



# Estimating the Total Cost of Attendance at the University of California

FEBRUARY 2024

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
Estimating Costs and Setting Student Expense Budgets at UC	3
2023 Cost of Attendance Survey (COAS:23)	4
Estimating Costs and Setting Student Expense Budgets at UC	5
Background	5
Recent Innovations	5
2023 Cost of Attendance Survey (COAS:23)	7
Student Focus Groups and Instrument Vetting	7
Administering COAS:23	7
Findings	9
Living arrangements and expenses	9
Transportation	14
Personal, Entertainment and Incidentals	16
Books and Supplies	18
Work	20
Sending Money Home	21
Other Data Sources	21

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Central to the University of California’s policy on undergraduate financial aid is the understanding that any discussion of college affordability must consider the total cost of attendance, not just tuition and fees. The Education Financing Model (EFM), UC’s strategic approach to undergraduate financial aid, sets this as its first principle.

Estimating costs is the first step in building a student’s financial aid offer and is the cornerstone of a fair distribution of UC-funded, need-based financial aid across the nine undergraduate campuses. This briefing covers two topics: How UC sets student expense budgets — including recent innovations — and the results of the 2023 administration of the UC Cost of Attendance Survey (COAS:23).

### ESTIMATING COSTS AND SETTING STUDENT EXPENSE BUDGETS AT UC

The systemwide Education Financing Model steering committee oversees the establishment of student expense budgets.

- Budgets are set systemwide using a standard methodology because they affect the distribution of UC need-based grants across the nine undergraduate campuses. Elements include:
  - Separate budgets for those living on campus, off campus or at home with parents.
  - Allowances for books and supplies, living (housing and food), personal expenses, transportation, healthcare, campus fees and tuition and student services fees.
- Direct expenses (those charged by UC) are derived from administrative data, while indirect expenses (those not charged by the university) are estimated from the COAS.

Over the last several budget cycles, the EFM steering committee has responded to concerns about basic needs and to feedback from student focus groups by implementing innovations in how it sets student expense budgets. These include the following:

- The methodology excludes all responses from students who share a bedroom with more than one person. Off-campus housing is seldom built with triple occupancy in mind. Moreover, students choosing this housing circumstance may be making other financial decisions under duress.
- Localized Housing and Urban Development (HUD) data augments the COAS:23 results when estimating off-campus rent. HUD figures act as a *floor* for rents self-reported by students, affecting about 27 percent of responses, which are adjusted upward to meet the floor.
- Use of the US Department of Agriculture’s (USDA) *moderate* cost for a monthly food plan amount is used as a floor for on- and off-campus grocery costs for students who do not have a campus meal plan.
- Books and supplies allowances use the average reported expense for every subcategory (e.g., textbooks) for those reporting such expenses, rather than a per-capita average including those who reported no expenses in the subcategory.
- As with books and supplies, personal allowances are also calculated using the average reported expense for every subcategory for those reporting such expenses.
- Administrative data collected from the campuses inform the amount used for course materials and technology fees.

## 2023 COST OF ATTENDANCE SURVEY (COAS:23)

The Cost of Attendance Survey 2023 (COAS:23) launched in April and invited over 84,000 undergraduates from nine UC campuses to report the costs they incur related to housing, food, books and supplies, transportation, entertainment, and other miscellaneous expenses. The survey was open for about ten weeks and closed in early June. This paper offers a high-level summary of findings from COAS:23, with additional analysis forthcoming.

- COAS:23 yielded the largest pool of participants in a COAS to date, with an overall completion rate of 26 percent. See **TABLE 1**.
- All categories, with the exception of textbooks, showed cost increases in constant dollars, with average off-campus rent increasing by 24 percent, including significant increases for Merced, Irvine and San Diego (**TABLES 7a and 7b**); grocery expenses increasing by 24 percent for commuter students and 27 percent for off-campus students (**TABLE 8**) and personal expenses increasing by 36 percent (**TABLE 16**).
- Factors of inflation not accounted for in UC's between-years estimates and a change in student commuting behavior may have influenced increases in vehicular and non-vehicular transportation. See **TABLES 12 and 13**.
- While educational supplies and computer hardware and software increased in cost, the average cost of textbooks declined by 25 percent. See **TABLE 17**.
- After shifts in student work patterns during the pandemic, student work has returned to pre-pandemic patterns. See **TABLE 19**.

The survey provided a robust data set, which was particularly critical due to the dismissal of data from COAS:21 (as that survey yielded cost information during the pandemic that was not representative of costs that students would face in future years). Consequently, the student budgets and other cost analyses have relied on data from the 2019 COAS, the base year of comparison used in this report. As campus life and learning have largely returned to a pre-pandemic state of operations, UC is pleased to have an updated data set that reflects current student spending.

## ESTIMATING COSTS AND SETTING STUDENT EXPENSE BUDGETS AT UC

### BACKGROUND

The University of California's undergraduate financial assistance program is built around the goal of making UC financially accessible to all California students who are academically eligible to enroll. Regents Policy 3201 states,

*The University's undergraduate student support policy is guided by the goal of maintaining the affordability of the University for all the students admitted within the framework of the Master Plan. (Regents Policy 3201)*

The University of California uses an integrated conceptual framework to guide implementation of the Education Financing Model. The EFM policy guides financial aid awards to UC students, defines goals for affordability and allocates funding across the system to remove cost as a consideration when prospective students are choosing a UC campus. The EFM is overseen by a systemwide steering committee that includes administrative representatives from all campuses, comprising students and faculty.

The first principle of the EFM is that the appropriate context for assessing affordability is the total cost of attendance — not just tuition and fees. The importance of both the systemwide nature of EFM and its focus on costs beyond tuition was reaffirmed by a working group established by the Regents and the President in 2017 to assess and define the total cost of attendance. Some key points about student expense budgets at UC:

- The EFM steering committee developed and continues to modify a single systemwide methodology for establishing student expense budgets to maintain equity across the system.
- This standard methodology provides a common set of categories of allowable expenses and a common way to calculate those expenses at every campus.
- For direct charges (e.g., on-campus housing, campus-based fees), the student expense budgets use information gathered from UC campuses each spring.
- To determine how much students spend on indirect educational costs (e.g., books, off-campus rent, transportation), the university relies on COAS results. In the years between surveys, indirect expenses are adjusted to account for inflation.
- Three budget types based on living arrangement are generated for each campus: On campus, off campus and living at home with parents or other relatives.
- Campuses have the flexibility to adjust the allowance for individual components of the budget within limits, as well as the flexibility to adjust an individual student's budget to reflect unique circumstances.

### RECENT INNOVATIONS

As mentioned above, the EFM steering committee reviews survey results and recommends changes to the standard methodology. Since 2016, the steering committee has responded to concerns about students' ability to meet their basic needs, e.g., food and housing, with several changes. With each survey and budget cycle, the committee reviews and authorizes minor changes to the survey instrument (detailed in the survey

section of this report) and to the student budget methodology to be responsive to student and leadership recommendations. Recent changes to the budget methodology include:

- Excluding responses from those with > 1 Roommate: Budget calculations now exclude responses from students living off-campus who shared a bedroom with two or more roommates. This did not have a large impact on the average student budgets, but the steering committee felt it was important on principle, noting that off-campus housing is not typically built to accommodate triple occupancy. It was deemed inappropriate to average these rents in with others. Furthermore, it was assumed that these students' other financial decisions may be made under financial duress, so their responses in other cost categories were also excluded.
- Books and supplies/personal expenses: The calculation of all subcategories for books and supplies and personal expenses now only include positive responses. Thus, if a student reported that they did not have an expense in a particular category, that zero would not be reflected in the average.

The steering committee wanted to provide for an allowance that would be adequate for anyone incurring a given expense. For example, with healthcare expenses not covered by insurance, the committee wanted an allowance that represented 100 percent of the average expense, not 80 percent of the average expense when including those who reported no healthcare expense at all.

- Augmenting off-campus rent responses with HUD data: Calculation of off-campus rent now incorporates the fair market rent amounts produced by HUD in cases where the HUD value exceeds the amount of off-campus rent a student reported in the COAS:23. Students were assigned a HUD housing type and rental value based on the number of housemates and roommates they reported on the COAS:23; if the HUD calculation was higher than the figure reported on COAS:23, the survey figure was replaced by the HUD amount in the calculation of off-campus living costs. The fair market rent figures were drawn from the zip codes surrounding each campus within a five-mile radius.
- Augmenting reported grocery cost with USDA amount: Calculation of grocery costs for on- and off-campus students who do not have a meal plan now incorporates the moderate USDA amount for monthly grocery expenditure as a floor. If students report an amount on the COAS:23 that is below the USDA amount, the latter will become the replacement value for calculation of the budgets.
- Administrative data replaced survey data: Based on a recommendation from the total cost of attendance working group, in 2018–19 the EFM steering committee began using administrative data collected from campuses to create an allowance for course materials and technology fees.



## 2023 COST OF ATTENDANCE SURVEY (COAS:23)

Financial aid and institutional research staff at UC campuses and the Office of the President originally developed the cost of attendance survey in the late 1990s. Since then, the delivery method has moved to a fully online instrument. The questions have also evolved as the elements of the cost of attendance have changed (e.g., cell phones, tablets, interactive learning devices).

### STUDENT FOCUS GROUPS AND INSTRUMENT VETTING

In preparation for COAS:23, staff followed recommendations from the total cost of attendance working group to solicit feedback from students and survey experts regarding the survey instrument. Student Financial Support staff met with student groups from two campuses — Berkeley and Santa Barbara — to review survey questions and discuss interpretations and to welcome suggestions for improving the survey. Some of the suggestions offered by students were incorporated into the survey, including:

- Revise the dollar-range answer options for questions relating to rent, groceries, phones and computers.
- Prioritize homework/tutorial subscription cost in the question regarding educational costs.
- Collapse all hourly wage options less than minimum wage into a *less than minimum wage* category.

In addition to student feedback, staff also convened a systemwide workgroup of campus colleagues from housing, registrar, financial aid and institutional research to review and discuss the survey instrument. Additional changes based on campus colleague recommendations included:

- Increase the selection ranges for most categories to account for cost-of-living increases.
- Move cleaning supplies, paper goods and other non-food items from the grocery category to the personal items category.
- Combine computer and tablet questions.

### ADMINISTERING COAS:23

For COAS:23, UCOP revised the sample methodology to capture a larger proportion of the student body. The prior COAS cycles drew about 25 percent of students from each housing type; this year that share increased to 35 percent. Additionally, UCOP invited all independent students to take the survey, to better inform its understanding of the unique spending habits of that population, which constitutes 6 percent of all undergraduates. These changes resulted in a sample size of 84,000 students, twice as large as previous COAS.

In April 2023, all UC vice chancellors for Student Affairs sent the sampled students on their campuses an email message informing them that they had been selected to participate in the survey, emphasizing the importance of their participation and encouraging them to respond to the survey when they received the invitation. UCOP staff sent the entire survey sample an email invitation with personalized links and login information for the web-based survey. Sampled students received weekly reminder emails, signed by the vice chancellors.

UCOP offered systemwide incentive prizes to encourage participation over the course of 10 weeks while the survey was open. Once a student completed the survey, they were entered into weekly drawings for the gift cards and grand prize. The earlier a student completed the survey, the more opportunities they had to win one of the prizes.

A few weeks into the survey administration, response rates at some campuses were lagging behind other campuses; additional messaging and campus-specific incentive prizes were employed to help boost rates. All campuses achieved the minimum 25 percent response rate.

**TABLE 1: COAS Response Rates, 2005–06 to 2022–23**

Campus	2005–06	2009–10	2012–13	2015–16	2018–19	2020–21	2022–23
Berkeley	48%	58%	40%	48%	38%	36%	28%
Davis	55%	62%	40%	38%	41%	37%	30%
Irvine	62%	46%	44%	49%	33%	24%	27%
Los Angeles	57%	46%	27%	39%	35%	30%	29%
Merced		63%	46%	45%	40%	37%	32%
Riverside	49%	42%	36%	42%	34%	31%	25%
San Diego	49%	54%	46%	31%	35%	29%	30%
Santa Barbara	48%	59%	38%	44%	34%	26%	30%
Santa Cruz	48%	45%	38%	39%	34%	28%	26%
Systemwide	52%	52%	39%	42%	36%	30%	28%

Twenty-eight percent, or 21,822 of the 76,571 students, in the main COAS sample (not including the oversampling of independent students) submitted a complete or nearly complete survey. Systemwide, response rates were two points lower than for the 2021 survey and eight points lower than for the 2019 survey, following a trend in declining response rates also seen for other systemwide surveys (see Table 1). Nonetheless, COAS:23 response rates exceed those of other major student surveys, and the numbers of respondents were sufficient for estimating expense budgets with the requisite level of precision at each campus (see Table 2).

