

identify most clearly as a necessary beginning point. Considering the well-known and thoughtful higher education leaders represented by Burke and Associates, it is too bad that this volume does not do much to help us figure out how to get to that beginning point.

#### REFERENCES

- Business-Higher Education Forum. (2004). *Public accountability for student learning in higher education: Issues and options*. Washington, DC: Business-Higher Education Forum.
- State Higher Education Executive Officers Association. (2005). *Accountability for better results: A national imperative for higher education*. Denver, CO: National Commission on Accountability in Higher Education.

---

**William G. Tierney (Ed.). *Competing Conceptions of Academic Governance: Negotiating the Perfect Storm*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004. 264 pp. Cloth: \$36.95. ISBN: 0-8018-7920-5.**

REVIEWED BY HARRY DEBOER, SENIOR RESEARCHER, CENTER FOR HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY STUDIES, UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE, THE NETHERLANDS

Governance within higher education is a most complicated issue. Managing a university, variously described as “monadic chaos” or “organized anarchy,” is a redoubtable challenge. Who should govern a university, how, and to what ends, have been recurring questions in the history of universities. As the historian Alan Cobban (1975) states: “Whatever the difference in scale and technology, there is a hard core of perennial problems which have taxed the minds and ingenuity of university legislators from the thirteenth century to the present day” (p. 35).

Governance issues have nearly always been raised passionately. This book on academic governance in the United States fits this tradition well. Many of the views and the accompanying arguments used by the nine chapter authors may not (always) be surprising for those interested in the topic but they certainly present well the highlights of important and challenging issues.

Tierney starts off with the metaphor of the perfect storm. He argues that, while external changes are not new in higher education, the scale and scope of the problems academe currently faces are combining to create a unique storm. A careful reconsideration of higher education governance is justified since many of its structures have been in place for a rather long time and may have become

obsolete in various ways. The goal of the book is to enable those involved in traditional colleges and universities not merely to weather the coming storm but to ensure that higher education institutions reach their destination in a timely manner and in good shape.

To reach this goal, the authors of subsequent chapters address governance at different levels in the system, resulting in varying and sometimes conflicting suggestions for improving existing structures. Ultimately, Tierney’s goal has proven to be too ambitious. I seriously doubt that, after reading this book, governors, academic leaders, and faculty will better know how to reach their destination promptly and effectively. Nevertheless the book is highly interesting and insightful.

The perfect storm in higher education (i.e., the forces that create the unique, changed environment) refers to increased levels of competition, different ways of approaching the issue of quality, and the transformation of the state’s role. In a competitive world, institutions need to be able to determine how they excel in order to clarify their market position.

The first chapters of the book by Marginson and Collis describe some of the most important external changes that are challenging higher education. Globalization, Marginson argues, is largely determined outside the mechanisms of formal governance. In this sense, the university runs the risk of losing control over its own destiny. Collis takes the argument further by discussing the “paradox of scope”: The traditional core of organizations is shrinking, while at the same time its peripheries are expanding through the proliferation of alliances, joint ventures, partnerships, and other long-term contracts. Current governance structures cannot deal with this “unbundling of the university,” or at least they are having sincere difficulties with it.

As Keller and Duderstadt in their chapters clearly argue, current governance structures impede the ability to make hard choices and should therefore be revised, particularly since clear strategies are required more than ever before. Most arguments against the present structures are well known, such as the fact that multiple constituencies in the universities are represented in various governing bodies, all having their own agendas and vested interests. As a consequence, such governance structures are frequently conservative—perhaps more conservative than effective. They have a style of governance that is more adept at protecting the past than preparing for the future.

After convincing analysis of the problems and needs for change, several contributions of this volume are not satisfying when they look for answers. Suggestions, mainly normative, are instead what is offered. Tierney in his concluding chapter, for ex-

ample, argues that the way to improve governance is usually not through an intensive restructuring of the organization but through paying attention to the culture of the organization. The challenge for institutional leaders is to orchestrate equifinal definitions towards unified outcomes. In this process, the demonstration of trust, development of a common language, walking the talk, and concentration on developing and maintaining a core identity are vital. I am not convinced, however, that such ideas are not executable in the existing structures.

The normative views of some of the authors are a rather common thing when governance is the topic under discussion. This is evident in Duderstadt's contribution when he states:

It is *simply* unrealistic to expect that the governance mechanisms developed decades or even centuries ago can be adequate. . . . To assign the fate of these important institutions to inexperienced and increasingly political lay governing boards isolated from accountability is *simply* not in the public interest. . . . We *simply* must find ways to cut through the Gordian knot of shared governance, of indecision and inaction, to allow our colleges and universities to better serve our society (emphasis mine)

I am afraid that the world of governance isn't all that simple.

Criticizing the volume as descriptive, normative, and a-theoretical might suggest that I haven't enjoyed reading this book. Such a conclusion is totally wrong. The book is very informative and, for those interested in U.S. governance, highly recommended. And even though the book focuses exclusively on governance in the United States, it is very understandable and worth reading for students, policymakers, and researchers from other countries. This is really appreciated, all the more since many of the aspects, views, and arguments on governance can be witnessed internationally. The need to reconsider the external and internal governance arrangements in higher education systems is, in other words, not a uniquely American issue but a global one. The broad perspectives on university governance put forward in this book, relevant to all who are "negotiating the perfect storm," make it worthwhile reading.

#### REFERENCE

- Cobban, A. B. (1975). *The medieval universities: Their development and organization*. Chatham, MA: Methuen & Co.

**Mario C. Martinez.** *Postsecondary Participation and State Policy: Meeting the Future Demand*. Stylus Higher Education Policy Series. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, 2004. 280 pp. Paper: \$27.50. ISBN 1-57922-117-3.

REVIEWED BY GREG DUBROW, DIRECTOR OF ANALYSIS, POLICY, AND RESEARCH, OFFICE OF ADMISSIONS AND ENROLLMENT, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY

State-level higher education policy was relatively cyclical and predictable in the decades after World War II. When economic times were good and state coffers flush, then public higher education got its share and more of revenues. When recessions hit, public higher education was the first item to face flat or reduced appropriation. Also cyclical and relatively predictable was the literature on state-level higher education policy analysis. The typical discussions centered on the good-times/bad-times scenario described above.

The first waves of serious change in the standard narrative came with the accountability movements of the 1980s. All of a sudden, higher education policy analysts had to explain why it was that state policy actors were demanding proof that public colleges and universities were engines of social equity and economic progress. These had been the selling points of investment in public higher education for decades from the Morrill Act to the Truman Commission and through the great expansion of the 1960s.

More recently, the budget realities of the post-September 11 era have led some policy analysts to predict that the usual rebound for higher education may not happen this time around. The trend in the decline of state appropriations as a percentage of overall revenues is anticipated by many to not just continue but to get worse, with institutions forced to make tough budget cuts and students expected to pay a larger share of their college education.

Mario Martinez's book *Postsecondary Participation and State Policy: Meeting the Future Demand* is a new take on the state policy discussion. Martinez does not wallow in old assumptions and, best of all, presents his argument in a very easy-to-understand manner. Couched in the context of access, the book serves as a tool to assess how each of the fifty states is positioned to meet a projected increased demand for higher education, a demand that is expected to crest around the year 2015. Using a trove of publicly available census, NCES, and other data, Martinez constructs a series of measures that work in logical sequence to benchmark and compare where states are now and where they could and should be in 2015. In recognizing that higher education is not just for 18 to 24 year olds, Martinez divides the population