

definition, the realization of which, in itself, has the potential for a genuine renaissance among Canadian universities.

Alan M. Thomas
The Ontario Institute for
Studies in Education

Alfred Morris and John Sizer, editors. *Resources and Higher Education*, Guildford, Surrey: Society for Research into Higher Education, 1982

Education, particularly higher education in Great Britain, has experienced more drastic cuts in resource availability from government sources than any other western country. Much of the data on government cutbacks are included in this book along with a number of ideas regarding alternatives.

The volume, eighth in a series of studies focusing "on the major strategic options — available to higher education institutions — in the 1980s and 1990s." The series has been conducted by the Society for Research into Higher Education and financed by the Leverhulme Trust.

Topics covered include student aid, privatization, public sector resource allocation, internal resource allocation, faculty employment, historical data, and proposals on how to deal with fiscal restraint. Because the papers were originally delivered orally at a conference, there is less emphasis on theoretical issues and greater emphasis on policy. Clearly, the usual mathematical and geometric models are not present but the arguments are made just as vividly.

Maureen Woodhall in her chapter "Financial Support for Students" puts the U.K. student aid program in an international context with considerable reference to Canada. Despite having the highest level of support in terms of the percentage of students receiving aid, there are criticisms particularly of the "means test". Woodhall estimates various enhancements to the present system but notes the lack of reality in such enhancement both because of the cost and the effect on demand for education. Instead, she argues for an introduction of loans to enhance available funds and as a substitute for part of the current grant system. In doing so, she fails to look at the impact of loans on demand.

For those interested in public sector allocation, John Pratt has an excellent summary of public finance allocation techniques, missing zero-base budgeting.

Allocation within academic institution is difficult given the lack of pricing mechanisms. Invariably, some units subsidize others. Geoffrey Sims emphasizes consensual budgeting and adding an emphasis to research, particularly in areas where traditionally research funds are less available. In addition, Sims appears to be impressed with encouraging entrepreneurial activity within the universities, an idea which seems to have become popular in Canada in recent years.

While my own favourite chapter is Maynard's on privatization in which he reminds us that there are some rigidities amongst the suppliers of education that preclude a perfect market mechanism, essential reading is Morris' chapter "Some Radical Proposals". Perhaps the title is a bit off-putting when the summary proposals appear to be fairly conservative and realistic. The chapter serves to conclude the book by reviewing the previous papers and deriving italicized proposals from them. Morris has managed in a short 22 pages to pull together some very diverse papers.

This book is clearly aimed at a diverse but informed audience in Great Britain. The papers individually are of high quality and there is in Morris' paper an attempt to set a thread of unity through the papers. Consequently, Morris' paper could have advantageously been placed at the first of the book as a guide to the reader.

For Canadian readers, despite the institutional details which give those of us who have studied in Britain an advantage, there is much to be applied to our own system. Also, it leaves one yearning for trust funds and independent of government research centres where such studies could be carried out in Canada.

Douglas J. McCready, Ph.D.
Wilfrid Laurier University

Response to the Reviewer Editor – A New Coalition Emerges. Howard Buchbinder and Janice Newson

The editorial in Vol. XV-1, 1985 of this journal, written by David Allnut was entitled "A New Coalition Emerges". The coalition referred to is between universities and business. An organization known as the Corporate-Higher Education Forum is active in promoting this sort of coalition. David Allnut is a co-founder and vice-chairman of the Corporate-Higher Education Forum. Since his comments were presented as an editorial, we assume they represent the position of The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, if not the CSSHE. We have drafted the following comments in order to respond to the editorial and to encourage discussion and debate on corporate-university linkages, their value and their potential effects.

The argument put forward by Allnut and by the Maxwell-Currie report is an argument which supports increased corporate-university collaboration.* This collaboration is required in order to provide a long-term solution to the financial plight of universities. This collaboration must lead to economic productivity through technological innovation and transfer. Corporate-university partnerships are seen to be essential if this agenda for economic productivity and growth is to be realized.