**TABLE 2: Sample Sizes and Response Rates by Housing**

Campus	On campus			Off campus and Commuter			All Students		
	Invited	Responded	Rate	Invited	Responded	Rate	Invited	Responded	Rate
Berkeley	3,119	1,110	36%	7,633	1,917	25%	10,752	3,027	28%
Davis*	2,550	980	38%	4,582	1,417	31%	10,606	3,167	30%
Irvine	3,919	1,268	32%	4,965	1,145	23%	8,884	2,413	27%
Los Angeles	4,674	1,578	34%	6,380	1,645	26%	11,054	3,223	29%
Merced	1,336	446	33%	1,357	410	30%	2,693	856	32%
Riverside	2,737	742	27%	4,979	1,203	24%	7,716	1,945	25%
San Diego	4,289	1,683	39%	6,836	1,620	24%	11,125	3,303	30%
Santa Barbara	3,029	1,107	37%	4,781	1,225	26%	7,810	2,332	30%
Santa Cruz	3,041	966	32%	2,890	590	20%	5,931	1,556	26%
<b>System</b>	<b>28,694</b>	<b>9,880</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>44,403</b>	<b>11,172</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>76,571</b>	<b>21,822</b>	<b>28%</b>

\*Some records for this campus had missing housing data. Unknown housing is included in "all students" totals.

The breakdown of COAS:23 respondents resemble the overall UC undergraduate population, however, variances in a couple of categories have widened compared with COAS:19. For example, respondents were more likely to be female, a trend seen for several survey cycles, and the gender gap increased by another



two percentage points from COAS:19. Also, respondents are more heavily underclassmen, with senior-level students responding at about eight percent below their representation overall. When appropriate, differences between respondents were corrected through weighting their responses. This comparison suggests that COAS:23 respondents constitute a representative sample of UC undergraduate students (see Table 3).

**TABLE 3: 2022–23 Population versus COAS:23 Respondents**

<b>Student Level</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Respondents</b>
Freshman	17.7%	21.4%
Sophomore	19.2%	21.0%
Junior	26.7%	28.8%
Senior	36.4%	28.8%
<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Respondents</b>
African American	4.5%	4.4%
Asian American	46.5%	43.7%
Chicano/Latino	23.5%	26.7%
Native American	1.6%	1.8%
White	20.4%	20.5%
Other	3.5%	3.0%
<b>Gender</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Respondents</b>
Female	54.0%	64.8%
Male	46.0%	35.2%
<b>Parent income</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Respondents</b>
Dependent		
Less than \$60K	29.7%	33.8%
\$60K-\$120K	19.6%	20.2%
\$120K-\$200K	16.7%	15.9%
\$200K or more	27.8%	23.2%
Independent	6.2%	6.9%

## FINDINGS

### *LIVING ARRANGEMENTS AND EXPENSES*

Questions on the COAS are designed to gain an understanding of not only how much students pay for rent, but the living situation that corresponds with the reported amount. The survey includes questions about housing type, number of roommates and how far respondents live from campus. This information allows staff to understand, for example, if a lower-than-average reported cost may be associated with a high number of roommates sharing a space. The following tables detail the COAS:23 living arrangement and expense data.



In addition to a shift in the housing-type percents, COAS:23 revealed that more students are opting to not share a bedroom. Table 6a shows the percent of off-campus students by bedroom sharing and 6b shows how the trend in sharing a bedroom has shifted since COAS:19. Those trends include:

- A 16 percent increase in students who do not share a bedroom, to 50 percent.
- An increase in the percent of students who do not share a bedroom at all campuses except for Merced and Santa Cruz

**TABLE 6a: Percent of Off-Campus Respondents by Number of Roommates (share bedroom)**

	System-wide	Campus								
		Berkeley	Davis	Irvine	Los Angeles	Merced	Riverside	San Diego	Santa Barbara	Santa Cruz
<b>Number of Roommates</b>										
None	50%	48%	51%	51%	53%	29%	79%	76%	51%	21%
One	44%	44%	44%	45%	40%	56%	18%	19%	44%	62%
Two +	6%	7%	6%	4%	7%	15%	3%	5%	6%	17%
<i>All students</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>100%</i>

**TABLE 6b: Percent Change in Bedroom Sharing from 2019 to 2023**

	System-wide	Campus								
		Berkeley	Davis	Irvine	Los Angeles	Merced	Riverside	San Diego	Santa Barbara	Santa Cruz
<b>Number of Roommates</b>										
None	16%	17%	8%	26%	35%	-35%	13%	35%	34%	-21%
One	-7%	-9%	-7%	-2%	-11%	24%	-10%	-35%	-17%	13%
Two +	-9%	-7%	-1%	-24%	-24%	11%	-3%	0%	-17%	8%

That fewer students are choosing to share a bedroom is likely a contributing factor in why the rent averages reported on the COAS:23 are substantially higher than the consumer price index (CPI)-adjusted COAS:19 amounts. While changes to student living patterns may be one reason rental averages have increased beyond inflation-adjusted estimates, another factor may be that the rent-specific CPI used is a blend of San Francisco and Los Angeles markets. Housing costs in those two regions did not increase at the same rate as many of the other regions where UC campuses are located; for example, Merced, Riverside, Irvine and San Diego all saw large housing cost increases in the wake of the COVID pandemic. Table 7a shows the average rent reported by roommate number and campus on the COAS:23 and Table 7b shows the percent change in average rent compared to the COAS:19 (inflation adjusted to 2023 dollars).

**TABLE 7a: Average Off-campus Rent, by Number of Roommates (share bedroom) and Campus**

	System-wide	Campus								
		Berkeley	Davis	Irvine	Los Angeles	Merced	Riverside	San Diego	Santa Barbara	Santa Cruz
<b>Number of Roommates</b>										
None	\$1,277	\$1,478	\$1,089	\$1,323	\$1,592	\$760	\$967	\$1,334	\$1,510	\$1,404
One	\$1,001	\$1,140	\$741	\$1,072	\$1,110	\$712	\$851	\$1,006	\$1,002	\$1,116
Two +	\$1,003	\$1,074	\$814	\$1,137	\$970	\$1,055	\$882	\$979	\$1,019	\$1,000
<i>None or 1 Roommate</i>	\$1,145	\$1,321	\$925	\$1,215	\$1,275	\$750	\$943	\$1,182	\$1,130	\$1,269
<i>All students</i>	\$1,134	\$1,307	\$921	\$1,209	\$1,229	\$760	\$940	\$1,170	\$1,111	\$1,254

**TABLE 7b: Percent Change in Rent from 2019 to 2023 (constant dollars)**

	System-wide	Campus								
		Berkeley	Davis	Irvine	Los Angeles	Merced	Riverside	San Diego	Santa Barbara	Santa Cruz
<b>Number of Roommates</b>										
None	20%	4%	19%	23%	13%	44%	22%	26%	28%	20%
One	20%	12%	20%	30%	9%	76%	41%	32%	16%	21%
Two +	22%	11%	38%	54%	3%	119%	30%	32%	30%	17%
<i>None or 1 Roommate</i>	26%	16%	24%	35%	14%	55%	29%	35%	24%	25%
<i>All students</i>	24%	15%	24%	39%	15%	56%	28%	32%	23%	23%

- The systemwide average rent is \$1,134 for all students and \$1,145 for students who share a bedroom with one or no roommates.
- Overall average rent increased by 24 percent from COAS:19 to COAS:23.
- Increases ranged significantly by campus, from 15 percent at Berkeley and Los Angeles to 56 percent at Merced.
- Surprisingly, some of the largest percent increases were reported for students sharing a bedroom with two or more students. UCOP does not include data for students reporting two or more roommates in its calculation of the standard methodology budgets under the assumption that these students may be experiencing financial distress.

One measure of quality of housing is how far a student must travel to get to campus. The percent of students who reported living more than ten miles from campus increased from COAS:19 to COAS:23 from 6 to 12 percent. UCOP tested the hypothesis that students were moving farther from campus to secure more space and lower rents. While a greater percent of students who live more than 10 miles from campus do not share a bedroom, those who live farther away reported higher rents across all campuses (except Irvine) and

all roommate scenarios. In other words, cost does not appear to be the primary factor for students living a greater distance from campus. Table 7c shows the percent of off-campus students who live within 10 miles of campus and the average rent amounts for those within and outside of 10 miles from campus.

**TABLE 7c: COAS:23 Average Off-campus Rent, <=10 miles and >10 Miles from Campus**

	System-wide	Campus								
		Berkeley	Davis	Irvine	Los Angeles	Merced	Riverside	San Diego	Santa Barbara	Santa Cruz
% <10 miles	87.8%	90.3%	89.4%	81.4%	83.4%	91.9%	79.7%	84.1%	96.6%	89.4%
Rent	\$1,152	\$1,338	\$964	\$1,257	\$1,264	\$761	\$982	\$1,190	\$1,122	\$1,266
% >10 miles	12.2%	9.7%	10.6%	18.6%	16.6%	8.1%	20.3%	15.9%	3.4%	10.6%
Rent	\$1,290	\$1,465	\$1,193	\$1,170	\$1,368	\$904	\$1,175	\$1,334	\$1,285	\$1,450

Table 8 shows the average monthly amount that off-campus and commuter students spend on rent, utilities and groceries. Not all commuter students report expenses in rent, utilities and grocery categories; Table 9 shows the percent of commuter students by family income who report these costs.

**TABLE 8: Average Monthly Rent, Utilities and Groceries Expenses for Commuter and Off-campus Students (2022–23 dollars)**

	COAS:19	COAS:23	DIFFERENCE COAS:19 to COAS:23	
			Dollars	Percent
<b>Off-campus</b>				
Rent	\$914	\$1,134	\$220	24%
Utilities	\$68	\$84	\$16	23%
Groceries	\$305	\$386	\$81	27%
<b>Commuter</b>				
Rent	\$322	\$407	\$85	27%
Utilities	\$53	\$64	\$11	21%
Groceries	\$221	\$274	\$53	24%

- For off-campus students, rent increased by 24 percent and groceries by 27 percent.
- For commuter students, rent increased by 27 percent, utilities by 21 percent and groceries by 24 percent.
- The off-campus grocery average is nearly equal to the USDA moderate amount.

**TABLE 9: Percent of Commuter Students Reporting Rent, Utilities or Groceries Expenses, by Parent Income**

	<i>All commuters</i>	<i>Parent Income</i>				
		<i>Less than \$60,000</i>	<i>\$60,000-\$120,000</i>	<i>\$120,000 - \$200,000</i>	<i>\$200,000 or more</i>	<i>Independent</i>
Pays rent	52%	60%	49%	33%	38%	77%
Pays utilities	54%	63%	51%	36%	38%	76%
Pays groceries	74%	80%	73%	63%	64%	92%

- About half (52 percent) of all commuter students report paying rent and (54 percent) utilities.
- A larger percentage of lower-income commuter students pay rent, utilities and groceries than their higher-income counterparts.

**TABLE 10: Average Monthly Snacks and Meals-out Expenses (2023 Dollars)**

	<i>COAS:19</i>	<i>COAS:23</i>	<i>DIFFERENCE</i>	
			<i>COAS:21 to COAS:23</i>	
			<i>Dollars</i>	<i>Percent</i>
All Students	\$194	\$226	\$32	16%
Commuter	\$194	\$231	\$37	19%
On-campus	\$164	\$196	\$32	19%
Off-campus	\$199	\$230	\$31	15%

- Adjusting for inflation, the snacks and meals-out cost reported by students increased 16 percent from that reported on COAS:19.
- The increased availability of food delivery, with fees and tipping, may be contributing to the increase in the snacks and meals category.

**TRANSPORTATION**

Since the pandemic, transportation trends shifted for some campuses. A larger percentage of students living farther away from campus, combined with greater parking availability because of remote work for campus staff, has resulted in an increase in car use in place of other modes of transportation. These trends contributed to the larger transportation costs reported on COAS:19.



**TABLE 11: Percent of Students Owning Motor Vehicles, COAS:19 to COAS:23**

Campus	All Students			On-campus			Off-campus		
	COAS:19	COAS:21	COAS:23	COAS:19	COAS:21	COAS:23	COAS:19	COAS:21	COAS:23
Berkeley	21%	21%	22%	7%	21%	8%	27%	48%	27%
Davis	47%	48%	46%	38%	36%	18%	49%	68%	59%
Irvine	64%	57%	69%	31%	53%	33%	66%	81%	79%
Los Angeles	31%	30%	26%	15%	43%	14%	43%	65%	44%
Merced	50%	55%	50%	18%	34%	24%	78%	75%	78%
Riverside	58%	62%	58%	32%	45%	30%	78%	81%	75%
San Diego	43%	48%	50%	22%	39%	23%	64%	73%	68%
Santa Barbara	44%	41%	40%	21%	52%	25%	53%	64%	52%
Santa Cruz	37%	44%	47%	23%	47%	26%	67%	70%	69%
Systemwide	43%	43%	44%	21%	42%	21%	55%	68%	59%

- COAS:21 data is included here but is considered anomalous due to living and commuting changes caused by the pandemic.
- Systemwide, the proportion of students reporting they have a car is the same for students living on campus, but the off-campus population owning a car increased by four percent since 2019. Car ownership varies by campus, ranging from 22 percent at Berkeley to 69 percent at Irvine and ranging for students living off-campus from 27 percent at Berkeley to 79 percent at Irvine.
- Since 2019, trends in car ownership by off-campus students have increased the most at Irvine and Davis (by 13 percent and 10 percent) and have decreased at Riverside and Santa Barbara (by 3 percent and 1 percent).

