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New Mexico and the West
Challenges and Opportunities
New Mexico’s no-growth scenario in context

Figure 17. Percent Change in Number of Public and Nonpublic High School Graduates by State, U.S., 2001-02 (actual) and 2017-18 (projected)

The challenge – no growth in a growth industry

- Innovating on budget dust
- Redistribution within a static flow

Figure 4. New Mexico Public High School Graduates by Race/Ethnicity
1990-91 through 2001-02 (actual), 2002-03 through 2017-18 (projected)
**Opportunities – growth from elsewhere**

Migration of first-time, first-year college students, 2000-2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Receiving</th>
<th>Sending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>28%³</td>
<td>9%²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>9%⁴</td>
<td>8%⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>24%²</td>
<td>14%³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>9%¹</td>
<td>9%¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Opportunities – growth from within – preparing high school students better

Performance on preparation:

**F : Measuring Up 2004**

*(Down from a “D-” in ’02)*

Why?
How does New Mexico measure up?

Completion

High school completers as a portion of 9th graders 4 years earlier

Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NM 2004</th>
<th>Top States 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9th-12th grade upper level math</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th-12th grade upper level science</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th grade algebra</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th grade upper level math</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Measuring Up 2004
Percent of 18- to 24-year-olds with no high school diploma

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000
Maintaining high participation

Performance on participation:

\[ \text{A : Measuring Up 2002} \]

Why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NM</th>
<th>WICHE</th>
<th>US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recent HS Grads enrolling anywhere</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult participation</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Improving student success

Performance on successful participation:

D: *Measuring Up 2002*

Why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Production</th>
<th>NM</th>
<th>WICHE</th>
<th>US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associates Degree</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors Degree</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student pipeline – the net effect

Of 100 9th graders, how many...

Graduate from High School: 84, 67, 60
Enter College: 58, 38, 36
Enroll Sophomore Year: 42, 26, 22
Graduate Within 150%: 28, 18, 11
25-44 with Bachelor's Degree: 38.8, 26.7, 21.2

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Public Use Microdata Samples, 2000
How important is this?

- World leaders in higher education attainment:
  - Canada, Finland, Ireland, Japan, Korea

- Second Tier:
  - U.S., Australia, Belgium, France, Norway, Spain, Sweden, U.K.

Source: OECD Statistics, Annex 3 – Table 2.5
How important is this – median earnings by degree level

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Public Use Microdata Samples, 2000
The fiscal challenge

State and local surplus or shortfall as a percent of baseline revenues

Source: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS)
How does New Mexico measure up?

Support of Institutions – mixed
- Effort is substantial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NM</th>
<th>WICHE</th>
<th>US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State share to Higher Ed</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Competitiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E&amp;G/FT Student</th>
<th>NM</th>
<th>WICHE</th>
<th>US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two year</td>
<td>$5,258</td>
<td>$8,553</td>
<td>$9,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>$15,889</td>
<td>$12,470</td>
<td>$11,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>$25,030</td>
<td>$28,485</td>
<td>$23,831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How does New Mexico measure up?

Support of students

**C-**: Affordability (*Measuring Up 2002*)

Why?
- Low tuition
- Low need-based aid.
How does New Mexico measure up?

Distribution of Need- and Non Need-Based Aid per Undergraduate FTE, 2000-2001

- New Mexico: 31.6% Need-Based, 68.4% Non-Need-Based
- WICHE: 90.6% Need-Based, 9.4% Non-Need-Based
- US: 73.8% Need-Based, 26.2% Non-Need-Based

Estimated Need-Based Aid Dollars per Undergraduate FTE, 2002-2003

- New Mexico: $229
- WICHE: $238
- US: $316
Performance relative to total funding per FTE - overall index scores for state higher education systems

Utah: 136.3
Massachusetts: 127.7
Colorado: 122.7
Rhode Island: 107.7
Iowa: 106.3
North Dakota: 104.3
Arizona: 103.2
Wisconsin: 101.8
Maryland: 100.9
New Hampshire: 100.6
Washington: 99.5
Virginia: 98.8
Nebraska: 97.9
Kansas: 97.7
Illinois: 97.2
California: 97.0
Delaware: 96.8
Minnesota: 96.3
Montana: 96.0
South Dakota: 95.7
North Carolina: 95.0
Connecticut: 94.9
Montana: 94.7
New York: 94.5
Pennsylvania: 94.3
Indiana: 94.0
Michigan: 93.9
Alabama: 93.0
Ohio: 92.9
Oregon: 92.7
Oklahoma: 92.5
New Mexico: 92.4
Tennessee: 92.2
Texas: 91.7
Hawaii: 91.6
Mississippi: 91.4
Wyoming: 91.4
Idaho: 91.2
Georgia: 91.1
New Jersey: 91.0
South Carolina: 90.9
Nevada: 90.8
Vermont: 90.7
West Virginia: 90.7
Arkansas: 90.5
Maine: 90.4
Kentucky: 90.3
Alaska: 90.2

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 110 120
New Mexico’s choice

- Face the challenge – no growth
- Accept the status quo
- Seize the opportunity
  - Improved performance on student success
State and local surplus or shortfall as a percent of baseline revenues

Source: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS)