powerful." (p. 242) However, Sewell's response of organizing a vocal reaction to restraint has apparently succumbed to the realities of the electoral process. Other than Sewell's short piece and Gerald Regan's account of the problems of restraint in a have-not province, there is little rebuttal to the case for restraint.

The conference and book would have benefitted from the inclusion of some analysis such as Daniel Chall's recent study of the cost of budget cutbacks in the New York City subway system, published in the spring 1981 *Quarterly Review of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.* Chall attempted to measure the total cost of the deterioration of subway service, resulting from a prolonged period of curtailed maintenance. He estimates, for example, that the total annual time lost by workers because of slower service and delays is equivalent to roughly 166 million dollars of output or one-third of the annual corporate tax bill of New York City employers. Other costs, some even higher, also result from this form of government fiscal restraint.

In summary, *The Politics and Management of Restraint in Government* is worthy of examination, particularly for Aucoin's skilful summary. The book fails to present a complete picture of the broad issue of government fiscal restraint. There is little discussion of the costs of restraint. And that may well be the most important message of all.

Brian D. Christie
Saskatchewan Universities Commission

The Shrinking Maze. Report of the University of Calgary Program Review Committee. The University of Calgary, October 1980. pp. iii + 297.

University planning studies frequently make for boring reading, especially to the outsider. Rhetoric is abundant, hard facts in short supply. Difficult issues respecting priorities tend to be glossed over under safe and woolly generalities about the university's "mission". If there is self-criticism, it usually is of a rather limited and perfunctory kind.

The Shrinking Maze, however, is an exception to these strictures, and presents a model which other universities might well emulate. The report, developed by a group of eight academics from diverse disciplines within the framework of a committee chaired by the University's President himself, is broad in scope but thorough at many points of detail. There is a good balance between the analytic and the synthetic: the discussion is buttressed throughout by relevant empirical data contributed by the University's office of institutional reseach, yet there is a genuine attempt, particularly in the opening and closing chapters, to achieve a philosophical perspective on the university enterprise in general and the situation of the University of Calgary in particular. To be sure, some of the report's observations and recommendations do not completely escape the charge of being on the bland side; but many, though couched in reasonably diplomatic language, are of a refreshing candour and cannot have been particularly welcomed by those internal constituencies to whom they are directed. The inquiry sustains

a reputation which the University of Calgary appears to have been developing for public self-examination, even though sometimes such "open evaluation" must be attended, as is inevitable, with considerable localized pain and distress. The organization of the report is excellent and the presentation clear and readily comprehensible.

By standards prevailing elsewhere, Alberta's resources are so vast, and special grants to the university system so munificent, that one may perhaps be forgiven for some initial scepticism as to whether a university such as Calgary could possibly have any problems worth worrying about. Nevertheless, the report indicates that affluence appears to present its own problems: if opportunities are large, capitalizing upon them, in a generally overheated environment, presents difficulties of an equivalent order of magnitude. For one thing, even affluence seems not to make projections of growth very reliable: earlier forecasts of levels of enrolment made by the Alberta Department of Advanced Education and Manpower have been off target by surprisingly large margins. As the report indicates, participation rates in Alberta have fallen by about a third from the peak reached in 1970, a decline far greater than that in the national average itself. Such disparities between planning assumptions and subsequent actualities have caused dislocations in the University's development and in the congruence of physical and other resources with present needs.

At any rate, and notwithstanding Alberta's affluence, the authors of the report find an underlying identity of their planning problems with those of other Canadian universities. They have selected the maze as "an appropriate symbol for all Canadian universities in these times." As they put it,

> "A maze is something that can be negotiated; it is not a series of dead ends. On the other hand, finding a way through a maze requires patience and ingenuity. The route for this University may not be easy, and sometimes the walls will appear to be closing in, making progress ever more difficult. Also, additional mazes may well unfold as time passes. But universities dare not be deterred from their struggle to find the exit if they are to reach the opportunities and achievements that lie beyond" (p.iii).

Chapter I of the study sets forth the salient features of the context in which the University of Calgary is operating, under the rubrics of "objectives, realities, resources, and opportunities." In the second chapter, the committee delineates the various management structures and procedures which have evolved since the University's emergence as an independent institution in 1966. The core of the report, however, and perhaps the focus of greatest interest for most readers, is to be found in Chapter III, in which each of the major academic units is described and assessed. Commendation is given when it is considered to be warranted, but in certain instances the authors do not hesitate to paint in the warts as well. Some of the problems noted are hardly unique to Calgary; others do relate to that institution specifically, and to the sorts of difficulties which would beset any university forced to grow so rapidly in such a short time.

