What Is **Measuring Up**?

*Measuring Up* is a series of biennial report cards that provide the general public and policymakers with information to assess and improve higher education in each state. The report cards evaluate states because they are primarily responsible for educational access and quality in the United States. This year’s edition, *Measuring Up 2008*, is the fifth in the series, which began in 2000. In *Measuring Up*, “higher education” refers to all education and training beyond high school, including public and private, two- and four-year, and for-profit and nonprofit institutions.

The report card grades states in six overall performance categories:

**Preparation:** How adequately does the state prepare students for education and training beyond high school?

**Participation:** Do state residents have sufficient opportunities to enroll in education and training beyond high school?

**Affordability:** How affordable is higher education for students and their families?

**Completion:** Do students make progress toward and complete their certificates or degrees in a timely manner?

**Benefits:** What benefits does the state receive from having a highly educated population?

**Learning:** What is known about student learning as a result of education and training beyond high school?

Each state receives a letter grade in each performance category. Each grade is based on the state’s performance on several indicators, or quantitative measures, in that category.

In four of the performance categories — Preparation, Participation, Completion, and Benefits — grades are calculated by comparing each state’s current performance with that of the best-performing states. This comparison provides a benchmark for evaluating each state’s performance within a national context and encourages each state to “measure up” to the highest-performing states. The Affordability category is the exception.

In this category, the state’s current performance is compared with the performance of the best states in the late 1990s, since current performance reflects a trend to “measure down” rather than “measure up.” All but one state receive an “F” in Affordability. The failing grades in this category confirm the fast decline in affordable higher education for American families. Despite state and federal increases in student financial aid, the over-all portion of income that most families must devote for higher education continues to escalate.

In *Measuring Up 2008*, state performance in higher education is assessed in three ways:

**Graded Information:** Each state’s current performance is compared with that of the best-performing states, and the results are indicated by letter grades.

**Change Over Time:** Change Over Time indicators compare each state’s current performance with its own previous performance in the 1990s. For each category, the state’s change is determined by its improvement or decline in performance on a key indicator in that category. This information is displayed in two ways. First, states receive either an “up” or a “down” arrow in each performance area (see page 3). An “up” arrow indicates that the state has increased or remained stable on the key indicator in the category, a “down” arrow indicates that the state has declined on the key indicator in the category. Secondly, information about Change Over Time is presented graphically in greater detail on the fourth page of this report card.

**International Comparisons:** As in 2006, this year’s edition of *Measuring Up* offers international comparisons that reveal how well the United States and each of the 50 states are preparing residents with the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy. State performance is compared with the performance of nations that are associated with the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).

In *Measuring Up 2008*, all states receive an “Incomplete” in Learning because there are not sufficient data to allow meaningful state-by-state comparisons. *Measuring Up 2006* provided state-specific information on Learning for nine states, but in 2008 no state collects and provides the information necessary to determine the state’s “educational capital” — or the level of knowledge and skills possessed by its residents.

---

**A Snapshot of Grades and Change Over Time**

**Preparation:**
- Grades: 6 states received an A, 18 states received a B, 21 states received a C, 5 states received a D, and no state received an F.

**Change Over Time:**
- 34 states have improved or remained stable on the key indicator and 16 states have declined on the key indicator.

**Participation:**
- Grades: 2 states received an A, 8 states received a B, 22 states received a C, 15 states received a D, and 3 states received an F.

**Change Over Time:**
- 43 states have improved or remained stable on the key indicator and 7 states have declined on the key indicator.

**Affordability:**
- Grades: 1 state received a C and 49 states received an F.

**Change Over Time:**
- 2 states have improved or remained stable on the key indicator and 48 states have declined on the key indicator.

**Completion:**
- Grades: 11 states received an A, 20 states received a B, 16 states received a C, 1 state received a D, and 2 states received an F.

**Change Over Time:**
- 48 states have improved or remained stable on the key indicator and 2 states have declined on the key indicator.

