PURPOSE

This Fact Sheet summarizes and expands upon the findings of the College Board’s 2016-17 State and Local Funding for Higher Education per Student and per $1,000 in Personal Income and 10-Year Percentage Change in Inflation-Adjusted Funding per Student, by State report on per pupil and per $1,000 in personal income governmental funding for higher education in the United States in 2016-17. For the purposes of this Fact Sheet, the focus of the report has been narrowed to states located within the Mountain West region of the United States (Nevada, Arizona, Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico).

HOW PER PUPIL FUNDING IS EVALUATED

The College Board report focuses on full-time equivalent (FTE) students. A 2016 State Higher Education Finance (SHEF) report, used by the College Board, defines FTE enrollment as “a measure of enrollment equal to one student enrolled full time for one academic year, calculated from the aggregate number of enrolled credit hours.”

The College Board ranks states based on state and local funding for higher education per FTE student over the fiscal year of 2016-17.

Here, higher education refers specifically to education at 2-year and 4-year public academic institutions.

KEY TAKEAWAYS FROM THE REPORT

1. The Mountain West states are distributed throughout the ranking, with Colorado and Arizona within the 10 states that spend the least per FTE student, with funding per student at $4,390 and $5,150, respectively. Meanwhile, New Mexico spends the 10th most per student.

2. No Mountain West state’s per pupil funding has returned to its pre-Recession levels.

3. Decreases in per pupil funding in the Mountain West region over a ten year period vary from 6% (Colorado) to 37% (Arizona).

4. New Mexico’s per pupil funding remains the highest in the Mountain West region despite a ~11% cut over a period of ten years.

5. Utah’s per pupil funding is 23rd least in the US, representing close to the national median.

6. Nevada has decreased its per pupil funding by 31%, the fourth largest such cut in the nation, and the second largest cut in the Mountain West states after Arizona’s cut of 37%.

---

1 College Board’s report can be accessed at: trends.collegeboard.org/college-pricing/figures-tables/state-local-funding-student-1000-personal-income-state-2016-17

Table 1 depicts the higher education per pupil funding of the selected Mountain West states.

**Table 1: STATE & LOCAL PER PUPIL FUNDING FOR HIGHER EDUCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>State and Local Per Pupil Education Funding (in Dollars)</th>
<th>Percentage Change in Per Pupil Funding over a 10-Year Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>5,150</td>
<td>-37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>7,050</td>
<td>-31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>6,380</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>8,930</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>4,390</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures 1-4 are adapted from data available from the State Higher Education Executive Officers Association (SHEEO).³

Figure 1 displays per pupil funding for each state. Mountain West States are highlighted in red, and the national average in orange.

---

Figure 2 depicts a heat map of the data for Mountain West states featured in Figure 1.

**Figure 2: PER PUPIL FUNDING IN MOUNTAIN WEST STATES**

Figure 3 presents the percentage change in per pupil funding over the selected 10-year period, with Mountain West states highlighted in red, and the national average in orange.

**Figure 3: PERCENT CHANGE IN PER PUPIL FUNDING, 2006-07 TO 2016-17**
Figure 4 displays a heat map of the data for Mountain West states featured in Figure 3.

**Figure 4: PERCENT CHANGE IN PER PUPIL FUNDING IN MOUNTAIN WEST STATES**