**TABLE 12: Average Vehicle Expenses (in 2023 dollars)**

	COAS:19	COAS:21	COAS:23	DIFFERENCE COAS:19 to COAS:23	
				Dollars	Percent
Vehicle payment (per month)	\$79	\$149	\$173	\$94	118%
Insurance and registration (per academic year)	\$515	\$1,067	\$1,000	\$485	94%
Vehicle maintenance (per academic year)	\$89	\$372	\$347	\$258	291%
Gas and parking for local travel (per month)	\$80	\$58	\$173	\$93	115%

- Table 12 shows reported vehicle-related expenses by survey year. Vehicle payments are not included in the standard methodology budgets per federal regulations; however, COAS tracks these expenses since they are part of the cost structure that students face.
- Since 2019 there have been substantial percent increases in vehicle costs.

**TABLE 13: Percent of Students Reporting Mode of Transportation and Percent Change from COAS:19**

	Walk	% Change	Drive	% Change	Bike or Scooter	% Change	Public Trans.	% Change	Car or Ride Share	% Change
Berkeley	84%	-4%	27%	0%	21%	3%	69%	-6%	26%	-30%
Davis	61%	-10%	59%	10%	45%	-17%	59%	-8%	15%	-16%
Irvine	36%	-20%	79%	13%	11%	-9%	15%	-17%	15%	-9%
Los Angeles	76%	-5%	44%	1%	24%	12%	34%	-1%	20%	-32%
Merced	23%	-10%	78%	0%	13%	-1%	33%	-21%	18%	-5%
Riverside	40%	-15%	75%	-3%	16%	-2%	16%	-13%	13%	-1%
San Diego	50%	-6%	68%	4%	17%	0%	68%	-9%	20%	-30%
Santa Barbara	76%	0%	52%	-1%	59%	-11%	30%	-4%	14%	-9%
Santa Cruz	52%	-14%	69%	2%	18%	-5%	72%	-13%	22%	-13%
System	58%	-10%	59%	4%	26%	-5%	45%	-9%	18%	-18%

- Table 13 shows the modes of transportation students are using and the change since 2019; systemwide, as car use has increased by 4 percent, the percent of students who report walking, biking, using public transportation or ride sharing has declined.
- Students reported a decline in all modes of transportation. In 2019, the largest percent of students reported that they use three different modes of transportation to get to campus; in 2023 the largest percent of student reported using two modes of transportation. This explains why Riverside and Santa Barbara show declines in all modes of transportation.

**TABLE 14: Annual Expense for Non-Vehicle Transportation**

	Public transit	Ride/Carshare	Bike/Scooter
Commuter	\$601	\$1,838	\$93
On Campus	\$153	\$447	\$34
Off Campus	\$213	\$427	\$160
All students	\$206	\$476	\$85

- Table 14 shows average annual expenses for non-vehicle transportation by housing type, with the reported *all students* average for public transit at \$206, ride/carshare at \$476 and the bike/scooter cost at \$85. Commuter students have non-vehicle transportation costs that are two to three times higher than on-campus or off-campus students.

**PERSONAL, ENTERTAINMENT AND INCIDENTALS**

The category of personal expenses includes clothing and incidentals (shoes, laundry, toiletries, hair care, cleaning supplies, toilet paper and other household necessities), entertainment and recreation, and healthcare costs that are not covered by insurance. The personal expense category is believed to be more elastic than other cost categories, with greater fluctuation in spending, depending on resources. Some change in reported costs may be attributed to revision of the clothing and incidentals questions to include

more items like cleaning supplies and toilet paper, which in previous surveys were included in the grocery expense question.

**TABLE 15: Average Monthly Personal Expenses**

	COAS:19	COAS:21	COAS:23	DIFFERENCE	
				COAS:19 to COAS:23	
				Dollars	Percent
<b>All Students</b>					
Clothing and incidentals	\$71	\$68	\$101	\$30	43%
Entertainment and recreation	\$70	\$59	\$88	\$18	26%
Health care costs not covered by insurance	\$24	\$27	\$34	\$10	42%
<b>Commuter</b>					
Clothing and incidentals	\$83	\$64	\$109	\$26	32%
Entertainment and recreation	\$74	\$56	\$88	\$14	18%
Health care costs not covered by insurance	\$24	\$24	\$31	\$7	29%
<b>On campus</b>					
Clothing and incidentals	\$67	\$69	\$95	\$28	41%
Entertainment and recreation	\$65	\$60	\$85	\$20	31%
Health care costs not covered by insurance	\$23	\$27	\$33	\$10	45%
<b>Off campus</b>					
Clothing and incidentals	\$71	\$73	\$105	\$34	48%
Entertainment and recreation	\$72	\$63	\$91	\$19	26%
Health care costs not covered by insurance	\$24	\$30	\$35	\$11	46%

- Table 15 shows that personal expenses increased in every category and for all housing types between COAS:19 and COAS:23; this is a reversal in trend from surveys prior to and including COAS:19, where personal expenses steadily declined each survey year in all categories.
- Reported amounts for clothing and incidentals and healthcare not covered by insurance increased by the largest percent (43 percent and 42 percent, respectively) and entertainment costs increased by 26 percent.
- On average, off-campus students spend the most on personal expenses and on-campus students spend the least; the difference between the two is about \$18 per month.

**TABLE 16: Average Personal Expenses, by Parental Income and Gender**

	<i>Systemwide</i>		
	<i>Clothing and incidentals</i>	<i>Entertainment and recreation</i>	<i>Health care costs not covered by insurance</i>
<b>Parent Income</b>			
Less than \$60,000	\$105	\$86	\$31
\$60,000-\$120,000	\$99	\$86	\$33
\$120,000 to \$200,000	\$94	\$87	\$32
\$200,000 or more	\$90	\$91	\$34
Independent	\$139	\$101	\$52
<b>Gender</b>			
Female	\$107	\$92	\$35
Male	\$91	\$90	\$30
<b>All students</b>	\$102	\$91	\$33

- As shown in Table 16, independent students spend more on clothing, incidentals and health care than their dependent student counterparts.
- While higher-income students reported slightly higher entertainment and health expenses, the lowest-income students reported spending more on clothing and incidentals.
- Female students spent more in all categories than male students.

**BOOKS AND SUPPLIES**

The books and supplies section of COAS:23 asked students to report expenses for textbooks, supplies (including educational subscriptions, interactive clickers, and art supplies), computer hardware and software, and computer or tablet purchases. The survey does not ask students to report course material or laboratory fees, which is data collected directly from the campuses.