**Benefits:**
- Grades: 5 states received an A, 15 states received a B, 19 states received a C, 10 states received a D, and 1 state received an F.

**Change Over Time:**
- 50 states have improved or remained stable on the key indicator.

*For the key indicators for Change Over Time, please see the five indicators with asterisks on page 4.*
New York performs fairly well in preparing its young people for college, but there are large gaps by ethnicity.

- Large proportions of high school students score well on Advanced Placement tests and on college entrance exams.
- However, only 74% of Hispanics and 85% of blacks have a high school credential, compared with 95% of whites.

College opportunities for New York residents are poor.

- The likelihood of enrolling in college by age 19 is only fair, and a very low percentage of working-age adults (4 in 100) are enrolled in higher education.
- Among young adults, 29% of Hispanics and 34% of blacks are enrolled in college, compared with 50% of whites.

Despite some improvement over the decade, the costs of higher education remain high for families.

- Financial aid to low-income students is high compared with other states. For every dollar in Pell Grant aid to students, the state spends 88 cents.
- However, poor and working-class families must devote 37% of their income, even after aid, to pay for costs at public four-year colleges.

New York performs well in awarding certificates and degrees.

- Fifty-eight percent of college students complete a bachelor’s degree within six years.
- However, only 40% of blacks and 43% of Hispanics graduate within six years, compared with 63% of whites.

A large proportion of residents have a bachelor’s degree, but there are substantial gaps by ethnicity.

- Sixteen percent of Hispanics and 21% of blacks have a bachelor’s degree, compared with 40% of whites.
- If all racial/ethnic groups had the same educational attainment and earnings as whites, total annual personal income in the state would be about $60 billion higher.

Like all states, New York receives an “Incomplete” in Learning because there is not sufficient data to allow meaningful state-by-state comparisons.
This page reflects New York’s performance and progress since the early 1990s on several key indicators.

**PREPARATION**

The percentage of young adults in New York who earn a high school diploma has remained stable since the early 1990s. High school completion is slightly above the U.S. average but below the top-performing states.

**PARTICIPATION**

College enrollment of young adults in New York has improved substantially since the early 1990s. New York is at the national average but below the top states in the percentage of young adults enrolled.

**AFFORDABILITY**

The share of family income, after financial aid, needed to pay for college has remained relatively stable at two- and four-year colleges. To attend public two-year colleges in New York, students and families pay more than the U.S. average. To attend public four-year colleges, they pay about the same as the national average but more than those in the best-performing states.

**COMPLETION**

The number of undergraduate credentials and degrees awarded in New York, relative to the number of students enrolled, has increased since the early 1990s. New York surpasses the U.S. average but is below the top states on this measure.

**BENEFITS**

The percentage of residents who have a bachelor’s degree has increased. New York is well above the U.S. average but below the top states.

*Key indicator for the category.*
New York performs fairly well in preparing its young people for college, but there are large gaps by ethnicity.

**Graded Information**

**Compared with other states:**

- Eighty-nine percent of young adults in New York earn a high school diploma or General Education Development (GED) diploma by age 24.
- A large proportion (53%) of high school students in New York are enrolled in upper-level math, and a fair proportion (35%) are enrolled in upper-level science.
- A very small proportion (18%) of 8th graders take algebra.
- Eighth graders in New York perform fairly well on national assessments in reading, but their performance on national assessments in math and science is only fair, and their performance in writing is fairly poor.
- The performance of low-income 8th graders on national assessments in math is only fair.
- Very large proportions of 11th and 12th graders score well on Advanced Placement tests, and large proportions score well on college entrance exams.
- Eighty-three percent of secondary school students are taught by qualified teachers, making New York a top-performing state on this measure.

### PREPARATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New York</th>
<th>Top States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early 1990s*</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School Completion (25%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18- to 24-year-olds with a high school credential</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K-12 Course Taking (30%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th to 12th graders taking at least one upper-level math course</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th to 12th graders taking at least one upper-level science course</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th grade students taking algebra</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K-12 Student Achievement (35%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th graders scoring at or above “proficient” on the national assessment exam in math</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th graders scoring at or above “proficient” on the national assessment exam in reading</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th graders scoring at or above “proficient” on the national assessment exam in science</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th graders scoring at or above “proficient” on the national assessment exam in writing</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income 8th graders scoring at or above “proficient” on the national assessment exam in math</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of scores in the top 20% nationally on SAT/ACT college entrance exam per 1,000 high school graduates</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of scores that are 3 or higher on an Advanced Placement subject test per 1,000 high school juniors and seniors</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Quality (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th to 12th graders taught by teachers with a major in their subject</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The indicators report data beginning in the early 1990s or the closest year for which reliable data are available. See the Technical Guide for Measuring Up 2008.

### Performance Gaps

- There is a 13% gap between whites and all minorities in the percentage of 18- to 24-year-olds with a high school credential. Among the same population, 85% of blacks and 74% of Hispanics, the largest minority populations in New York, have a high school credential, compared with 95% of whites.

### Change in Graded Measures

- Over the past 15 years, New York has consistently performed very well in the proportions of 11th and 12th graders who score well on Advanced Placement tests.

### Other Key Facts

- Among working-age adults (ages 25 to 49) without a high school diploma, only eight out of 1,000 earned a GED.
- About 20% of children under age 18 live in poverty, compared with a national rate of 18%.

The preparation category measures how well a state’s K-12 schools prepare students for education and training beyond high school. The opportunities that residents have to enroll in and benefit from higher education depend heavily on the performance of their state’s K-12 educational system.
Graded Information

Compared with other states:
- The chance of New York high school students enrolling in college by age 19 is only fair, primarily because the proportion of students who graduate from high school within four years is small. The proportion of students graduating from high school within four years is one of the smallest in the country.
- A very low percentage of working-age adults (ages 25 to 49) are enrolled in college-level education or training.

Performance Gaps
- There is a 14% gap between whites and all minorities in the percentage of 18- to 24-year-olds enrolled in college. The gap between whites and Hispanics is 21%, and the gap between whites and blacks is 16%.

Other Key Facts
- New York’s population is projected to grow by 2% from 2005 to 2025, below the national rate of 18%. During approximately the same period, the number of high school graduates is projected to decrease by 13%.
- About 16% of the adult population has less than a high school diploma or its equivalent, compared with 16% nationwide.
- In New York, 3,779 more students are entering the state than leaving to attend college. About 18% of New York high school graduates who go to college attend college out of state.

The participation category addresses the opportunities for state residents to enroll in higher education. A strong grade in participation generally indicates that state residents have high individual expectations for education and that the state provides enough spaces and types of educational programs for its residents.
Graded Information

- Compared with best-performing states, families in New York devote a very large share of family income, even after financial aid, to attend public two-year, public four-year, and private four-year colleges and universities in the state.

- New York’s investment in need-based financial aid is very high when compared with top-performing states. Nonetheless, the share of family income needed to pay for college is still very large when compared with other states, and the state does not offer low-priced college opportunities.

- Undergraduate students borrowed on average $4,367 in 2007.

Other Key Facts

- In New York, 29% of students are enrolled in community colleges, 32% in public four-year colleges and universities, and 35% in private four-year institutions.

The affordability category measures whether students and families can afford to pay for higher education, given income levels, financial aid, and the types of colleges and universities in the state.


Note: In the affordability category, the lower the figures, the better the performance for all indicators except for “State investment in need-based financial aid.”
Financial Burden to Pay for College Varies Widely by Family Income

Those who are striving to reach or stay in the middle class— the 40% of the population with the lowest incomes — earn on average $18,816.

■ If a student from such a family were to attend a community college in the state, their net cost to attend college would represent about 43% of their income annually.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income groups used to calculate 2008 family ability to pay</th>
<th>Median Family Income</th>
<th>Community Colleges</th>
<th>Public 4-Year colleges/universities</th>
<th>Private Non-Profit 4-Year colleges/universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20% of the population with the lowest income</td>
<td>$10,766</td>
<td>$6,635</td>
<td>$5,824</td>
<td>$25,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% of the population with lower-middle income</td>
<td>$27,922</td>
<td>$9,810</td>
<td>$8,969</td>
<td>$24,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% of the population with middle income</td>
<td>$48,498</td>
<td>$11,265</td>
<td>$12,127</td>
<td>$26,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% of the population with upper-middle income</td>
<td>$76,471</td>
<td>$11,586</td>
<td>$12,571</td>
<td>$27,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% of the population with the highest income</td>
<td>$141,739</td>
<td>$11,798</td>
<td>$12,826</td>
<td>$28,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% of the population with the lowest income</td>
<td>$18,816</td>
<td>$8,175</td>
<td>$6,947</td>
<td>$25,212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Net college cost equals tuition, room, and board, minus financial aid.
Graded Information

Compared with other states:

- A high percentage (59%) of first-year students in community colleges return for their second year.
- Moreover, at public and private four-year colleges and universities, a very high percentage (81%) of freshmen return for their sophomore year, placing New York among the top-performing states on this measure.
- A very high percentage (58%) of first-time, full-time college students complete a bachelor’s degree within six years of enrolling in college.
- In addition, New York has a very large proportion of students who complete certificates and degrees relative to the number enrolled.
- Thirty-three postsecondary certificates and degrees were awarded for every 1,000 people in the state without a college degree.

New York 2008

New York performs well in awarding certificates and degrees.

**COMPLETION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New York</th>
<th>Top States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early 1990s*</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence (20%)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st year community college students returning their second year</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen at 4-year colleges/universities returning their sophomore year</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion (80%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-time, full-time students completing a bachelor’s degree within 6 years of college entrance</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates, degrees, diplomas at all colleges &amp; universities per 100 undergraduate students</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates, degrees, diplomas at all colleges &amp; universities per 1,000 adults with no college degree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The indicators report data beginning in the early 1990s or the closest year for which reliable data are available.

**2008 data may not be comparable with data from previous years. See the Technical Guide for Measuring Up 2008.

Performance Gaps

- There is a 16% gap between whites and all minorities in college graduation rates at four-year institutions. Forty percent of blacks and 43% of Hispanics, the largest minority populations in New York, graduate from a four-year institution within six years, compared with 63% of whites.
- Among white students, 21 degrees are awarded for every 100 students. In contrast, among all minority students, 17 degrees are awarded for every 100 students. The rate of awards for blacks and Hispanics, the largest minority populations in the state, is 17 for every 100 undergraduate enrollments and 16 for every 100 undergraduate enrollments, respectively.

Change in Graded Measures

- Since the early 1990s, the state has seen an increase in the proportion of students completing certificates and degrees relative to the number enrolled, with the greatest growth in bachelor’s degrees awarded.
- During the same period, New York has seen an increase in the number of certificates and degrees completed relative to the population with no college degree.

The completion category addresses whether students continue through their educational programs and earn certificates or degrees in a timely manner. Certificates and degrees from one- and two-year programs as well as the bachelor’s degree are included.
Graded Information

Compared with other states:

- A very large proportion of residents have a bachelor’s degree, and this strengthens the state economy.
- In addition, New York is the top performer in the extent to which residents contribute to the civic good, as measured by charitable giving.

Performance Gaps

- There is a 16% gap between whites and minorities in the percentage of 25- to 64-year-olds with a bachelor’s degree or higher, which is one of the largest gaps in the United States. Among the same population, 16% of Hispanics and 21% of blacks, the largest minority populations in New York, have a bachelor’s degree or higher, compared with 40% of whites.
- If all racial/ethnic groups had the same educational attainment and earnings as whites, total annual personal income in the state would be about $60 billion higher.

BENEFITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>New York</th>
<th>Top States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Achievement (38%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults (ages 25 to 64) with an associate’s degree or higher</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults (ages 25 to 64) with a bachelor’s degree or higher</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Benefits (31%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in total personal income as a result of the percentage of population with some college (including an associate’s degree), but not a bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in total personal income as a result of the percentage of population holding a bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civic Benefits (31%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents voting in national elections</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of those who itemize on federal income taxes, the percentage declaring charitable gifts</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in volunteering as a result of college education</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adult Skill Levels (0%)</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Literacy</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prose Literacy</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Literacy</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The indicators report data beginning in the early 1990s or the closest year for which reliable data are available. See the Technical Guide for Measuring Up 2008.

**State-level estimates on these measures are not currently available except for six states participating in an oversample; NCES intends to release limited 50-state data on this 2003 survey in 2009.

Change in Graded Measures

- Since the early 1990s, the percentage of residents holding a bachelor’s degree has increased by 30%, compared with an increase of 28% for the United States overall.

Other Key Facts

- In 2007, New York scored 77 on the New Economy Index, compared with a nationwide score of 62. The New Economy Index, created by the Kauffman Foundation, measures the extent to which a state is participating in knowledge-based industries. A higher score means increased participation.
Like all states, New York receives an “Incomplete” in Learning because there is not sufficient data to allow meaningful state-by-state comparisons.

New York Results

New York’s SAAL results show that it faces significant challenges in the literacy of its adult population. The state ranks 20 percentage points below the national benchmark in the proportion of its college-educated citizens who are proficient in prose literacy. Twenty-four percent of New York’s college-educated citizens are proficient in prose literacy, compared with 30% nationally. The state is even more heavily challenged in quantitative literacy. Twenty-two percent of its college-educated citizens are proficient in this ability, compared with 28% nationally. The same challenges are present for document literacy. Nineteen percent of New York’s college-educated citizens are proficient in this area, compared with 24% nationally.

New York is almost 16 percentage points below the national benchmark in workforce preparation as reflected in professional licensure examinations. Nine percent fewer of the state’s graduates take such examinations than do graduates on average nationwide, and their pass rates are 5% below the national average. In contrast, New York is eight percentage points above the national benchmark in preparing students for graduate study as reflected in graduate admissions examinations, which places it among the 10 top-performing states on this measure. Although 5% fewer of the state’s graduates take such examinations than do graduates on average nationwide, the proportion earning competitive scores is 14% above the national average. Finally, New York is almost 48 percentage points above the national benchmark with respect to pass rates on teacher examinations.

1. Literacy Levels of College-Educated Residents

Like all states, New York receives an “Incomplete” in Learning because there is not sufficient data to allow meaningful state-by-state comparisons.

New York Results

New York’s SAAL results show that it faces significant challenges in the literacy of its adult population. The state ranks 20 percentage points below the national benchmark in the proportion of its college-educated citizens who are proficient in prose literacy. Twenty-four percent of New York’s college-educated citizens are proficient in prose literacy, compared with 30% nationally. The state is even more heavily challenged in quantitative literacy. Twenty-two percent of its college-educated citizens are proficient in this ability, compared with 28% nationally. The same challenges are present for document literacy. Nineteen percent of New York’s college-educated citizens are proficient in this area, compared with 24% nationally.

New York is almost 16 percentage points below the national benchmark in workforce preparation as reflected in professional licensure examinations. Nine percent fewer of the state’s graduates take such examinations than do graduates on average nationwide, and their pass rates are 5% below the national average. In contrast, New York is eight percentage points above the national benchmark in preparing students for graduate study as reflected in graduate admissions examinations, which places it among the 10 top-performing states on this measure. Although 5% fewer of the state’s graduates take such examinations than do graduates on average nationwide, the proportion earning competitive scores is 14% above the national average. Finally, New York is almost 48 percentage points above the national benchmark with respect to pass rates on teacher examinations.

