Le Cegep 5 ans après: succès ou échec. Montréal: Le Cegep de Saint-Laurent et les grandes éditions du Québec inc., 1973. 94 pp.

Le Cegep 5 ans après: succès ou échec est un recueil de discours prononcés au Cegep de Saint-Laurent lors d'un colloque sur le même sujet. Pour ceux qui n'ont pas suivi de près les grands débats entourant la mise sur pied des Cegeps, et pour ceux qui veulent s'en rappeller, ces textes seront intéressants. Il y en a d'administrateurs, de professeurs, d'étudiants, de parents, d'hommes d'affaires . . . chacun avec son propre point de vue concernant les questions à soulever et les réponses à proposer. On discute du curriculum du Cegep – et en soi-même et par rapport au monde du travail – ainsi que du rôle des différents intéressés à l'intérieur de l'institution (étudiants, professeurs, administrateurs . . .). On y aborde aussi la question de la démocratisation de l'éducation: le pourcentage de la population aux études post-secondaires a sûrement augmenté, mais c'est surtout la classe moyenne qui bénéficie de cet enseignement gratuit.

Est-ce qu'en fait le Cegep a été un succès ou un échec? La réponse est nuancée quelque soit l'aspect qu'on considère. Accomplir tellement vite une réforme scolaire de cette envergure est sûrement un indice de succès, mais en ce qui concerne les détails de la démocratisation, des rapports avec le monde de travail etc, l'évaluation est plus difficile. Cette brochure elle-même n'est pas une grande oeuvre de recherche ou d'analyse, mais elle ne prétend pas l'être non plus. Cependant il me semble que la plupart des grandes préoccupations de l'époque y sont soulevées ainsi que l'éventail des évaluations courantes du Cegep.

Ann B. Denis
Université d'Ottawa

Murray G. Ross, *The University: The Anatomy of Academe.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1976. 310 pp.

Next to its survival, perhaps the most remarkable characteristic of the university is the continuity of certain features of its form and structure over the past eight centuries. The clue to the persistence of the university thus lies in its ability to adapt through periods of change – many of them involving severe upheavals and misfortunes – and yet to preserve intact its perennial mission of the accumulation, preservation, development, and transmission of knowledge. To some observers, the profound changes and new social pressures of recent years threaten to penetrate the traditional life of the university and to effect widespread and irreversible transformations in its character. The central issue of the university today is how to adapt the divergent forces of tradition and radical change to a future existence of internal coherence and orderly creative growth.

The University: The Anatomy of Academe, the tenth book by Dr. Murray Ross, President Emeritus of York University, is neither a history nor a sociological analysis of the university and its problems, although it involves aspects of both. It is an attempt to present the general reader with a brief, comprehensive account of the current difficulties and the forces that will shape the university of the future, set against the background of the growth

and development of the university from its earliest times. The book is divided into four parts: the first deals with the evolution of the university from its beginning 800 years ago; the second examines the changing roles of students and professors and the profound changes wrought in the upheavals of the 1960s; the third considers four central issues: goals, governance, academic freedom, the university and the state; the fourth describes the salient features of the university of the present day and concludes with an attempt to identify the conditions that will influence its future development. Throughout, the emphasis is on institutions in Canada, England, and the United States.

The historical and sociological overview of the evolution of the university covers its unstructured and spontaneous development in early medieval times, the period of stagnation and retreat from 1500 to 1850, its revitalization and growth from 1850 to 1950, and the period of enrolment expansion, research development, and student revolution from 1950 to 1975. The generalized descriptions of the characteristic method of scholasticism of the late medieval period (p. 25) and the "rational-empirical" outlook of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries (p. 34), which Dr. Ross identifies as central determinants in the fortunes of the university in its respective periods of decay and expansion, will exasperate meticulous historians who abhor the application of over-simplified labels to complex congeries of intellectual events. For example, such generalizations as "the most significant [of the major changes in the hundred years before 1950] was the shift from scholasticism to science" (p. 254), and "the scholar, whether in philosophy, psychology, or physics, became committed to the same values [of science]" (p. 255), convey a very imperfect picture of the refinements of intellectual history.

The description of the role of students in the university, past and present, is spiced with many anecdotes of student rebellions, of major and minor proportions, against the imposition of authority and discipline. For many years, the paternalistic university viewed the student as its ward and attempted to assume responsibility for all phases of the student's development. However, the concept of *in loco parentis* suffered erosion in the last 100 years and this unrealizable ideal was effectively demolished by the people's revolt of the 1960s. Progressive freedom from internal rules and regulations, accompanied by increased participation in university government, altered the position of the student more in the direction of member-citizenship in the university community, while allowing other roles, such as apprentice, client, or customer, to emerge from time to time.

A comparable shift in role has characterized the university professor. The Mr. Chips image of the university teacher as a kindly but firm master was never an accurate description, although this myth persisted until comparatively recently. In truth, the life of the professor is beset by a variety of conflicting role expectations – teacher, scholar, counsellor, administrator, independent professional, and community advisor. The sentimental picture of the quiet, genteel, civilized life of the college teacher, indifferent to material gain, fades in the harsh light of reality: the present-day university professor is a worldly, well-paid, practical, research-oriented professional, enjoying many comforts and privileges unknown elsewhere in society, whose loyalty is more likely to extend to colleagues in the discipline, whatever their affiliation, than to the university or to departmental associates. This faculty commitment to discipline ahead of institution is the source of academic conflict flowing from the teaching-research dilemma and is the point of the criticism about neglect of students, courses, and teaching competence. Dr. Ross's description of his colleagues in academe,

whom he understands all too well, is perceptive and candid, although he should be the first to admit that the professorial profile is more typical of the "cosmopolitans" in larger research-oriented universities than of the "locals" in smaller teaching-oriented liberal arts colleges.

Among the professor's various roles, one of the most recently acquired is that of unionist. The movement towards faculty collective bargaining has been accompanied by severe internal tensions within the university and may have altered significantly the traditional concept of collegiality. Dr. Ross's discussion of this topic is weakened by a neglect of its background conditions and causes and by reliance on some observers whose estimates of the effects of unionism have proved faulty in the light of recent experience. For example, the statement that "a union tends to shift the locus of decision making outside the university" (p. 110), is incomprehensible in the context of major Canadian and American universities. This judgment applies more to community and junior colleges affiliated with national unions following the industrial-labour model, but such institutions are not the subject of the present book. The expressed fear that faculty unionism might cause deterioration of faculty-student relations, if student unions should become the third party in bargaining relationships (p. 111), is incompletely formulated, since students could form alliances with the faculty against the administration, depending upon the conflict relationships existing at a particular time. At any rate, the fear has proved to be groundless, as student apathy largely has displaced the militant activism of an earlier generation. Finally, the positive effects of collective bargaining – closer faculty-administration relations, the development of new lines of communication, enlarged faculty roles and responsibilities, and greater sensitivity and effiency among administrators – remain unidentified.

The succinct description of the upheavals of the 1960s provides the background of the revolt, its cultural and political aspects, and the elements of the new ideologies that struck at some of the fundamental principles of the university. Although relatively brief in time, the people's revolt challenged roles in the hierarchy, altered the power structure of the university through student gains in participation in governance, and brought about a variety of other results in areas of admissions, curriculum, and academic procedures. To some of these – the movement towards the "cafeteria" curriculum, for example – counter-reactions even now are setting in. The fundamental questions of the purpose of higher education, the governance of universities, and the extent of academic freedom considered elsewhere in this book, are themselves legacies of the heightened self-examination inspired by this unsettled period in the history of the university.

The effective administration of any human enterprise requires a clear statement of goals and purposes, but is this possible in the university which harbours so many conflicting functions within and is beset by incompatible demands from without? Until recently, the notion of the idealized university as a secluded community of intellectuals united in the search for truth and the perpetuation of high culture was dominant. The eclipse of this concept and the ensuing uncertain direction of the university is attributable to a mismatch between the goals of the institution as a whole and those of its individual members, incompatibility between the ends and the means of attaining them, and inconsistency between stated and actual goals. Specifically, in the post-war years students became more interested in job training than in purely intellectual pursuits, professors often preferred research activity to teaching, and the university as a whole was expected by society to adjust to the utilitarian requirement of a growing industrial machine. The radical attacks on the modern multiversity which emerg-

ed as a comprehensive, service-oriented institution emphasizing the training of professionals and the social applications of knowledge, raised many aggravating questions which did not seem capable of resolution within the context of a single philosophy. Mutual adjustments in traditional and radical viewpoints within the university will take time, but the process may be hastened by the influence of government and other external agencies.

In Dr. Ross's opinion, the problem of governance is one of the most serious the university faces in the 1970s (others might name financing in top place!) and it, too, can best be understood in terms of the conflict between traditional forms and new demands. The early medieval concept of self-government, with its conditions of loyalty and participation, was gradually eroded by the growth of faculty professionalism, increased mobility, and greater involvement of the university in the community. The egalitarian thrust of the revolution of the 1960s did not result in complete democratization in the political sense, but the university undoubtedly has been revitalized through increased participation on the part of students, professors, employees, and laymen in new governing structures.

The present state of academic freedom for the individual faculty member is the product of a history of assaults by trustees, administrators, politicans, and others outside the universities on the ideal of scholarship as the unrestrained and uninhibited practice of teaching and pursuit of research. The degree of freedom has varied, depending on the country in question. In England, academic freedom is not an issue at the present time, due to a congenial political climate. Canada, although less liberal and elitist than England, has not experienced the repressions felt in the United States, where the climate was much less hospitable to unorthodox thought. The issues involved in North American controversies have been clouded by neglected ambiguities in concepts of professorial responsibility and by overt breaches of accepted principles by radical academics and their critics alike. Questions about the social legitimacy of certain lines of research inquiry further complicated the situation. Clearly, the mid-1970s is a time for reassessment of customary doctrine and practice.

Pressures for increased state direction and control have substantially reduced the independence and autonomy of universities, due to the democratization of opportunity, the dependency of the university on the state for financial support, and demands for public accountability. Lines of defense have included the formation of buffer committees and statements about the appropriate divisions of authority and responsibility between the state and the university. Although the state seems determined to use the university system as a means for achieving national goals, the controls introduced have not produced the predicted disastrous effects. On the contrary, some wasteful duplication has been eliminated, scarce resources have been shared, and academic programs have been made more responsive to public needs. The demand for academic autonomy, therefore, may have been a myth perpetuated by self-seeking professional academics.

Dr. Ross is at his best in dealing with the peaks and valleys in the fortunes of the university, and he sketches them with broad and masterful strokes. This macrocosmic approach is appropriate in a book of modest length directed at a general readership. In approaching the university of the future, Dr. Ross correctly identifies the general areas of concern as internal (the uncertain role of the university in society and the search for more effective governing structures) and external (the attitude of society to university education in general), and his concluding treatment of them remains equally abstract, but occasionally obscure. For example, the difficulties in achieving a stable governing structure in which

students, professors, and administrators are represented, Dr. Ross attributes to "the absence of a central authority ('the hole in the center')" (p. 276). However, the ambiguity of this proposal leaves it open to question whether the author is lamenting the decline of presidential leadership or simply is advocating the need to foster a generalized loyalty to a loosely formulated ideal which will prevent ideological differences affecting all areas of university life. However, in the final analysis, much of the fragmentation of loyalty among faculty members in any particular university originates on the inter-departmental level, and may constitute a more subtle, pervasive, and long-lasting influence than the ideological differences stressed by the author. Attempts to reform governing structures of the university cannot be separated from the basic realities of present arrangements which seem well-adapted to the interests they serve. Therefore, in the absence of any convincing arguments against the arrangements which preserve the diversity of academic life, there is no reason to admit the superiority of recommendations for increased unity and central authority in academic affairs.

While Dr. Ross's theory that "the greater the internal coherence and strength of the university, the greater its independence and autonomy" (p. 279) is persuasive in its generality, suggestions as to the means for obtaining the desired coherence and strength are not to be found in this book. However, this cannot be counted as a fatal flaw, for two reasons. First, the proposal of specific solutions is not among the objectives of the book stated in the preface, and second, it is too much to expect a single mind to resolve the complex and perplexing problems that plague the modern university. What Dr. Ross does advocate is a shift in attitude, involving a restoration of faith in the university as an institution and a sense of trust in one's colleagues. This is not a solution, but a recommendation for a suitable atmosphere in which problems may be approached. The solutions themselves will gradually emerge on an incremental basis from the accumulation of decisions taken by university committees, faculty associations, student organizations, administrative officers, governing bodies, and ministerial departments, within a context of improved channels of communication between the various university constituencies and between the university and the wider society of which it is a part. All segments of the university community and members of the general public concerned about the future of the institution will profit from an encounter with this readable, opportune, and wisely conceived book.

James B. Hartman
Algoma University College

Rapport intérimaire du Conseil des universités sur les objectifs de la recherche universitaire. Québec: Editeur officiel du Québec, 1975. 277 pp.

Ce rapport contient huit recommendations du Conseil des universités au ministre de l'éducation du Québec, portant sur les objectifs de la recherche universitaire, sur l'élaboration d'une politique de la recherche au Québec, sur une politique universitaire de la recherche libre et orientée, et sur l'organisation de l'enseignement et de la recherche. Ce document comprend aussi plusieurs annexes, dont le rapport du Comité sur les objectifs de la recherche universi-