**TABLE 17: Average Annual Expenses for Textbooks and Educational Supplies**

	<i>COAS:19</i>	<i>COAS:21</i>	<i>COAS:23</i>	<i>DIFFERENCE COAS:19 to COAS:23</i>	
				<i>Dollars</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<b>All students</b>					
Textbooks	\$514	\$457	\$386	(\$128)	-25%
Supplies	\$139	\$152	\$262	\$123	88%
Additional computer hardware	\$271	\$335	\$324	\$53	19%
Educational software	\$103	\$93	\$115	\$12	12%

**TABLE 18: Percent of Students Incurring Expenses for Selected Supplies**

	<b>2019</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>2023</b>
Purchased a new computer	29%	31%	44%
Purchased a tablet	11%	20%	27%
Any additional computer hardware purchases	19%	23%	17%
Any educational software purchases	20%	22%	21%

- As Table 17 shows, all books and supplies categories, apart from textbooks, increased between 2019 and 2023.
- Reported textbooks expenses continue to decline, a consistent trend over the last decade of COAS.
- The significant increase in supplies expenses may be attributed to an increase in the use of subscription services and required technology for classes.
- Table 18 shows the percentage of students who reported they had purchased a computer, tablet, hardware or software in the current academic year. There was a large jump (from 29 percent in 2019 to 44 percent) of students who reported they purchased a computer; similarly, those reporting a tablet purchase increased from 11 percent to 27 percent. Changes in software and hardware purchases were very small.

*WORK*

The survey asks students about work in which they receive pay for during the academic year, including the weekly number of hours, duration of the academic term, and the wage they receive. If a student does not report paid work, they are asked the reason for not working; Table 19 breaks down these responses.

**TABLE 19: Student Work During the Academic Year**

	<b>COAS 2019</b>	<b>COAS 2021</b>	<b>COAS 2023</b>
<b>Any Paid Work During the Academic Year</b>			
Yes	59%	52%	58%
No	41%	48%	42%
<b>Weeks worked</b>			
All	46%	43%	46%
Most	30%	30%	29%
Half	10%	11%	11%
Less than half	14%	16%	14%
<b>Hours worked per week</b>			
Did not work	42%	48%	42%
1 to 10 hours	20%	16%	18%
11 to 20 hours	29%	21%	28%
> 20 hours	10%	15%	11%
<b>Average hours worked per week</b>	16	17	16
<b>Average hourly wage</b>	\$17	\$17	\$18
<b>Average total earnings</b>	\$5,185	\$7,240	\$6,573
<b>Reason not working, if no work</b>			
Could not find a job	15%	22%	17%
School work did not allow time for a job	56%	46%	53%
Family obligations did not allow time for a job	4%	11%	6%
Did not need the additional income	14%	13%	14%
Did not want to work	10%	8%	10%

- Students reported a return to pre-pandemic work patterns in the COAS:23, with 58 percent of respondents reporting they work for pay.
- Seventy-five percent of students reported working all or most weeks of the academic year and averaged 16 hours per week.
- Students reported an average hourly wage of \$18 and estimated their total earnings for the year to be about \$6,570.
- Most students who did not work cited that their schoolwork did not allow time for a job.



*SENDING MONEY HOME*

Concerns about food and housing insecurity have been at the forefront of policy discussions in California, including reports of students sending money home to help support their parents. Therefore, since the COAS:19, the question “Do you send money to parents or siblings to assist with family expenses?” has been included in the survey.

**TABLE 20: Percent of Students Sending Money Home by Campus**

<b>Campus</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2023</b>	<b>Difference</b>
Berkeley	16%	20%	4%
Davis	16%	15%	-1%
Irvine	23%	22%	-1%
Los Angeles	18%	19%	1%
Merced	27%	29%	2%
Riverside	28%	29%	1%
San Diego	17%	20%	3%
Santa Barbara	15%	14%	-1%
Santa Cruz	18%	18%	1%
Systemwide	20%	20%	0%

- Twenty percent of UC students reported sending money home to their families; this amount is unchanged since the 2019 survey.
- The proportion of students sending money home varies by campus, from a low of 14 percent at Santa Barbara to a high of 29 percent at Merced and Riverside.
- Preliminary analysis shows that students from low-income or underrepresented backgrounds are more likely to send money home. Additional analysis is being conducted on these results.

**OTHER DATA SOURCES**

The EFM Steering Committee compares the results of COAS with other data sources.

- As mentioned above, the food allowance was compared with USDA allowances for men and women. The COAS:23 results are nearly equal to the moderate USDA food plan amount for the typical age range of UC students.
- As mentioned in the section entitled Estimating Costs and Setting Student Expense Budgets at UC, HUD rents replace those reported by students on COAS:23 if the self-reported amounts are lower than the fair market rents for the same or similar housing circumstance (i.e., housemates and roommates).

## Appendix: 2023-24 Student Expense Budgets

Table 1 in this appendix uses the COAS:23 data to create hypothetical standard methodology budgets for 2023–24. Tables 2 and 3 compare these figures with those based on the COAS:19, adjusted for inflation.

