Learning from Other Countries---and from Ourselves: the case of demography

Cliff Adelman, Institute for Higher Education Policy

March 5, 2013

What are we going to talk about?

- Demography in a new key: an unacknowledged archipelago on today's agenda---in the U.S. and elsewhere;
- Hence, how demographic information may change our self-perceptions and our strategic planning. A vivid case in Japan.

What is the point of learning from other nations?

- Convergence. It happens. Macroeconomists have demonstrated this time and time again: nations that learn from others grow, those that do not learn, do not grow.

- Differential perspective (kenchi). Other countries address problems similar to yours. Understanding their perspectives inevitably leads to recasting your own approaches to these challenges in ways you would not otherwise have considered at all. You have epiphanies *(totsuzen no dosatsryoku)!*

Of all the obligations we have in higher education, our primary responsibility is to students

- The generation of knowledge and local community economic stimulus can go on elsewhere, but, in our ball game
- the core operating noun is "student"; the operating verbs are those of specific actions by *students*; the operating results are criteria for the award of degrees to *students*. I assume you understand.
- But there is a critical issue that should be on our radar screens---and is not. And this issue bears on ways we judge comparative international data as well.

Demography: Everything Flows from This Cup. The Numbers are tojikomeru

- Trends and policy issues in Bologna countries, elsewhere, and Japan
- Trends and parallel policy issues in the U.S.
- Dependency ratios and moving age (*toshi ugoku [??])*pyramids
- Aging populations consume less—except for health care. Do not think higher education is not affected.
- Total expenditures for higher education as a share of all public expenditures will follow the dependency ratios and moving pyramids.

Demography is about students---everywhere!!!

Demography Trivial Pursuit

- Which of the following will be the most populous country in 2050?: Argentina, Vietnam, Germany, Russia, Japan
- The U.S. cases (Somalia, Croatia, Laos, Cambodia) illustrate the role of involuntary migration (in these cases, asylum) in some countries' demographics.
- The proportion of ethnic minorities in the U.S. is 36%; the proportion in Russia is 43%. What's the principal difference in those groups?

Where demography plays directly into higher education policy

- Severe current and coming declines in the "youth age" population: Japan, Korea, Russia, Poland, Czech Republic
- Modest declines or flat growth: Germany, Finland, Austria, Hungary, Italy, Portugal, Spain, Greece, China
- Slight growth: UK, Denmark, Sweden
- More robust, but volatile growth: Ireland, France, Norway, Switzerland, Mexico
- Steady growth: US, Canada, Australia, N.Z., Brazil, Chile
- Over-the-Top growth: India, Turkey

To match: projected changes in FTE enrollments to 2025 (from OECD); index where 2004 or 2005 = 100

Country	Current Base	Trend Base
Netherlands	111	141
Norway	115	128
U.S.	112	120
U.K.	97	116
Australia	100	114
Finland	92	99
Japan	81	93
South Korea	67	69
Poland	58	69

Comparative behavior compounds demography:

	% of beginning 1st degree students: 15-19 years old	% of beginning 1st degree students: 25+ years old
Sweden	17.7	32.0
Denmark	6.8	29.9
Switzerland	19.6	26.8
U.S.	58.3	19.6
Spain	63.3	13.6
Ireland	75.8	8.0
France	82.1	N.A.
Japan	91.2	Low N

Migration and Net Migration Feed "Student Stock" as well

TO:	FROM:
France	Maghreb; Outre-Mer
Ireland	Poland; UK
Netherlands	Turkey; Surinam
Norway	Poland; Sweden
Poland	Ukraine; Belarus
Portugal	Angola; Brazil
Spain	Romania; Morocco
Sweden	Finland; Iraq

Migrant Stock Observations---at least Where we Find Migrant Stocks

- Language affinity, e.g. Francophone West Africa
- Geographical adjacency
- Reciprocities and replacements, e.g. Poland
- Colonial relationships
- Combinations of the above.

But across all cases the median age of the migrant stock is considerably younger than the native stock.

So much for the West and Japan; What about China?

