with an advisory committee, students with and without disabilities appear to have similar perspectives on what they feel their committee expects from them, in terms of receiving a written progress report and meeting at least once.
 - **Presence of interaction:** Of those with a committee, 74% of participants from each group responded that they had interacted with their advisory committee at least once.
 - **Format of interaction:** Of those who had at least one interaction, for most participants this interaction took place in a formal meeting (87% of students without and 82% of students with disabilities responded this way).
 - **Rating of Feedback:** Of those who had an interaction, approximately 90% from each group of respondents indicated they ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that the committee feedback was useful.

SECTION 10- FINANCIAL SUPPORT

(Pages 50-54)

- **Sources of Financial Support:**

- **Top 5 sources for students with disabilities:** loans, savings, or family assistance (55%), graduate teaching assistantships (42%), graduate research assistantship (30%), university-funded bursary (30%), and off campus employment (25%).
- **Top 10 sources for students with disabilities:** When examining the top sources of financial support for students with disabilities and comparing the percentage of respondents from each group that reported using that source of support, it is clear that students with disabilities are more reliant on these sources than those without disabilities (some sources to a greater than others, however).
- **Differences between students with and without disabilities:**
 - For 14 out of 18 items there was a difference of only 3% between the two groups.
 - The greatest differences between the two groups were for ‘loans, savings, or family assistance’ (16% difference), ‘university-funded bursaries’ (9% difference), and provincial bursaries (6% difference).
 - Loans, savings, or family assistance: While 55% of students with disabilities reported using this source of financial support, only 39% of students without disabilities reported using this.

- **Amount of Education Debt:**

- Overall, graduate students with disabilities have a greater amount of debt at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.
- **Undergraduate:** 66% of students without disabilities and only 54% of students with disabilities reported they had no undergraduate student debt.
- **Graduate:** 49% of students without disabilities and only 36% of students with disabilities reported they had no graduate student debt.

SECTION 11- UNIVERSITY RESOURCES AND STUDENT LIFE

(Pages 55-60)

- **Rating Quality of Services:**

- **Overall Pattern:** When asked to rate the quality of various resources, the overall pattern shows students without disabilities typically rate services in a more positive light (based on responses of Excellent/Very Good/Good), with some exceptions such as with health care services and student counselling.
- **Services that few students reported using:** Child care services; services to international students attending this university; services to students attending this university but studying abroad; ombudsperson’s office.
- **Differences between students with and without disabilities:** Three of the examined services had a difference of over 10% between the two groups for responses of Excellent/Very Good/Good. These items included: Graduate student work/study space (56% without and 46% with disabilities); research laboratories (42% without and 29% with disabilities); and athletic facilities (53% without and 42% with disabilities).
- **Disability/Access services:** 40% of students with disabilities rated this service favourably, while 16% rated it as ‘Fair’ or ‘Poor’. Interestingly, 25% of students

with disabilities said they did not use this service, and 18% said it was not applicable to them.

- **For ‘Did not participate’:** For 9 out of 20 items, there was a difference of 5% or more on this response option. These items included: library facilities; research laboratories; health care services; child care services; financial aid office; athletic facilities; housing assistance; bookstore; student government office. For some items, the percentage of students without disabilities was higher, and for others it was lower.
- **Location of Offices:**
 - **Overall Patterns:**
 - For most services, the most common location where students use the service was the Central Office. The two items that were exceptions to this were “Graduate student work/study space’ and ‘research laboratories’ where higher percentages of students with and without disabilities indicated they used the Local Office for these services.
 - It appears that more students with disabilities use the Central Office for most of the examined services, in comparison to students without disabilities (with the exception of graduate student work/study space). Conversely, the percentages of students without disabilities indicating they used the Local Office for services was typically higher in comparison to students with disabilities (with the exception of graduate student work/study space).

SECTION 12- SOCIAL LIFE

(Pages 61-63)

- **Availability Social Events:**
 - **No differences:** For two of the four examined items, student perceptions of the availability of activities are quite similar (organized university-wide social activities; organized social activities within your department).
 - **Organized social activities within your advisor/research group:** For the ‘Never’ response option, 45% of students with disabilities and 37% of those without said these activities did not occur; a difference of 8%.
 - **Organized social activities within your residence:** For the ‘Never’ response option, 74% of students with disabilities and 65% of those without said these activities did not occur; a difference of 9%.
- **Attending Social Events:**
 - **Small differences:** For two of the four examined items, participation in ‘organized social activities within department’ and ‘organized social activities within your advisor/research group’ appears to be similar.
 - **Organized university-wide social activities:** The greatest difference for this item is on the ‘Frequently’ response option, where 61% of students with disabilities and 52% of those without said they attended these activities frequently.
 - **Organized social activities within our residence:** For the ‘Frequently’ response option, more students with disabilities (54%) indicated they attended frequently in comparison to the 44% of students without disabilities. More students without

disabilities (40%) indicated they attended occasionally, in comparison to students with disabilities.

SECTION 13- GENERAL ASSESSMENT

(Pages 64-68)

- **Quality Rating:**
 - **Overall Pattern:** Students without disabilities rated all examined items more favourably than students with disabilities.
 - **Highest Rating:** For both groups of respondents, the item that was rated most favourably was 'your academic experience at this university'. 90% of students without and 83% of students with disabilities rated this item as Excellent/Very Good/Good.
 - **Lowest Rating:** 'Your student life experience at this university' was rated the least favourably by both groups. For students without disabilities, 79% responded with Excellent/Very Good/Good while 21% responded with Fair/Poor. For students with disabilities, 68% responded with Excellent/Very Good/Good and 32% responded with Fair/Poor.
- **Obstacles to Academic Progress:**
 - **Biggest Obstacle:** The obstacle that was considered a 'major obstacle' by the highest number of respondents for both groups was 'work/financial commitments'. While 32% of students without disabilities responded that it was a major obstacle, this was much higher for students with disabilities, at 43% (a difference of 11%).
 - **Not an Obstacle:** For six out of seven examined factors, more students without disabilities indicated they were 'not an obstacle', in comparison to students with disabilities. The only item where more students with disabilities indicated it was not an obstacle was for 'immigration laws or regulations.'
- **Importance of Various Opportunities:**
 - **Most important:** 'Networking with local/provincial/federal government' appeared to be the most important item for both groups, with 43% of students without and 44% of students with disabilities indicating this was 'very important.'
 - **Least important:** 'Study abroad' was the least important item for both groups, with 35% of students without and 41% of students with disabilities responding that this was 'Not important.'