<b>2023-24 Standard Methodology Budgets</b>										
<b>Table 1. Standard Methodology Budgets</b>										
	Berkeley	Davis	Irvine	Los Angeles	Merced	Riverside	San Diego	Santa Barbara	Santa Cruz	Systemwide
<b>COMMUTER</b>										
Books and Supplies	\$1,163	\$1,423	\$1,505	\$1,667	\$1,075	\$1,605	\$1,323	\$1,414	\$1,226	\$1,406
Living	\$8,206	\$8,206	\$8,206	\$8,206	\$8,206	\$8,206	\$8,206	\$8,206	\$8,206	\$8,206
Personal	\$2,608	\$2,608	\$2,608	\$2,608	\$2,608	\$2,608	\$2,608	\$2,608	\$2,608	\$2,608
Transportation	\$2,482	\$2,482	\$2,482	\$2,482	\$2,482	\$2,482	\$2,482	\$2,482	\$2,482	\$2,482
Healthcare	\$3,858	\$3,117	\$2,185	\$3,202	\$2,265	\$2,090	\$2,257	\$3,192	\$3,141	\$2,470
Total non-fee expenses	\$18,317	\$17,836	\$16,986	\$18,165	\$16,636	\$16,991	\$16,876	\$17,902	\$17,663	\$17,171
Systemwide fees	\$13,089	\$13,089	\$13,089	\$13,089	\$13,089	\$13,089	\$13,089	\$13,089	\$13,089	\$13,089
Campus fees	\$1,803	\$2,154	\$1,237	\$697	\$1,087	\$1,169	\$2,215	\$1,913	\$1,560	\$1,430
Total fees for residents	\$14,892	\$15,243	\$14,326	\$13,786	\$14,176	\$14,258	\$15,304	\$15,002	\$14,649	\$14,519
<b>TOTAL BUDGET</b>	<b>\$33,209</b>	<b>\$33,079</b>	<b>\$31,312</b>	<b>\$31,951</b>	<b>\$30,812</b>	<b>\$31,249</b>	<b>\$32,180</b>	<b>\$32,904</b>	<b>\$32,312</b>	<b>\$31,691</b>
# students	1,620	2,644	10,422	2,630	1,141	7,102	4,265	495	712	31,031
% of campus	5%	8%	36%	8%	13%	30%	13%	2%	4%	13%
<b>ON-CAMPUS</b>										
Books and Supplies	\$1,163	\$1,423	\$1,505	\$1,667	\$1,075	\$1,605	\$1,323	\$1,414	\$1,226	\$1,406
Living	\$23,009	\$18,867	\$18,801	\$17,756	\$20,767	\$20,003	\$17,736	\$19,412	\$19,334	\$19,155
Personal	\$2,319	\$2,115	\$2,219	\$2,294	\$2,320	\$2,462	\$2,296	\$2,208	\$2,253	\$2,276
Transportation	\$755	\$876	\$881	\$793	\$967	\$977	\$962	\$941	\$1,051	\$897
Healthcare	\$3,858	\$3,117	\$2,185	\$3,202	\$2,265	\$2,090	\$2,257	\$3,192	\$3,141	\$2,877
Total non-fee expenses	\$31,104	\$26,398	\$25,591	\$25,712	\$27,394	\$27,137	\$24,574	\$27,167	\$27,005	\$26,611
Systemwide fees	\$13,089	\$13,089	\$13,089	\$13,089	\$13,089	\$13,089	\$13,089	\$13,089	\$13,089	\$13,089
Campus fees	\$1,803	\$2,154	\$1,237	\$697	\$1,087	\$1,169	\$2,215	\$1,913	\$1,560	\$1,526
Total fees for residents	\$14,892	\$15,243	\$14,326	\$13,786	\$14,176	\$14,258	\$15,304	\$15,002	\$14,649	\$14,615
<b>TOTAL BUDGET</b>	<b>\$45,996</b>	<b>\$41,641</b>	<b>\$39,917</b>	<b>\$39,498</b>	<b>\$41,570</b>	<b>\$41,395</b>	<b>\$39,878</b>	<b>\$42,169</b>	<b>\$41,654</b>	<b>\$41,226</b>
# students	9,122	9,982	6,431	19,180	4,100	8,443	14,710	8,746	8,846	89,560
% of campus	27%	31%	22%	58%	48%	36%	44%	37%	49%	38%
<b>OFF-CAMPUS</b>										
Books and Supplies	\$1,163	\$1,423	\$1,505	\$1,667	\$1,075	\$1,605	\$1,323	\$1,414	\$1,226	\$1,406
Living	\$19,248	\$15,261	\$19,215	\$18,797	\$13,153	\$15,479	\$18,607	\$17,181	\$18,782	\$17,683
Personal	\$2,500	\$2,239	\$2,472	\$2,411	\$2,390	\$2,576	\$2,440	\$2,373	\$2,317	\$2,409
Transportation	\$1,091	\$1,471	\$2,222	\$1,494	\$2,453	\$2,430	\$2,000	\$1,420	\$1,961	\$1,676
Healthcare	\$3,858	\$3,117	\$2,185	\$3,202	\$2,265	\$2,090	\$2,257	\$3,192	\$3,141	\$2,972
Total non-fee expenses	\$27,860	\$23,511	\$27,599	\$27,571	\$21,336	\$24,180	\$26,627	\$25,580	\$27,427	\$26,146
Systemwide fees	\$13,089	\$13,089	\$13,089	\$13,089	\$13,089	\$13,089	\$13,089	\$13,089	\$13,089	\$13,089
Campus fees	\$1,803	\$2,154	\$1,237	\$697	\$1,087	\$1,169	\$2,215	\$1,913	\$1,560	\$1,685
Total fees for residents	\$14,892	\$15,243	\$14,326	\$13,786	\$14,176	\$14,258	\$15,304	\$15,002	\$14,649	\$14,774
<b>TOTAL BUDGET</b>	<b>\$42,752</b>	<b>\$38,754</b>	<b>\$41,925</b>	<b>\$41,357</b>	<b>\$35,512</b>	<b>\$38,438</b>	<b>\$41,931</b>	<b>\$40,582</b>	<b>\$42,076</b>	<b>\$40,920</b>
# students	22,533	19,431	12,253	11,283	3,259	8,180	14,774	14,645	8,514	114,872
% of campus	68%	61%	42%	34%	38%	34%	44%	61%	47%	49%
<b>ALL STUDENTS</b>										
Books and Supplies	\$1,163	\$1,423	\$1,505	\$1,667	\$1,075	\$1,605	\$1,323	\$1,414	\$1,226	\$1,406
Living	\$19,741	\$15,802	\$15,182	\$17,352	\$16,162	\$14,912	\$16,913	\$17,812	\$18,636	\$16,994
Personal	\$2,456	\$2,231	\$2,465	\$2,359	\$2,385	\$2,545	\$2,398	\$2,317	\$2,297	\$2,385
Transportation	\$1,067	\$1,369	\$2,019	\$1,166	\$1,740	\$1,928	\$1,608	\$1,267	\$1,536	\$1,486
Healthcare	\$3,858	\$3,117	\$2,185	\$3,202	\$2,265	\$2,090	\$2,257	\$3,192	\$3,141	\$2,870
Total non-fee expenses	\$28,285	\$23,942	\$23,356	\$25,746	\$23,627	\$23,080	\$24,499	\$26,002	\$26,836	\$25,141
Systemwide fees	\$13,089	\$13,089	\$13,089	\$13,089	\$13,089	\$13,089	\$13,089	\$13,089	\$13,089	\$13,089
Campus fees	\$1,803	\$2,154	\$1,237	\$697	\$1,087	\$1,169	\$2,215	\$1,913	\$1,560	\$1,591
Total fees for residents	\$14,892	\$15,243	\$14,326	\$13,786	\$14,176	\$14,258	\$15,304	\$15,002	\$14,649	\$14,680
<b>TOTAL BUDGET</b>	<b>\$43,177</b>	<b>\$39,185</b>	<b>\$37,682</b>	<b>\$39,532</b>	<b>\$37,803</b>	<b>\$37,338</b>	<b>\$39,803</b>	<b>\$41,004</b>	<b>\$41,485</b>	<b>\$39,821</b>
# students	33,275	32,057	29,106	33,093	8,500	23,725	33,749	23,886	18,072	235,463
% of campus	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

