

Harvey's first chapter provides an exceptionally valuable overview of Montreal's complicated network of Protestant poor relief; the remaining six chapters and epilogue are rife with statistics and anecdotes that can be usefully compared with similar institutions in other nineteenth century urban areas. The author has mined the core archival sources available—institutional records of the POA and LBS—for every bit of insight they can provide, and wrestled the results into a solidly researched, thoughtfully analyzed portrait of these two women-run charities. Although not unproblematic in their views on class, the POA and LBS offered refuge and education at a time when the effects of urban poverty were particularly harsh.

**Sarah Glassford**  
University of Windsor

Dominik Antonowicz and Glen A. Jones

*The Role of University Governing Boards in Canadian Higher Education: Sociological Perspectives on the Form and Functioning of Boards*

---

Routledge, 2024. 192 pp.

In this timely study, Dominik Antonowicz and Glen A. Jones explore the integral but often hidden role of governing boards in Canadian higher education. The foundation of universities in Canada, they argue, is a deep and widely shared belief in education as a transformative power for individuals and communities. Central to this belief is the concept of the university as a public institution, with the strong commitment to service to society. As Antonowicz and Jones suggest, the public university in Canada occupies a somewhat grey area; publicly funded and secular, yet private corporations, universities are public institutions that are neither under direct state supervision, nor completely independent from the government. The book maintains that the role of governing boards in bicameral university governance has evolved as part of a broadly shared concept of public higher education. In the bicameral model, governance is divided between the board and the senate. While the senate has authority over academic policy, the board exists as a mechanism to distance the university from direct political interference, maintain public trust, and perform the essential function of oversight.

In the first half of the book, Antonowicz and Jones demonstrate that the social foundation of Canadian higher education rests on the fundamentally pragmatic assumption that universities exist for specific social, political, and economic purposes. Universities evolved away from their colonial roots as private sectarian colleges, to public institutions graduating the teachers, doctors, and engineers needed to support regional economic growth. At the local level, communities regarded the establishment of a university as a means for socioeconomic development, in effect, assuming that the university would serve society by providing postsecondary education. The surging expectations of local communities, the authors maintain, is nowhere

so evident as during the postwar boom, where new public universities were created across Canada with the goal of serving the broader public interest.

Antonowicz and Jones trace the history of bicameral governance back to two key investigations: the Flavelle Commission of 1906, and the Duff/Berdahl Report of 1966. The Flavelle Commission argued for university autonomy from direct state control, and the delegation of state authority to a governing board responsible for general oversight. The senate and faculty councils would be responsible for academic policy. Bicameral governance gradually became the dominant model for Canadian universities, yet as higher education expanded rapidly, each university became nested in what the authors refer to as “the complex configuration of stakeholder society” (31). This configuration remains foundational for Canadian higher education: individual universities are accountable to various stakeholders, including provincial authorities, local municipalities, community groups, and alumni, all of whom have their own understanding of the public interest. In the 1960s, university governance again emerged as a controversial issue, culminating in the activism of students and faculty who demanded greater transparency. To reinforce bicameral governance, the Duff/Berdahl Report recommended changes to create more democratic processes, including modifying the composition of boards, and rebalancing the composition of senate to favour faculty participation.

In the second half of the book, Antonowicz and Jones provide a detailed examination of the legal foundation, structure, composition, and work of the governing boards of eighty public universities in Canada. Conducting their research between 2020 and 2022, the authors note that the COVID-19 pandemic provided them with an unusual degree of access, as open sessions of some university boards meetings were held online. Antonowicz and Jones also held remote interviews with board secretaries and chairs, sent out online surveys to members, and reviewed the acts, charters, and legislations of each university. They conclude that boards have common core functions, including the essential responsibilities of appointing the president and overseeing budgetary decisions. The book presents a revealing analysis of the individual profiles of all 1,690 board members identified during the course of the study. The analysis shows that there are three primary types of professional qualifications that correspond with the major functions of the board: finance, insurance, and real estate; business and administration; and membership in community-based organizations. Compared to an earlier study published by Jones in 1994, the data obtained in 2021 indicates that the percentage of women in the composition of university boards has increased significantly over the last three decades, rising from “36%” to “45%” (167).

One of the major expectations of university boards—and undoubtedly their most important contribution to institutional governance—is their responsibility for financial management. This is a critical role which normally includes oversight of university borrowing, lending, and investment policies and procedures, as well as property management. Antonowicz and Jones observe the growing recognition among board members of their key role in ethical financial management, where the well-being of thousands of faculty, staff, and students rests on their ability to monitor the financial health of the university. Poor financial management, errors of judgment

on capital investment, and lack of proper oversight, the authors point out, can have serious consequences. The historically unprecedented example is that of Laurentian University, which in 2021 sought bankruptcy protection under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA). According to the Auditor General of Ontario's *Special Report on Laurentian University* (2022), this decision caused the sudden termination of 341 tenured faculty and staff at Laurentian and its federated universities. Antonowicz and Jones state that while the crisis resulted from a combination of factors, the Laurentian board is also to be blamed because it had responsibility for oversight. They conclude: "The case clearly illustrates that poor governance oversight of financial and capital management can have catastrophic implications affecting students, faculty, staff, and the wider community" (156).

*The Role of University Governing Boards* makes a significant contribution to the scholarship on Canadian higher education, education policy, and the history of university governance. The authors maintain that boards are pivotal components of bicameral university governance, historically embedded in the social foundation of the public university in Canada. Public universities have become increasingly complex organizations, and the book raises the interesting question of how the boards will continue to sustain their core roles and fulfill these expectations.

**Sara Z. MacDonald**  
Laurentian University

Cecil King

*The Boy From Buzwah: A Life in Indian Education*

---

University of Regina Press, 2022. 356 pp.

Cecil King's memoir, *The Boy from Buzwah: A Life in Indian Education*, is a vivid portrait of King's development as an Indian educator and community activist who helped to bring about significant changes in the curriculum used for educating Indigenous children. To improve academic experience and outcomes for Indigenous children, King advocated for Indigenous parents' control of their children's education, training of Indigenous teachers, and inclusion of Indigenous languages, culture, knowledge, and teaching methods. Born in 1932, his childhood was in Wikwemikong Unceded First Nation. His experiences inspired his work to reform the Indigenous educational system. Raised by his grandparents, who were farmers and local teachers, King was encouraged to continue his education. During this period, Wikwemikong was primarily a fishing, farming, and animal-raising community. Some Odawa farmers made dairy products; other Odawa families traded maple syrup, fished and logged. King did chores on the farm and learned how his grandparents lived off the land.

King called his early childhood "land-based learning," where he learned to respect and adapt to the land. King also described a special relationship with an Anishinaabe knowledge-holder, Kohkwehns, his most influential teacher of