SECTION 1: PERSONAL DEMOGRAPHICS

Table 1

Participant Profiles

	Students without Disabilities		Students with Disabilities	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Gender –University Data				
Male	17,870	41.63	766	32.93
Female	25,051	58.37	1,560	67.07
Age				
20 or younger	14	0.03	0	0.00
21-25	13,345	31.17	610	26.30
26-30	13,783	32.19	675	29.11
31-35	6,892	16.10	416	17.94
36-40	3,524	8.23	210	9.06
41-45	2,232	5.21	130	5.61
Over 45	3,021	7.06	278	11.99
Current Residence				
On-campus student housing (no resident assistant/dorm responsibilities)	1,475	3.45	78	3.36
On-campus student housing (with resident assistant/dorm responsibilities)	658	1.54	21	0.91
Off-campus housing owned by this university	608	1.42	31	1.34
Off-campus housing not owned by this university	39,991	93.59	2,189	94.39
Marital Status				
Not married	22,155	51.79	1,169	50.47
Married	12,689	29.66	581	25.09
Divorced	719	1.68	78	3.37
Separated	429	1.00	58	2.50
Widowed	68	0.16	7	0.30
With domestic partner	6,717	15.70	423	18.26
Number of Children				
None/Not applicable	33,229	77.63	1,851	79.78
1 child	3,544	8.28	159	6.85

	Students without Disabilities		Students with Disabilities	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
2 children	3,949	9.23	187	8.06
3 children	1,482	3.46	77	3.32
4 or more children	601	1.40	46	1.98
Current Citizenship Status				
Canadian Citizen	29,428	68.66	2,085	89.72
Canadian Permanent Resident	2,820	6.58	60	2.58
Citizen of another country with a student visa or other non-immigrant visa	10,613	24.76	179	7.70
Identifies with visible minority group(s) Responses of 'Yes'				
Black (e.g. African, African American, African Canadian, Caribbean)	2,512	5.85	94	4.04
East Asian (e.g. Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Polynesian)	4,679	10.90	104	4.47
South Asian (e.g. Indian, Pakistani, Sri Lankan, Bangladeshi)	3,532	8.23	81	3.48
Southeast Asian (e.g. Burmese, Cambodian, Filipino, Laotian, Malaysian, Thai, Vietnamese)	652	1.52	24	1.03
West Asian (e.g. Arabian, Armenian, Iranian, Israeli, Lebanese, Palestinian, Syrian, Turkish)	2,910	6.78	73	3.14
Latin American (e.g. Mexican, Indigenous Central and South American)	1,478	3.44	59	2.54
Mixed origin, please specify	1,473	3.43	178	7.65
None	24,016	55.95	1,618	69.53
Do you self-identify with, or have ancestry as an Aboriginal person (status or non-status Indian, Métis or Inuit)?				
Yes	1,265	2.96	189	8.16
No	41,477	97.04	2,126	91.84

SECTION 2: DISABILITY

Table 2

Participants' Responses: Do you self-identify with any disability or impairment?

	<i>n</i>	%
Yes	2,327	4.95
No	42,924	91.37
Prefer not to respond	1,727	3.68

Note. N = 46,978

Table 3

Types of Disabilities

	<i>n</i>	%
Sensory (vision or hearing)	308	13.25
Mobility	255	10.97
Learning (e.g. ADHD, Dyslexia)	693	29.82
Mental Health (e.g. Depression, Bipolar)	991	42.64
Autism Spectrum (e.g. Autism, Asperger's)	80	3.44
Chronic (e.g. Chron's, Colitis, MS)	397	17.08
A disability or impairment not listed above	334	14.5
Prefer not to respond	138	6.0

Note. Participants could select all that apply
N = 2,324

Table 4

Participants' Responses: How would you rate your institution's efforts to accommodate your disability or impairment in your graduate program?

	<i>n</i>	%
Excellent	398	18.28
Very good	457	20.99
Good	548	25.17
Fair	457	19.94
Poor	398	15.62

Note. N = 2,177.

SECTION 3- EDUCATIONAL STATUS

Table 5

Participants' Responses: Is your program research-based, under the supervision of a research director/advisor, or is more course-based without the same level of supervision?

	Students without Disabilities		Students with Disabilities	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Student Response				
Mostly research-based, and I already have a research director/advisor	26,772	62.37	1,460	62.74
Mostly research-based, but I still do not have a research director/advisor	1,173	2.73	128	5.50
Mainly course-based	14,979	34.90	739	31.76

	Students without Disabilities		Students with Disabilities	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Degree Level- University Data				
Master's	28,067	65.43	1,573	67.63
Doctoral	14,826	34.57	753	32.37
Program/Degree Level (calculated using combined data)				
Master's – without thesis	14,026	32.68	680	29.22
Master's- with thesis	14,072	32.78	894	38.42
Doctoral	14,826	34.54	753	32.36
Discipline				
Architecture/Landscape/Urban Design/Planning	383	0.90	18	0.78
Arts and Culture	343	0.80	31	1.34
Biological Science	3,136	7.33	125	5.39
Business/Management	3,651	8.54	86	3.71
Education	4,069	9.52	248	10.69
Engineering	6,551	15.32	127	5.47
Environmental Science	1,726	4.04	67	2.89
Finance/Mathematics/Computing	410	0.96	8	0.34
Fine and Applied Arts	1,069	2.50	68	2.93
Health Science	6,080	14.22	272	11.72
Humanities	3,469	8.11	343	14.78
Journalism	36	0.08	8	0.34
Law	250	0.58	10	0.43
Library and Information Sciences	423	0.99	56	2.41
Other	2,445	5.72	157	6.77
Physical and Mathematical Sciences	2,474	5.79	103	4.44
Public Administration/Public Policy/International Relations	789	1.85	39	1.68
Social Sciences	4,863	11.37	467	20.13
Social Work	594	1.39	87	3.75
Year of Study- University Data				
1 st year	17,292	41.00	931	40.73
2 nd year	11,965	28.37	601	26.29
3 rd year	5,599	13.28	310	13.56
4 th year	3,137	7.44	179	7.83
5 th year	2,069	4.91	112	4.90
6 th year or above	2,112	5.01	153	6.69
Current Program Status				
I am still taking courses (All streams)	23,200	54.10	1,286	55.34