<b>2023-24 Standard Methodology Budgets</b>										
<b>Table 2. Dollar Difference Between 2023-24 (COAS19) and 2023-24 (COAS23) Standard Methodology Budgets</b>										
	Berkeley	Davis	Irvine	Los Angeles	Merced	Riverside	San Diego	Santa Barbara	Santa Cruz	Systemwide
<b>COMMUTER</b>										
Books & supplies	(\$110)	\$42	(\$45)	\$93	(\$139)	(\$143)	\$16	(\$68)	(\$89)	(\$33)
Living	\$492	\$492	\$492	\$492	\$492	\$492	\$492	\$492	\$492	\$492
Personal	\$558	\$558	\$558	\$558	\$558	\$558	\$558	\$558	\$558	\$558
Transportation	\$206	\$206	\$206	\$206	\$206	\$206	\$206	\$206	\$206	\$206
Healthcare	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$4)
Total non-fee expenses	\$1,146	\$1,298	\$1,211	\$1,349	\$1,117	\$1,113	\$1,272	\$1,188	\$1,167	\$1,218
Systemwide fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Campus fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$17
Total fees for residents	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$17
<b>TOTAL BUDGET</b>	<b>\$1,146</b>	<b>\$1,298</b>	<b>\$1,211</b>	<b>\$1,349</b>	<b>\$1,117</b>	<b>\$1,113</b>	<b>\$1,272</b>	<b>\$1,188</b>	<b>\$1,167</b>	<b>\$1,236</b>
<b>ON-CAMPUS</b>										
Books & supplies	(\$110)	\$42	(\$45)	\$93	(\$139)	(\$143)	\$16	(\$68)	(\$89)	(\$33)
Living	\$207	(\$201)	\$302	\$459	\$474	\$453	\$538	\$541	\$385	\$370
Personal	\$643	\$554	\$417	\$639	\$454	\$548	\$678	\$613	\$647	\$597
Transportation	\$51	\$195	\$27	\$89	\$87	\$47	\$104	\$272	\$152	\$111
Healthcare	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8
Total non-fee expenses	\$791	\$590	\$701	\$1,280	\$876	\$905	\$1,336	\$1,358	\$1,095	\$1,053
Systemwide fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Campus fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$25
Total fees for residents	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$25
<b>TOTAL BUDGET</b>	<b>\$791</b>	<b>\$590</b>	<b>\$701</b>	<b>\$1,280</b>	<b>\$876</b>	<b>\$905</b>	<b>\$1,336</b>	<b>\$1,358</b>	<b>\$1,095</b>	<b>\$1,078</b>
<b>OFF-CAMPUS</b>										
Books & supplies	(\$110)	\$42	(\$45)	\$93	(\$139)	(\$143)	\$16	(\$68)	(\$89)	(\$33)
Living	\$1,166	\$1,682	\$2,530	\$887	\$2,105	\$1,218	\$2,556	\$1,343	\$1,644	\$1,730
Personal	\$783	\$620	\$589	\$490	\$617	\$579	\$651	\$576	\$619	\$635
Transportation	\$86	\$342	\$383	\$298	\$898	\$765	\$502	\$333	\$536	\$360
Healthcare	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$27
Total non-fee expenses	\$1,925	\$2,686	\$3,457	\$1,768	\$3,481	\$2,419	\$3,725	\$2,184	\$2,710	\$2,719
Systemwide fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Campus fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$7)
Total fees for residents	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$7)
<b>TOTAL BUDGET</b>	<b>\$1,925</b>	<b>\$2,686</b>	<b>\$3,457</b>	<b>\$1,768</b>	<b>\$3,481</b>	<b>\$2,419</b>	<b>\$3,725</b>	<b>\$2,184</b>	<b>\$2,710</b>	<b>\$2,712</b>
<b>ALL STUDENTS</b>										
Books & supplies	(\$110)	\$42	(\$45)	\$93	(\$139)	(\$143)	\$16	(\$68)	(\$89)	(\$33)
Living	\$726	\$808	\$543	\$408	\$683	\$134	\$1,038	\$980	\$946	\$748
Personal	\$737	\$606	\$554	\$589	\$541	\$568	\$668	\$591	\$631	\$621
Transportation	\$96	\$317	\$272	\$200	\$467	\$406	\$347	\$316	\$338	\$283
Healthcare	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2
Total non-fee expenses	\$1,449	\$1,773	\$1,324	\$1,290	\$1,552	\$965	\$2,069	\$1,819	\$1,826	\$1,621
Systemwide fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Campus fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2
Total fees for residents	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2
<b>TOTAL BUDGET</b>	<b>\$1,449</b>	<b>\$1,773</b>	<b>\$1,324</b>	<b>\$1,290</b>	<b>\$1,552</b>	<b>\$965</b>	<b>\$2,069</b>	<b>\$1,819</b>	<b>\$1,826</b>	<b>\$1,623</b>

<b>2023-24 Standard Methodology Budgets</b>										
<b>Table 3. Percent Difference Between 2023-24 (COAS19) and 2023-24 (COAS23) Standard Methodology Budgets</b>										
	Berkeley	Davis	Irvine	Los Angeles	Merced	Riverside	San Diego	Santa Barbara	Santa Cruz	Systemwide
<b>COMMUTER</b>										
Books & supplies	-9%	3%	-3%	6%	-11%	-8%	1%	-5%	-7%	-2%
Living	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%
Personal	27%	27%	27%	27%	27%	27%	27%	27%	27%	27%
Transportation	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%
Healthcare	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total non-fee expenses	7%	8%	8%	8%	7%	7%	8%	7%	7%	8%
Systemwide fees	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Campus fees	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Total fees for residents	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>TOTAL BUDGET</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>ON-CAMPUS</b>										
Books & supplies	-9%	3%	-3%	6%	-11%	-8%	1%	-5%	-7%	-2%
Living	1%	-1%	2%	3%	2%	2%	3%	3%	2%	2%
Personal	38%	35%	23%	39%	24%	29%	42%	38%	40%	36%
Transportation	7%	29%	3%	13%	10%	5%	12%	41%	17%	14%
Healthcare	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total non-fee expenses	3%	2%	3%	5%	3%	3%	6%	5%	4%	4%
Systemwide fees	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Campus fees	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%
Total fees for residents	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>TOTAL BUDGET</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>OFF-CAMPUS</b>										
Books & supplies	-9%	3%	-3%	6%	-11%	-8%	1%	-5%	-7%	-2%
Living	6%	12%	15%	5%	19%	9%	16%	8%	10%	11%
Personal	46%	38%	31%	26%	35%	29%	36%	32%	36%	36%
Transportation	9%	30%	21%	25%	58%	46%	34%	31%	38%	27%
Healthcare	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Total non-fee expenses	7%	13%	14%	7%	19%	11%	16%	9%	11%	12%
Systemwide fees	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Campus fees	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total fees for residents	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>TOTAL BUDGET</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>7%</b>
<b>ALL STUDENTS</b>										
Books & supplies	-9%	3%	-3%	6%	-11%	-8%	1%	-5%	-7%	-2%
Living	4%	5%	4%	2%	4%	1%	7%	6%	5%	5%
Personal	43%	37%	29%	33%	29%	29%	39%	34%	38%	35%
Transportation	10%	30%	16%	21%	37%	27%	28%	33%	28%	24%
Healthcare	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total non-fee expenses	5%	8%	6%	5%	7%	4%	9%	8%	7%	7%
Systemwide fees	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Campus fees	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total fees for residents	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>TOTAL BUDGET</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>4%</b>