* Maxwell, J. and Currie, S., *Partnership for Growth: Corporate-University Cooperation in Canada*, Corporate-Higher Education Forum, Montreal, 1984.

The Allnut editorial expresses the concern that Canada has experienced a lag in industrial development due to a lag in the development of Canadian computer and robotic technology. To overcome this deficit "means twinning educational and business/industrial forces". Mr. Allnut then turns to the Corporate-Higher Education Forum study to illustrate how Canada's businesses and universities can collaborate to try and resolve this problem. In this proposed collaboration, business would gain the benefits of technology transfer, universities would receive funding for research and "up-to-date equipment and contact with companies that are using technology in the market place". (p. 4) The Forum can provide leadership in seeing that this happens by allowing both universities and corporations to "transcend their narrow self-interests and to address jointly many of the pressing issues of our time". This collaboration between universities and corporations would be in the self-interest of financially squeezed universities. However, a solution to the financial plight of universities will not be forthcoming until and unless the problem of economic productivity is resolved, primarily through technological innovation. Collaboration between corporations and universities is seen to be vital to this agenda for economic growth.

Although the Corporate-Higher Education Forum study proposes corporate-university linkages it identifies certain "cultural barriers" to cooperation between universities and industry. In universities, faculty members exercise discretion over the organization and management of their research, and freedom exists to communicate and publish research findings. Academics have control over the pace of their work as well. However, the industrial environment is different, it is geared towards commercialization and profit, towards meeting production deadlines and to holding proprietary rights over research. Overcoming such "cultural barriers" would seem to involve significant alterations in the way academic life is organized and controlled and/or in altered business patterns. *Partnership for Growth* relegates major responsibility for such changes to the universities, not the corporations. University attitudes towards institutional autonomy and academic freedom are singled out as "problematic". Specifically, it is control over the substance of teaching, research, admission standards and the right to teach and publish without fear of censorship that are deemed to be "problematic" (p. 19). It would seem that the essentials of academic freedom and the institutional autonomy of universities would have to change significantly if these so-called cultural barriers were to be overcome. In addition, the definition of priorities in proposed university-corporate linkages is given explicitly to the corporations. (p. 3)

Certainly, there can be an ideological 'bias' to the way one views these proposals. Some of us have long argued that universities in capitalist society are engaged primarily in the spread of capitalist ideology and the reproduction of capitalist labour. Even though some of us have argued this we have, at the same time, shaped our working lives within the parameters of a liberal vision of the university. The main premise of *Partnership for Growth* is that university research efforts and curriculum development need to be more closely tuned to the needs of the

marketplace. These proposed ties would seem to require changes in both relative university autonomy and the nature of academic work. The high-tech focus would seem to have the potential for nullifying the liberal version of the university and replacing it with a university which functioned as a market oriented business adjunct.

But other concerns should also be raised. For example, the role mapped out for university research and teaching emphasizes the need to increase corporate productivity and technological innovation. It assumes universities will participate in a partnership with the private sector to train the highly skilled workforce needed by new forces of production. However, no mention is made of massive job dislocation, deskilling and long-term unemployment, all predicted to result from high tech developments. What then happens to the role of the university if it is harnessed to serving corporate economic needs rather than conducting research to find answers to prevailing economic ills? Will such a strategy benefit Canadian society or merely enhance corporate profits? It may encourage universities to purchase their fiscal survival at the expense of their contribution to social betterment.

The structure of the Forum would seem to suggest a process confined to the top managerial levels of both constituencies. The Corporate-Higher Education Forum is composed of university presidents and corporate executives. It does not represent the academic community at large. Yet, it will surely alter academic work and institutional autonomy, such as it is. We think that a good deal of debate is needed in the academic community before such initiatives are allowed to be realized. Even now the process may be moving too rapidly for such a debate to be effective.