	Students without Disabilities		Students with Disabilities	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
I have completed coursework (All streams)	8,835	20.60	483	20.78
I have passed qualifying exams/paper (Long & Medium)	4,047	9.44	155	6.67
I have had my thesis/dissertation proposal accepted (Long & Medium)	5,592	13.04	354	15.23
I have defended my thesis/dissertation/research paper (Long & Medium)	1,208	2.82	46	1.98
Reason for Enrolling in Current Program				
To equip me to start a career, or advance an existing career in academia	13,537	31.56	741	31.86
To equip me to start a career, or advance an existing career outside of academia	17,654	41.23	838	36.03
To satisfy my interest in the field, regardless of career prospects	9,888	23.05	581	24.98
Other (specified)	1,815	4.23	166	7.14
Academic Load				
Full-time	35,304	82.26	1,964	84.51
Part-time	7,611	17.74	360	15.49
Expect to Graduate in Next Year				
Yes	16,866	39.32	797	34.29
No	26,029	60.68	1,527	65.71

SECTION 4- GENERAL SATISFACTION

Table 6

Participants' Responses: Please select your response to the following.

	Definitely		Probably		Maybe		Probably not		Definitely not		# of Respondents	
	No Disability	With Disability	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	ND	ND	WD	ND	WD
If you were to start your graduate/professional career again, would you select this same university?	33.84	30.44	37.21	32.46	17.85	19.82	8.07	11.31	3.02	5.98	42,897	2,326
If you were to start your graduate/professional career again, would you select the same field of study?	52.52	49.46	28.54	28.29	11.78	13.67	5.73	6.25	1.43	2.33	42,824	2,319
Would you recommend this university to someone considering your program?	43.89	37.98	30.92	28.12	15.16	17.18	6.76	10.03	3.26	6.68	42,784	2,322
Would you recommend this university to someone in another field?	26.31	23.24	36.20	30.34	29.94	34.42	5.82	8.43	1.73	3.57	42,802	2,324

	Definitely		Probably		Maybe		Probably not		Definitely not		# of Respondents	
	No Disability	With Disability	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	ND	ND	WD	ND	WD
If you were to start your graduate career again, would you select the same faculty supervisor? (Long stream only)	53.90	52.40	22.75	20.62	11.08	10.16	7.04	8.59	5.23	8.23	25,878	1,397

SECTION 5- SATISFACTION WITH PROGRAM, QUALITY OF INTERACTIONS, AND COURSEWORK

Table 7

Participants' Responses: Please rate the following dimensions of your program.

	Excellent		Very Good		Good		Fair		Poor		# of Respondents	
	No Disability	With Disability	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD
The intellectual quality of the faculty	42.06	42.77	39.80	37.95	13.82	13.98	3.42	4.22	0.89	1.08	42,854	2,324
The intellectual quality of my fellow students	22.25	24.10	44.05	40.17	25.33	24.62	6.98	8.51	1.40	2.59	42,740	2,315
The relationship between faculty and graduate students	26.55	21.35	37.47	32.41	24.00	27.38	8.86	12.61	3.12	6.24	42,745	2,323
Overall quality of graduate level teaching by faculty	20.93	19.46	41.80	38.44	25.46	26.23	9.14	11.17	2.67	4.70	42,738	2,318
Advice on the availability of financial support	10.24	8.55	21.58	17.19	32.40	28.04	22.59	24.74	13.20	21.48	42,417	2,304
Quality of academic advising and guidance	17.44	15.70	29.28	23.88	30.27	27.64	15.91	19.29	7.10	13.49	42,570	2,312
Helpfulness of staff members in my program	29.49	32.70	33.99	30.03	23.12	20.70	9.71	11.02	3.69	5.55	42,727	2,324

	Excellent		Very Good		Good		Fair		Poor		# of Respondents	
	No Disability	With Disability	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD
Availability of area courses I needed to complete my program	19.43	18.68	29.25	26.29	27.92	25.94	15.37	18.29	8.03	10.81	42,669	2,313
Quality of instruction in my courses	20.07	19.07	41.46	38.70	27.00	27.01	9.13	11.35	2.34	3.88	42,735	2,318
Relationship of program content to my research/professional goals	20.49	18.42	35.03	30.76	27.80	27.78	12.31	15.70	4.37	7.33	42,766	2,318
Opportunities for student collaboration or teamwork	22.71	19.30	32.44	27.89	26.28	26.42	12.47	15.76	6.11	10.62	42,712	2,316
Opportunities to take coursework outside my own department	14.19	14.04	24.69	20.77	30.28	27.25	18.47	21.08	12.37	16.86	42,194	2,301
Opportunities to engage in interdisciplinary work	15.50	17.96	25.04	21.27	30.54	27.88	19.02	19.14	9.90	13.75	42,249	2,299
Amount of coursework	12.17	10.10	35.83	30.64	39.50	41.17	10.16	13.47	2.34	4.62	42,698	2,317

SECTION 6- PROFESSIONAL SKILLS DEVELOPMENT

Table 8

Participants' Responses: How would you rate the quality of the support and training you received in these areas? (Long and Medium Streams only)

	Excellent		Very Good		Good		Fair		Poor		Did not Participate		Not Applicable		# of Respondents	
	No Disability	With a Disability	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD
Courses, workshops, or orientation on teaching	14.05	12.45	26.55	21.29	24.26	22.09	10.53	12.27	4.80	10.49	13.02	12.09	6.79	9.33	28,575	1,630
Advice/workshops on preparing for candidacy examinations	7.54	4.61	14.44	9.83	17.23	11.98	10.67	10.32	8.12	13.70	20.39	18.98	21.60	30.59	28,483	1,628
Feedback on your research	19.00	16.57	27.35	23.63	25.00	23.51	12.01	13.57	5.18	9.82	5.20	4.24	6.26	8.66	28,518	1,629
Advice/workshops on standards for academic writing in your field	9.85	8.37	18.21	14.52	21.37	18.83	13.10	15.14	8.34	13.91	22.16	20.74	6.96	8.49	28,473	1,625
Advice/workshops on standards for writing grant proposals	8.02	7.31	14.12	11.49	17.86	16.83	13.48	14.00	10.76	17.01	25.00	22.79	10.75	10.57	28,469	1,628
Advice/workshops on publishing your work	7.85	5.18	13.28	8.32	17.51	14.73	13.39	13.80	11.72	21.57	25.52	24.65	10.73	11.77	28,371	1,623
Advice/workshops on job searching (CV prep, interview skills, etc.)	6.62	4.30	11.89	8.60	16.66	13.94	13.19	14.00	12.58	20.33	28.13	26.23	10.93	12.59	28,477	1,628