1. A full report on the results of this project can be obtained from the National Center at http://www.highereducation.org/reports/mu_learning/index.shtml.
**Participation**

About 34% of young adults, ages 18 to 24, in New York are currently enrolled in college. Internationally, although New York’s enrollment rate compares well with that of top countries, it is 19% less than the rate in Korea, the best-performing nation on this measure. New York is also surpassed by Greece, Poland, Ireland, Belgium, and Hungary.

**Completion**

When compared internationally, New York is surpassed by many countries in the proportion of students who complete certificates or degrees. With 19 out of 100 students completing certificates or degrees, New York’s completion rate is only 73% of the rate in Australia, the top-performing nation on this measure, where 26 out of 100 students complete certificates or degrees. New York also lags Japan, Switzerland, Ireland, the United Kingdom, New Zealand, France, Iceland, Denmark, and Canada.

**Educational Level of Adult Population**

New York’s younger adults, ages 25 to 34, are ahead of older adults, ages 35 to 64, in attaining a college degree. When compared internationally, New York is among the leaders in the educational attainment of younger adults. Many countries, however, have made substantial progress in educating younger adults, so that New York is now surpassed by Canada, Japan, and Korea on this measure.
## State Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New York</th>
<th>State Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (2007)</td>
<td>19,297,729</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross State Product (2007, in millions)</td>
<td>$1,103,024</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Leading Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New York</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projected % change in population, 2005-2025</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected % change in number of all high school graduates, 2005-2022</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected budget surplus/shortfall by 2013</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median income of poorest 20% of population (2006)</td>
<td>$10,766</td>
<td>$11,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in poverty (2006)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of adult population with less than a high school diploma or equivalent (2006)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEDs awarded to 25- to 49-year-olds with no high school diploma (2006)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Economy Index (2007)*</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Facts and Figures

### Institutions of Postsecondary Education (2007-08)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Type</th>
<th>New York</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public 4-Year</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public 2-Year</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private 4-Year</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private 2-Year</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Students Enrolled by Institution Type (2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Type</th>
<th>New York</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public 4-Year</td>
<td>297,326</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public 2-Year</td>
<td>272,950</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private 4-Year</td>
<td>329,597</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private 2-Year</td>
<td>30,883</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Students Enrolled by Level (2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>New York</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>930,756</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>200,600</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>31,201</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Enrollment Status of Students (2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>New York</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>823,839</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>338,718</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Net Migration of Students (2006)

Positive numbers for net migration mean that more students are entering than leaving the state to attend college. Negative numbers reveal the reverse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Net Migration</th>
<th>New York</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>3,779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Average Tuition (2007-08)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Type</th>
<th>Average Tuition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public 4-year institutions</td>
<td>$5,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public 2-year institutions</td>
<td>$3,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private 4-year institutions</td>
<td>$27,331</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### State and Local Appropriations for Higher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Appropriation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per $1,000 of personal income, FY 2008</td>
<td>$6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita, FY 2008</td>
<td>$266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change, FY 1998-2008</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The New Economy Index, created by the Kauffman Foundation, measures the extent to which a state is participating in knowledge-based industries. A higher score means increased participation.*
Questions and Answers about Measuring Up 2008

Q. Who is being graded in this report card, and why?
A. Measuring Up 2008 grades states, not students or individual colleges or universities, on their performance in higher education. The states are responsible for preparing students for higher education by means of sound K-12 school systems, and they provide most of the public financial support — approximately $77 billion in 2008 — for colleges and universities. Through their oversight of public institutions of higher education, state leaders affect the types and number of education programs available in the state. State leaders also determine the limits of financial support and often influence tuition and fees for public colleges and universities. They also establish how much state-based financial aid is available to students and their families, which affects students attending both private and public colleges and universities. In addition, state economic development policies influence the income advantage that residents receive from having some college experience or a college degree.