Current total higher education enrollment	31 million
As percentage of 15-24 population in 2010	14%
# Studying in US, UK, Canada, Australia, and Japan, 2011	370,000
Current university enrollment	21.4 million
Fertility rate under 1-child policy Maximum projected fertility rate	1.47 1.62
Projected decline in 15-24 year olds to 2025	38 million
As percentage of 15-24 population in 2010	17.2%

U.S. foreign born: top 10 countries of birth

Mexico	29.9%
Philippines	4.5
India	4.3
China	3.7
El Salvador	3.0
Vietnam	3.0
Korea	2.6
Cuba	2.6
Canada	2.1
Dominican Republic	2.1

For our own migrants, considerable variations by state and region of birth

	% of foreign born	Mexico	South & East Asia	Caribbean	Central Amer.	South America	Middle East
California	25.8	37.5	32.3	2.1	29.1	8.5	30.7
New York	10.8	2.0	10.3	29.1	7.6	22.4	10.2
Texas	10.4	20.9	6.8	1.5	12.5	4.4	5.8
Florida	9.0	2.4	3.2	40.2	11.8	23.0	4.7
New Jersey	4.6	1.2	5.2	7.2	4.0	11.4	5.7
Illinois	4.5	6.0	4.2	0.8	1.6	2.3	4.0
Mass.	2.5	0.1	2.5	4.0	2.3	4.4	2.9

The U.S. is a nation of immigrants, and must watch younger generations to anticipate their impact on higher education (2009 data)

	Poverty Rate of the under-18s	Limited English, ages 5-17	College Enrollment Rate, 18-24
Native-born	19.5	3.7	42.8
Mexico	42.9	38.5	11.1
South and East Asia	17.2	28.4	61.7
Caribbean	29.4	33.8	39.2
Central America	27.0	33.2	13.6
South America	18.8	20.1	38.5
Middle East	42.4	34.8	55.7
Other (European, Canada, Africa, etc)	19.5	17.8	53.3

Japanese analyses of youth populations will have different independent variable categories. . .

So which categories do *you* think will be more productive in a Japanese context?

For example, some IR questions:

- What is the current distribution of Hitotsubashi undergraduates by Prefecture of origin? What is the current population of 10-15 year-olds in each of those Prefectures? Which Prefectures are likely to be over/under represented in in the Hitotsobashi student body in 2016? 2017? 2018?. . .
- Is this a matter of concern? Does the University administration care about geographical representation as a national university? If so, what do you suggest be done about any observed demographic gaps?
- How would you determine the proportion of low-participating populations in higher education by Prefecture?

Then there is the matter of how IR treats graduation rates. Let's start with some international examples:

	What OECD says	OECD spread-sheet tracking	What you find when you dig	Tracking years
U.S.	56% (FT)	6	63%	6
France	64	7	64	7
Netherlands	65	7		
University *Hogescholen*			57 56	7 7
Sweden	69	6		
Full-time All students			54 44	7 7
Norway	67	9	67	9
Finland	72	10		
University			58	7.5

In light of demography and growth rates, maintaining positions is a challenge. Should we bother? Should you bother? Or do something else?

	% of pop. 0-14	% of pop. 65+	Dependency ratio
Brazil	27.9	6.1	4.57
China	21.4	7.6	2.81
U.S.	26.8	12.3	2.18
Australia	19.6	12.7	1.54
Canada	17.6	13.1	1.34
Finland	17.3	15.9	1.09
Sweden	17.5	17.2	1.02
Germany	14.3	18.8	0.76
Japan	14.0	19.7	0.71
Italy	14.0	20.0	0.70

You will now be tracking students in your special seminars and students bringing in credits from other institutions, so quality assurance becomes more important

- How do you assist attainment of that goal from an IR position?
- It's the first step in a true accountability chain---to students.
- So to the extent that Hitotsubashi enters the Tuning process, start entering the variables and derived variables in your data system that can make the connection between Tuned program environments and these new student attendance patterns.

In Tuning, and as part of accountability obligations to students, what questions do faculty need to ask?

- Identify and describe the leading edges of your field;
- Which of these is reflected in your current curriculum? In your ideal curriculum?
- What restructurings of the labor market in relation to these leading edges, if any, will your graduates face in 2020?
- Consider whether these restructurings will be within occupation, industry, geography—or a combination of these.

It's all about content, for both the knowledge base and the very nature of work

- will be subject to change in methods, tools, and applications.
- So what is written for a Tuning template in nursing, chemistry, history, or business in 2010 may be largely outmoded by 2020.
- We all know this, but we're not conducting constructive thinking yet. Examples based on the past might help, e.g.
- What would a Tuning template for computer science have looked like in 1940, 1960, 1985, 2000? What does it look like in 2010. If a historian conducted this research, we would have guidance to anticipate change in existing Tuning templates.

The questions we are not asking start with content on a demographic screen:

What will students in the developed world (anyway) need to know and be able to apply for our planet to be healthy, productive, and relatively pleased in 2030? In 2050?

Not only that, but . . .

- In light of demographic trends, who will those students be? What key elements of inclusion must be activated?
- In this putatively "competitive" world, do we stand in a line with other nations, a line in which someone is always first, or
- do we stand in a circle, learning from each other? We live on a sphere, so let's behave that way!