Table 9

Participants' Responses: How would you rate the quality of the support and training you received in these areas? (Long and Medium Streams only)

	Excellent		Very Good		Good		Fair		Poor		Did not Participate		Not Applicable		# of Respondents	
	No Disability	With a Disability	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD
Advice/workshops on career options within academia?	6.61	4.48	13.49	10.20	19.48	17.32	14.54	15.60	12.87	21.31	24.23	22.17	8.79	8.91	28,471	1,628
Advice/workshops on career options outside of academia	4.61	3.14	10.73	7.94	17.99	17.35	17.12	17.35	17.23	27.45	23.80	21.54	8.51	8.55	28,422	1,625
Advice/workshops about research positions	4.89	3.51	10.25	6.58	18.13	15.08	16.41	16.06	15.60	26.89	24.87	21.29	9.84	10.58	28,299	1,625
Advice/workshops about research ethics in human subject research	8.08	8.56	14.71	13.49	17.74	17.56	10.45	9.92	6.40	11.15	21.52	18.05	21.09	21.26	28,351	1,623
Advice/workshops about research ethics in the use of animals	4.79	3.65	8.01	4.33	9.94	6.86	6.33	4.45	4.82	7.54	25.60	20.52	40.51	52.66	28,321	1,618
Advice/workshops on intellectual property issues	7.21	7.57	13.63	10.28	19.09	16.13	12.27	12.19	10.78	18.41	23.60	20.01	13.42	15.39	28,373	1,624

Table 10

Participants' Responses: How would you rate the quality of the support and training you received in these areas? (Short Stream only)

	Excellent		Very Good		Good		Fair		Poor		Did not Participate		Not Applicable		# of Respondents	
	No Disability	With a Disability	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD
Advice/workshops on the standards for writing in your profession	9.34	8.43	19.85	15.99	23.14	20.93	11.36	15.55	5.16	8.14	21.38	22.67	9.77	8.28	14,162	688
Advice/workshops on career options	7.98	7.12	16.22	13.52	22.13	22.38	14.95	17.73	9.65	12.79	19.31	16.86	9.77	9.59	14,119	688
Advice/workshops on professional ethics	11.56	12.15	20.36	19.47	22.88	23.57	11.89	12.01	4.94	9.22	18.46	15.37	9.91	8.20	14,070	683
Advice/workshops on job preparation and professional practice	9.57	9.33	17.02	16.15	22.21	20.74	14.30	16.74	9.30	12.44	18.07	16.15	9.52	8.44	14,038	675
Opportunities for internships, practicum, and experiential learning as part of the program	17.17	21.75	18.76	18.83	17.48	18.83	11.75	12.85	11.69	12.12	12.61	6.72	10.53	8.91	14,093	685
Opportunities for contact (lectures, seminars, discussion) with practicing professionals	17.76	18.80	24.55	26.24	24.15	22.59	12.88	13.12	6.32	8.75	9.16	6.41	5.17	4.08	14,136	686

SECTION 7- RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

Table 11

Participants' Responses: How would you rate the quality of the support and opportunities you received in these areas?

	Excellent		Very Good		Good		Fair		Poor		Did not Participate		Not Applicable		# of Respondents	
	No Disability	With a Disability	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD
Conducting independent research since starting your graduate program	18.28	17.67	24.39	19.48	21.60	20.30	9.84	12.46	5.87	11.81	7.33	5.91	12.70	12.37	42,693	2,320
Training in research methods before beginning your own research	12.59	11.14	19.97	18.00	23.43	21.06	14.43	16.53	11.05	16.10	7.20	6.13	11.33	11.05	42,666	2,317
Faculty guidance in formulating a research topic	19.19	18.13	22.83	19.21	21.32	20.07	12.13	14.30	7.64	12.70	5.39	4.61	11.50	10.98	42,692	2,322

Table 12

Participants' Responses: How would you rate the quality of the support and opportunities you received in these areas? (Long and Medium Streams only)

	Excellent		Very Good		Good		Fair		Poor		Did not Participate		Not Applicable		# of Respondents	
	No Disability	With a Disability	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD
Research collaboration with one or more faculty members	19.77	18.18	22.98	17.63	19.36	15.97	9.72	11.06	8.46	15.11	10.65	10.38	9.07	11.67	22,522	1,628
Collaboration with faculty in writing a grant proposal	10.06	9.33	12.48	9.76	13.86	10.56	9.11	8.66	10.96	18.97	25.48	22.10	18.05	20.63	28,485	1,629

SECTION 8- PRESENTATIONS AND PUBLICATIONS

Table 13

Participants' responses: Please select if the following occurs in your department.

	Students without Disabilities				Students with Disabilities			
	No		Yes		No		Yes	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Seminars/colloquia at which students present their research	10,499	24.65	32,088	65.35	572	24.75	1,739	75.25
Departmental funding for students to attend national or regional meetings	21,387	50.55	20,922	49.45	1,145	49.70	1,159	50.30
Attend national scholarly meetings	22,823	54.03	19,418	45.97	1,230	53.39	1,074	46.61

If participants responded 'Yes' they were then asked to provide the number of occurrences.