Chapter IV discusses "people and resources." Not surprisingly, we learn that Calgary does not escape from certain endemic problems. Students are bewildered by the nature of the counselling services; the Calendar is too complicated; there is no adequate central control over timetabling; recreational space for students is insufficient; some baccalaureate programs "may be unnecessarily restricted with respect to those courses from other Faculties which may be taken for credit" (p. 212); and so forth. With respect to measures to improve the quality of teaching, the report is somewhat disappointing. There is the typical piety about the importance of excellent teaching, and the usual call "to demonstrate that teaching performance is a very important factor bearing on advancement through the ranks" (p. 226). It is conceded, however, that "in the minds of many faculty members prestige is inversely related to the amount of undergraduate teaching one does" (p. 277). One gets the impression that here, as elsewhere, it is the research enterprise that receives the lion's share in the university's reward system. The problem is acknowledged, but no far-reaching reforms seem to be contemplated. One gathers also (p. 75) that the academic advising function, especially for first year students, falls considerably short of what is desirable. Other sections of this chapter survey research activties and needs, the academic support units, and the state of the university's physical resources.

In the final chapter, the Committee speaks to the need for a greater degree of "initiative" rather than purely "reactive" planning. The pressures operating on the contemporary university are steadily increasing, and if universities cannot take the initiative the end result is likely to be severe distortion of academic priorities. The writers see as a special challenge to the university in the education of its students the improvement of the decision-making capabilities of ordinary citizens, as well as of those who will come to positions of influence in government, education or industry. Two developments are necessary. In the first place, there must be increasing commitment to the notion of education as a lifelong process. Secondly, universities must break the domination of the traditional academic departmental structure on the undergraduate curriculum. Innovation must be encouraged and adequate resources provided to create appropriate interdisciplinary and general education programs. The report calls for the establishment of a new degree-granting faculty with a core staff of its own to implement such curricular innovation, which simply will not happen apart from such organizational reforms. Developments since the publication of this report indicate that this recommendation has already borne some fruit with the creation at Calgary of a new Faculty of General Studies.

Does the figure of "the shrinking maze," intriguing though it is, adequately convey the nature of the predicament in which universities find themselves today? Perhaps (as the authors realize) in some respects the maze is steadily expanding – in which case we may never exit at all. Moreover, in the academic world, as elsewhere, we have to contend with the influence of unpredictable and uncontrollable forces, emanating not from just one centre of influence but from several, and generally in quite uncoordinated fashion. In the current controversy

over federal and provincial roles in education, for example, will the universities really suffer from "benign neglect," as the authors conjecture? What if (as now seems possible) the contrary happens, namely, that they suddenly become subject to the exercise of new and formidable powers by one or both levels of government? To the extent that such developments occur, the very configuration of the maze will be altered.

Some readers may feel that the report minimizes the magnitude of the obstacles lying in the path of effective planning, and that it does not speak to the condition in which their institutions find themselves. Even so, the report will repay reading, and some of its recommendations or underlying positions are worthy of emulation. More "initiative planning" surely is desirable, regardless of the situation in which a given university may find itself, and indeed especially so the graver that situation is. So is the readiness of a university to undergo searching self-examination, and the willingness to undertake appropriate curricular and organizational ventures in response to newly perceived educational challenges. Exit from the maze may eventually require even sterner measures than these, but anything less will hardly serve.

W.M. Sibley

Saskatchewan Universities Commission

Erwin Rausch (ed.), *Management in Institutions of Higher Learning,* Lexington Books, D.C. Heath and Co., Lexington, Mass., 1980.

This book should be included in the recommended readings list for incumbent and aspiring administrative Officers of institutions of higher learning. But, since there is some doubt that many incumbent administrative officers can be influenced in their amateur administrative practices, the best alternative would be to make the book required reading for all aspiring administrators, from department heads to presidents.

The fundamental problem confronting institutions of higher learning emanates from their failure to make the decisions and take the actions that are dictated by changes in social, demographic, political and economic conditions. They attempt to operate as if conditions have not changed over the past decade, and quite naturally find the process frustrating. Administrators continue to hope that government grants will bail them out of having to make unpopular administrative decisions, and faculty continue to behave as if demand for their services is as strong today as it was at the peak of institutional expansion.

If the on-set of conditions negative to the operations of institutions of higher learning had been temporary, the failure to make appropriate retrenchment decisions could have been justified on grounds of both administrative efficiency and programme quality. But, it is well known to all that the negative conditions are not temporary: enrolment of students is not likely to increase significantly; the increase in prices is not likely to abate over the foreseeable future; and the