Q. How are states graded?
A. States receive letter grades in each performance category. Each category consists of several indicators, or quantitative measures — a total of 36 indicators in the five graded categories. Grades are calculated based on each state’s current performance on these indicators, relative to the best-performing states. Grades in Measuring Up 2008 reflect state performance for 2006 or 2007, the most recent information available. For the sixth category, Learning, states receive an “Incomplete” because there is not sufficient information about student learning for meaningful state-by-state comparisons.

Q. What sources of information are used to determine the grades?
A. All data used to grade states in Measuring Up 2008 were collected from reliable national sources, including the U.S. Census Bureau and the U.S. Department of Education. All data are the most recent public information available for state comparisons. Please see the Technical Guide for Measuring Up 2008 for more information regarding data sources.

Q. How do we measure Change Over Time?
A. Change Over Time indicators compare each state’s current performance with its own previous performance in the 1990s. For each category, the state’s change is determined by its improvement or decline in performance on a key indicator in that category. This information is displayed in two ways. First, states receive either an “up” or a “down” arrow in each performance area (see page 3). An “up” arrow indicates that the state has increased or remained stable on the key indicator in the category, a “down” arrow indicates that the state has declined on the key indicator in the category. Secondly, information about Change Over Time is presented graphically in greater detail on the fourth page of this report card.

Q. What is new in Measuring Up 2008?
A. This year the National Center replaced the data from the Census Bureau’s Current Population Survey (CPS) with the American Community Survey (ACS), also administered by the Census Bureau. The ACS has a sample size of three million households (as of 2005), and will eventually replace the long survey form of the decennial census. Because of its large sample size, it is a valuable resource for state data. This new data source affects several indicators in the preparation, participation, completion, and benefits categories. For more information on these indicators, see Technical Guide for Measuring Up 2008 at www.highereducation.org. In addition, Measuring Up 2008 includes two new indicators, one in Completion and one in Benefits. These new indicators can be found in the Technical Guide for Measuring Up 2008.

Q. What information is provided but not graded?
A. The state report cards highlight important gaps in college opportunities for various income and ethnic groups, they identify improvements and setbacks in each state’s performance over time, and they compare state performance in higher education with other countries. Each state report card also presents important contextual information, such as demographic trends, student migration data, and state funding levels for higher education.

Q. Why does Measuring Up 2008 include international indicators?
A. As in 2006, this year’s edition of Measuring Up provides information on key international indicators of educational performance. In the global economy, it is critical for each nation to establish and maintain a competitive edge through the ongoing, high-quality education of its population. Measuring Up 2008 offers international comparisons that reveal how well the United States and each of the 50 states are preparing residents with the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy. As with other data in the report card, each international measure is based on the most current data available. In this case, the data are from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). International comparisons are used to gauge the states’ and the nation’s standing relative to OECD countries on the participation and educational success of their populations. Please see the Technical Guide for Measuring Up 2008 for more information regarding data sources.
## State Grades 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Preparation</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Affordability</th>
<th>Completion</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>D+</td>
<td>D+</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>D+</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>D+</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>D-</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>D+</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D+</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>D-</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D+</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>D+</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>D-</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D+</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D+</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>D+</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D+</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>D-</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D+</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D-</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D-</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State Change Over Time on Key Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Preparation</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Affordability</th>
<th>Completion</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Indicators by Category:**

**Preparation:** Percentage of 18- to 24-year-olds with a high school credential (1990 to 2006)

**Participation:** Percentage of 18- to 24-year-olds enrolled in higher education (1991 to 2007)

**Affordability:** Percentage of income (average of all income groups) needed to pay for college expenses at public four-year institutions (1999-2007)

**Completion:** All degree completions per 100 students (1992 to 2007)

**Benefits:** Percentage of 25- to 64-year-olds with a bachelor’s degree or higher (1990 to 2006)
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