Seminars/colloquia at which students present their research	Students without Disabilities (N = 31,012)		Students with Disabilities (N = 1,697)	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
0	6,629	21.38	409	24.10
1	6,558	21.15	396	23.34
2	5,460	17.61	299	17.62
3	2,641	8.52	153	9.02
4+	9,724	31.36	440	25.93

Departmental funding for students to attend national or regional meetings	Students without Disabilities (N = 20,064)		Students with Disabilities (N = 1,125)	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
0	9,462	47.16	559	49.69
1	5,530	27.56	290	25.78
2	2,528	12.60	156	13.87
3	1,134	5.65	45	4.00
4+	1,410	7.03	75	6.67

Attend national scholarly meetings	Students without Disabilities (N = 18,665)		Students with Disabilities (N = 1,050)	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
0	7,136	38.23	414	39.43
1	4,621	24.76	244	23.24
2	2,660	14.25	164	15.62
3	1,476	7.91	70	6.67
4+	2,772	14.85	158	15.05

Seminars/colloquia at which students present their research

65%

75%

Departmental funding for students to attend national or regional meetings

49%

50%

Attend national scholarly meetings

46%

47%

■ No Disability ■ With Disability

If participants responded 'Yes' they were then asked to provide the number of occurrences.

Table 14

Participants' responses: Please select if the following occurs in your department (Long Stream only)

	Students without Disabilities				Students with Disabilities			
	No		Yes		No		Yes	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Deliver any papers or present a poster at national scholarly meetings	8,546	33.33	17,096	66.67	476	34.37	909	65.63
Co-authored in refereed journals with your program faculty	12,908	50.41	12,696	49.59	834	60.00	556	40.00
Published as sole or first author in a refereed journal	13,540	52.88	12,064	47.12	804	57.88	585	42.12

If participants responded 'Yes' they were then asked to provide the number of occurrences.

Deliver any papers or present a poster at national scholarly meetings	Students without Disabilities (N = 16,538)		Students with Disabilities (N = 883)	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
0	4,279	25.87	214	24.24
1	4,436	26.82	242	27.52
2	2,849	17.23	156	17.67
3	1,630	9.86	65	7.36
4+	3,344	20.22	205	23.22

Co-authored in refereed journals with your program faculty	Students without Disabilities (N = 12,215)		Students with Disabilities (N = 539)	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
0	4,442	36.37	240	44.53
1	3,779	30.94	161	29.87
2	1,813	14.84	70	12.99
3	910	7.45	24	4.45
4+	1,271	10.41	44	8.16

Published as sole or first author in a refereed journal	Students without Disabilities (N = 11,627)		Students with Disabilities (N = 567)	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
0	4,620	39.74	252	44.44
1	3,908	33.61	177	31.22
2	1,655	14.23	71	12.52
3	705	6.06	32	5.64
4+	739	6.36	35	6.17

If participants responded 'Yes' they were then asked to provide the number of occurrences.

SECTION 9- ADVISOR AND THESIS/DISSERTATION/RESEARCH PAPER (Long Stream Only)

Table 15

Participants' responses: Thesis/Dissertation advisors engage in a variety of mentoring activities. For each of the following statements, indicate the extent that it DESCRIBES THE BEHAVIOUR of your advisor.

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		# of Respondents	
	No Disability	With a Disability	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD
My advisor was knowledgeable about formal degree requirements	57.27	50.61	35.29	37.17	5.87	8.99	1.57	3.24	25,669	1,391
My advisor served as my advocate when necessary	59.84	55.64	33.38	32.27	4.91	8.10	1.86	3.98	25,456	1,382
My advisor gave me constructive feedback on my work	61.75	56.97	30.66	32.78	5.62	6.79	1.97	3.47	25,567	1,385
My advisor returned my work promptly	53.54	50.18	32.94	33.65	9.48	10.59	4.04	5.58	25,467	1,379
My advisor promoted my professional development	53.70	47.14	33.63	33.38	9.55	13.90	3.12	5.58	25,428	1,381
My advisor overall, performed the role well	58.90	53.81	30.68	30.31	7.60	11.68	2.81	4.21	25,482	1,379
My advisor was available for regular meetings	59.47	53.70	30.01	32.17	7.95	10.22	2.57	3.91	25,519	1,380

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		# of Respondents	
	No Disability	With a Disability	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD
My advisor was very helpful to me in preparing for written qualifying exams	41.61	39.21	41.46	39.45	12.83	16.30	4.10	5.04	23,951	1,270
My advisor was very helpful to me in preparing for the oral qualifying exam	42.26	39.32	41.40	38.52	12.37	16.84	3.97	5.32	23,645	1,241
My advisor was very helpful to me in selecting a dissertation topic	51.63	47.05	35.57	34.48	9.68	14.66	3.13	3.81	25,032	1,337
My advisor was very helpful to me in writing a dissertation prospectus or proposal	48.62	45.92	37.63	35.77	10.60	13.69	3.15	4.62	24,443	1,300
My advisor was very helpful to me in writing the dissertation	46.18	43.47	39.64	37.86	10.78	13.83	3.41	4.94	23,081	1,215
My advisor was very helpful to me in selecting the dissertation committee	52.22	47.44	37.59	38.47	7.64	11.17	2.55	2.91	23,605	1,271
My advisor encouraged discussions about current job market and various career prospects	35.08	29.64	34.64	32.02	21.09	25.40	9.19	12.93	23,999	1,299

Note. With the exception of the ‘# of Respondents’ column, values represent percentage of respondents.

Students with Disabilities responses to: *For each of the following statements, indicate the extent that it describes the behaviour of your advisor.* These are arranged from most to least agreed upon statements.

Table 16

Participants responses: On average, how often per month do you meet or communicate with your dissertation advisor about:

	Four or more times (at least once a week)				One to three times (at least once a month)				Less than once a month			
	No Disability		With a Disability		No Disability		With a Disability		No Disability		With a Disability	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Your ongoing research and results	9,269	36.47	349	25.59	11,208	44.10	641	46.99	4,938	19.43	374	27.42
Your writing of the dissertation draft	4,859	20.45	215	16.68	10,388	43.73	547	42.44	8,509	35.82	527	40.88

Table 17

Participants' responses: Do you have an advisory committee?

	Students without Disabilities		Students with Disabilities	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Yes	13,865	32.30	797	34.25
No	11,857	27.62	594	25.53
Not Answered/Not Available	17,202	40.08	936	40.22

Table 18

Participants' responses: Do you have an advisory committee?

	Students without Disabilities		Students with Disabilities	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Yes	13,865	53.90	797	57.30
No	11,857	46.10	594	42.70

The following table represents responses of only those whom responded with a ‘yes’ to having a thesis advisory committee.

Table 19

Participants responses: Please specify with statement(s) best describe your situation (check all that apply).

	Students without Disabilities		Students with Disabilities	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
My advisory committee expects to receive from me a written progress report, at least once a year	6,572	47.40	394	49.44
I am expected to meet at least annually with my advisory committee	8,327	60.06	443	55.58
I have already interacted at least once with my advisory committee	10,240	73.86	590	74.03

If participants responded, ‘I have already interacted at least once with my advisory committee’ they were asked the following question.

Table 20

Participants responses: How have you interacted with your advisory committee?

	Students without Disabilities		Students with Disabilities	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
In a formal meeting	8,856	87.10	483	82.14
Through email or telephone contact (no formal meeting)	1,312	12.90	105	17.86

If participants responded, ‘I have already interacted at least once with my advisory committee’ they were asked the following question.

Table 21

Participants’ responses: Up to now, I have found my advisory committee's feedback constructive and useful.

	Students without Disabilities		Students with Disabilities	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Strongly agree	4,401	43.62	255	43.66
Agree	4,877	48.34	265	45.38
Disagree	621	6.16	50	8.56
Strongly disagree	190	1.88	14	2.40

SECTION 10- FINANCIAL SUPPORT

Table 22

Participants' responses: Please check all of the following forms of support you received while you have been enrolled in your program. Please check if you received support from this source:

	Students without Disabilities (N = 42,924)		Students with Disabilities (N = 2,327)	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Federal Granting Council Scholarship/Fellowship	6,297	14.67	405	17.40
Provincial Government Scholarship/ Fellowship	7,273	16.94	413	17.75
Support from a Foreign Government	1,197	2.79	30	1.29
External (to university) non-government fellowship	3,213	7.49	178	7.65
Provincial bursary (non-refundable)	4,044	9.42	338	14.53
University-funded bursary	9,044	21.07	689	29.61
University-funded fellowships	9,136	21.28	472	20.28
Full tuition scholarships or waivers	4,106	9.57	289	12.42
Partial tuition scholarships or waivers	4,978	11.60	310	13.32
Graduate research assistantship	12,050	28.07	700	30.08
Graduate teaching assistantship	15,772	36.74	978	42.03
Other part-time research employment	2,565	5.98	203	8.72
Other part-time teaching employment	2,496	5.81	138	5.93
Residence Donship	128	0.30	10	0.43
Other campus employment	2,619	6.10	193	8.29
Off campus employment	9,496	22.12	576	24.75
Employee benefit or employer funding	2,973	6.93	181	7.78
Loans, savings, or family assistance	16,579	38.62	1,180	55.01

Sources of Financial Support Used by Students with Disabilities

Leading sources of financial support for students with and without disabilities are similar, with one exception.

Table 23

*Participants responses: Please estimate the amount of **undergraduate** educational debt, if any, you will have to repay when you have completed your graduate degree here.*

	Students without Disabilities		Students with Disabilities	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
\$0	27,344	65.85	1,242	54.02
\$1-\$9,999	3,433	8.27	183	7.96
\$10,000-19,999	3,677	8.86	212	9.22
\$20,000-29,999	2,859	6.89	204	8.87
\$30,000-\$39,999	1,777	4.28	176	7.66
\$40,000-\$49,999	1,087	2.62	120	5.22
\$50,000-\$59,999	626	1.51	79	3.44
\$60,000-\$69,999	275	0.66	31	1.35
\$70,000-\$79,999	146	0.35	15	0.65
\$80,000 or more	299	0.72	37	1.61

Table 24

*Participants responses: Please estimate the amount of **graduate** educational debt, if any, you will have to repay when you have completed your graduate degree here.*

	Students without Disabilities		Students with Disabilities	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
\$0	20,475	49.18	825	36.28
\$1-\$9,999	7,244	17.40	440	19.35
\$10,000-19,999	5,734	13.77	384	16.89
\$20,000-29,999	3,560	8.55	245	10.77
\$30,000-\$39,999	1,767	4.24	144	6.33
\$40,000-\$49,999	1,072	2.58	93	4.09
\$50,000-\$59,999	637	1.53	54	2.37
\$60,000-\$69,999	385	0.92	26	1.14
\$70,000-\$79,999	215	0.52	17	0.75
\$80,000 or more	540	1.30	46	2.02

SECTION 11- UNIVERSITY RESOURCES AND STUDENT LIFE

Table 25

Participants' Responses: Please rate the following university resources based on the quality you have experienced while using them. Please answer regarding your most recent year's experience in the graduate school at this university.

	Excellent		Very Good		Good		Fair		Poor		Did not Participate		Not Applicable	
	No Disability ^a	With a Disability ^b	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD
Library facilities	32.59	30.29	34.30	31.20	19.54	22.47	4.57	6.70	1.59	3.33	5.51	4.67	1.88	1.34
Graduate student work/study space	16.63	13.61	19.57	13.83	18.82	18.27	11.40	14.13	10.53	18.27	15.03	12.55	8.01	9.34
Research laboratories	12.37	7.48	15.64	9.60	14.29	12.47	6.46	5.87	2.88	4.35	22.93	22.25	25.43	37.98
Health care services	10.93	11.34	16.36	16.33	17.91	18.40	7.70	10.24	3.40	5.91	31.52	26.13	12.17	11.65
Child care services	2.43	1.06	2.72	1.15	3.04	1.64	1.74	1.28	1.78	2.97	48.55	42.63	39.74	49.27
Financial aid office	6.15	4.88	10.32	9.71	14.66	15.24	9.02	11.63	5.07	9.58	37.98	33.28	16.80	15.68
Career services	5.66	2.79	8.79	6.33	12.29	11.70	7.68	8.51	4.86	8.08	46.25	45.96	14.46	16.63
Student counselling & resource center	6.41	8.44	8.87	10.31	10.60	11.15	5.54	8.92	3.30	8.61	50.33	39.60	14.95	12.98
Athletic facilities	15.03	9.52	20.78	15.59	17.26	15.54	6.33	6.95	3.26	5.36	28.01	34.85	9.34	12.18
Services to international students attending this university	6.30	2.52	8.15	2.96	8.31	2.96	4.31	2.70	2.63	2.09	34.05	33.72	36.25	52.05

	Excellent		Very Good		Good		Fair		Poor		Did not Participate		Not Applicable	
	No Disability ^a	With a Disability ^b	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD
Services to students attending this university studying abroad (or preparing to)	3.42	1.57	4.14	2.05	4.76	2.57	2.49	2.26	1.44	1.96	42.95	39.34	40.79	50.26
Housing assistance	3.15	1.94	4.29	2.65	5.89	3.27	4.35	2.96	4.66	5.69	47.06	44.04	30.61	39.45
Ombudsperson's office	2.36	1.88	2.91	2.09	3.77	2.01	2.01	1.96	1.19	2.79	55.96	53.55	31.80	35.72
Public/Campus transportation service	13.30	9.62	18.47	14.98	19.00	18.84	9.51	12.06	5.32	8.02	21.95	21.41	12.45	15.07
Food services	6.65	4.69	14.60	12.07	27.08	25.15	19.24	22.94	11.43	15.78	13.05	12.29	7.95	7.07
University bookstore	11.02	8.22	22.74	19.58	31.78	30.98	13.67	18.34	3.78	7.34	11.54	10.08	5.47	5.48
Student government office	5.53	3.89	10.21	7.47	14.10	12.36	6.12	7.90	2.91	4.93	43.26	44.98	17.87	18.47
Registrarial processes	11.84	8.47	23.58	19.95	31.17	30.60	13.25	18.29	4.97	8.86	9.76	8.42	5.43	5.41
Information technology services	12.08	10.28	23.43	20.04	27.55	26.32	10.34	14.77	3.70	6.93	16.11	15.12	6.80	6.54
Disability/Access services office	3.51	15.09	3.80	13.40	3.71	12.44	1.26	8.39	0.52	7.61	45.31	25.84	41.90	17.22

Note. Values represent percentage of respondents.

N^a = 41,538 – 42,692. N^b = 2,256 – 2,314.

Table 26

Participants responses: In some universities, resources are offered in multiple locations. To distinguish between resources or services that are offered by a "local office", for example based in a school, department or faculty, as opposed to a "central office" location offering their services campus-wide, please indicate if your rating applies to services received from a "local office" or from a "central office", or applies to both. Please answer regarding your most recent year's experience in the graduate school at this university. (Data collected only if item was ranked in previous question).

	Local office				Central Office				Both			
	No Disability		With a Disability		No Disability		With a Disability		No Disability		With a Disability	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Library facilities	9,373	24.78	398	19.07	17,288	45.71	1,025	49.11	11,158	29.50	664	31.82
Graduate student work/study space	21,374	69.10	1,172	68.82	4,633	14.98	262	15.38	4,993	15.92	269	15.80
Research laboratories	15,097	72.72	617	71.25	2,633	12.68	130	15.01	3,030	14.60	119	13.74
Health care services	4,060	18.19	184	13.63	35.57	68.40	1,015	75.19	2,992	13.41	151	11.19
Child care services	1,287	30.11	36	22.22	2,086	48.80	99	61.11	902	21.10	27	16.67
Financial aid office	4,068	22.74	199	18.11	10,848	60.63	746	67.88	2,977	16.64	154	14.01
Career services	4,689	30.45	207	25.52	7,732	50.21	460	56.72	2,979	19.34	144	17.76
Student counselling & resource center	3,717	27.52	191	18.76	7,282	53.91	693	68.07	2,509	18.57	134	13.16
Athletic facilities	4,292	17.23	178	15.44	17,232	69.17	832	72.16	3,388	13.60	143	12.40
Services to international students attending this university	2,780	23.96	59	20.21	6,387	55.04	175	59.93	2,438	21.01	58	19.86

	Local office				Central Office				Both			
	No Disability		With a Disability		No Disability		With a Disability		No Disability		With a Disability	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Services to students attending this university studying abroad (or preparing to)	1,759	28.41	53	24.20	2,995	48.38	123	56.16	1,437	23.21	43	19.63
Housing assistance	1,994	23.46	55	16.03	5,037	59.27	238	69.39	1,467	17.26	50	14.58
Ombudsperson's office	1,321	28.82	43	18.61	2,371	51.72	160	69.26	892	19.46	28	12.12
Public/Campus transportation service	3,917	15.20	177	12.91	16,219	62.93	936	68.27	5,639	21.88	258	18.82
Food services	7,749	24.56	362	20.46	15,086	47.81	943	53.31	8,721	27.64	464	26.23
University bookstore	6,648	20.02	317	17.15	21,537	64.85	1,294	70.02	5,025	15.13	237	12.82
Student government office	5,410	35.23	227	28.55	6,198	40.36	395	49.69	3,749	24.41	173	21.76
Registrarial processes	8,506	25.16	412	22.03	17,267	51.08	993	53.10	8,034	23.76	465	24.87
Information technology services	8,529	27.83	405	23.78	13,687	44.66	838	49.21	8,431	27.51	460	27.01
Disability/Access services office	1,331	27.64	201	16.16	2,050	42.58	859	69.05	1,434	29.78	184	14.79

		Local Office	Central Office	Both
Library facilities	No Disability	25%	46%	30%
	With Disability	19%	49%	32%
Graduate student work/study space	ND	69%	15%	16%
	WD	69%	15%	16%
Research laboratories	ND	73%	13%	15%
	WD	71%	15%	14%
Health care services	ND	18%	68%	13%
	WD	14%	75%	11%
Child care services	ND	30%	49%	21%
	WD	22%	61%	17%
Financial aid office	ND	23%	61%	17%
	WD	18%	68%	14%
Career services	ND	30%	50%	19%
	WD	26%	57%	18%
Student counselling & resource center	ND	28%	54%	19%
	WD	19%	68%	13%
Athletic facilities	ND	17%	69%	14%
	WD	15%	72%	12%
Services to international students attending this	ND	24%	55%	21%
	WD	20%	60%	20%
Services to students attending university studying abroad	ND	28%	48%	23%
	WD	24%	56%	20%
Housing assistance	ND	23%	59%	17%
	WD	16%	69%	15%
Ombudsperson's office	ND	29%	52%	19%
	WD	19%	69%	12%
Public/Campus transportation service	ND	15%	63%	22%
	WD	13%	68%	19%
Food services	ND	25%	48%	28%
	WD	20%	53%	26%
University bookstore	ND	20%	65%	15%
	WD	17%	70%	13%
Student government office	ND	35%	40%	24%
	WD	29%	50%	22%
Registrarial processes	ND	25%	51%	24%
	WD	22%	53%	25%
Information technology services	ND	28%	45%	28%
	WD	24%	49%	27%
Disability/Access services office	ND	28%	43%	30%
	WD	16%	69%	15%

SECTION 12- SOCIAL LIFE

Table 27

Participants responses: How often do the following social activities occur on campus?

	Frequently				Occasionally				Never			
	No Disability		WD		ND		WD		ND		WD	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Organized university-wide social activities	5,583	13.49	349	15.45	21,656	52.35	1,153	51.04	14,132	34.16	757	33.51
Organized social activities within your department	4,369	10.53	242	10.69	25,861	62.36	1,473	65.06	11,243	27.11	549	24.25
Organized social activities within your advisor/research group	15,114	36.98	1,015	45.39	20,027	49.00	953	42.62	5,732	14.02	268	11.99
Organized social activities within your residence	24,236	64.77	1,514	74.11	9,827	26.26	393	19.24	3,353	8.96	136	6.66

Table 28

Participants responses: How often do you attend these social events?

	Frequently				Occasionally				Never			
	No Disability		With a Disability		No Disability		With a Disability		No Disability		With a Disability	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Organized university-wide social activities	17,771	52.29	1,114	60.54	14,736	43.36	659	35.82	1,479	4.35	67	3.64
Organized social activities within your department	7,298	20.96	358	18.74	20,065	57.63	1,144	59.90	7,454	21.41	408	21.36
Organized social activities within your advisor/research group	3,770	15.86	189	16.61	10,227	43.02	506	44.46	9,773	41.11	443	38.93
Organized social activities within your residence	5,184	43.52	266	53.63	4,711	39.55	160	32.26	2,017	16.93	70	14.11

Table 29

Participants responses: In the current academic year, have you been physically present on campus (or affiliated institute) on a regular basis, or have you been away most of the time (out of town, out of the country, field work, distance program, working at a separate location, etc.)?

	Students without Disabilities		Students with Disabilities	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Physically present	33,241	78.73	1,747	76.46
Away most of the time	8,978	21.27	538	23.54

SECTION 13- GENERAL ASSESSMENT

Table 30

Participants' responses: Overall, how would you rate the quality of:

	Excellent		Very good		Good		Fair		Poor	
	No Disability ^a	With a Disability ^b	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD
Your academic experience at this university?	27.97	22.91	40.19	36.24	22.12	24.38	7.16	11.13	2.55	5.33
Your student life experience at this university?	17.23	12.44	31.25	24.88	31.20	31.10	14.62	19.65	5.70	11.92
Your graduate/ professional program at this university?	25.44	20.55	36.53	32.36	24.07	24.82	9.98	13.79	3.97	8.49
Your overall experience at this university?	22.78	16.71	39.00	32.47	26.20	29.24	9.32	14.81	2.70	6.76

Note. Values represent percentages of respondents.

N^a = 42,353 – 42,809. N^b = 2,315 – 2,326.

Table 31

Participants responses: Rate the extent to which the following factors are an obstacle to your academic progress.

	Not an obstacle				A minor obstacle				A major obstacle			
	No Disability		With a Disability		No Disability		With a Disability		No Disability		With a Disability	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Work/financial commitments	11,453	26.92	474	20.48	17,601	41.38	849	36.69	13,484	31.70	991	42.83
Family obligations	21,914	51.61	961	41.58	14,725	34.68	888	38.42	5,825	13.72	462	19.99
Availability of faculty	27,509	64.82	1,214	52.49	11,774	27.74	820	35.45	3,159	7.44	279	12.06
Program structure or requirements	22,306	52.50	974	42.13	15,442	36.35	904	39.10	4,737	11.15	434	18.77
Course scheduling	25,347	59.83	1,166	50.70	13,433	31.71	808	35.13	3,585	8.46	326	14.17
Immigration laws or regulations	35,029	83.49	2,117	92.77	4,503	10.73	99	4.34	2,423	5.78	66	2.89
Other (specified)	15,201	77.53	727	54.87	1,562	7.97	133	10.04	2,843	14.50	465	35.09

Table 32

Participants' responses: As it relates to your current program, how important is it to have the opportunity to ...

	Very important		Somewhat important		Not important		Not applicable	
	No Disability ^a	With a Disability ^b	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD
Study abroad	25.91	18.92	26.78	27.26	34.50	41.12	12.80	12.70
Collaborate on research internationally	38.45	31.36	30.57	36.90	20.99	22.04	10.10	9.70
Network with not for profit organizations	30.69	34.49	32.97	33.01	25.17	23.63	11.17	8.86
Work/collaborate with businesses	39.63	29.36	27.92	31.97	22.63	29.53	9.82	9.15
Network with local/ provincial/ federal government	42.98	43.67	32.89	33.35	15.81	15.83	8.33	7.16

Note. Values represent percentages of respondents.

N^a = 42,315 – 42,524. N^b = 2,296 – 2,315.

Table 33

Participants' responses: As it relates to your current program, have opportunities been available to...

	Yes, to a great extent		Yes, to some extent		No opportunity		Not applicable	
	No Disability ^a	With a Disability ^b	ND	WD	ND	WD	ND	WD
Study abroad	11.20	7.58	32.79	33.22	38.51	41.63	17.51	17.57
Collaborate on research internationally	11.11	7.16	32.05	30.96	42.15	47.83	14.70	14.05
Network with not for profit organizations	8.37	8.48	30.93	33.44	44.38	44.07	16.32	14.02
Work/collaborate with businesses	10.08	6.10	30.32	27.26	44.30	50.53	15.29	16.11
Work/collaborate with local/ provincial/ federal government	9.12	7.48	30.66	28.41	46.21	50.66	14.01	13.46

Note. Values represent percentages of respondents.

N^a = 41,702 – 41,903. N^b = 2,274 – 2,282.