



Estimating the Total Cost of Attendance at the University of California

DECEMBER 2025

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Executive Summary | 3 |
| Estimating Costs and Setting Student Expense Budgets at UC..... | 3 |
| 2025 Cost of Attendance Survey (COAS:25) | 4 |
| Estimating Costs and Setting Student Expense Budgets at UC..... | 5 |
| Background..... | 5 |
| Recent Innovations | 6 |
| 2025 Cost of Attendance Survey (COAS:25) | 7 |
| Student Focus Groups and Instrument Vetting | 7 |
| Administering COAS:25..... | 7 |
| Findings | 9 |
| Living arrangements and expenses..... | 9 |
| Transportation | 14 |
| Personal, Entertainment and Incidentals..... | 16 |
| Books and Supplies..... | 18 |
| Work..... | 19 |
| Sending Money Home | 20 |
| Other Data Sources | 20 |

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 2025 administration of the UC Cost of Attendance Survey (COAS:25).

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, health care, 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:25 results when estimating off-campus rent. HUD figures act as a *floor* for rents self-reported by students, affecting about 20 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 that includes 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 informs the amount used for course materials and technology fees.

2025 COST OF ATTENDANCE SURVEY (COAS:25)

The Cost of Attendance Survey 2025 (COAS:25) launched in April and invited over 83,000 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:25, with additional analysis forthcoming.

- COAS:25 yielded a large pool of participants with an overall completion rate of 23 percent. (See **Table 1**).
- Following a large increase in off campus rent between the 2019 and 2023 survey cycles, in which some campus communities were more impacted by market fluctuations in the wake of the pandemic — students in 2025 reported a 2 percent decline in rent when compared to CPI-adjusted 2023 amount. Some campuses did show an increase, and the rate of change varies from negative 7 percent at UC Merced to 5 percent increase at UC Davis. (See **Tables 7a and 7b**).
- While students reported lower grocery expenses, they did report higher amounts for snacks and meals out, including delivery services (See **Table 8**).
- In the “personal” expenses category, reported costs for clothing, incidentals, and entertainment were lower, while health care costs not covered by insurance increased by 65 percent (See **Table 15**).
- A smaller percentage of students reported using a car in 2025 (37 percent) compared to 2023 (44 percent), while the percentage using public transportation increased to 47 percent (from 45 percent in 2023) This trend may, in part, reflect more students living closer to campus. (See **Tables 11-13**)
- Textbooks, which had been declining in cost for many consecutive surveys, continue that trend. The costs of software, hardware, and other educational supplies were also reported to be lower than in the prior survey. (See **Table 17**).
- The percentage of students who reported working for pay during the academic year declined (from 58 percent to 50 percent), as did the number of hours per week worked. Among students who did not work, most cited that schoolwork not allowing enough time. However, there was a large increase in students who cited not being unable to find a job as their reason for not working. (See **Table 19**).

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, including 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 include:

- 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 and student budget methodology to be responsive to student and leadership recommendations. Recent changes include:

- Parenting Students: UCOP is working with the Financial Aid Directors on options to comply with new state legislation pertaining to parenting students. A summary for the EFM steering committee and others will be forthcoming.
- Excluding responses from those with more than one roommate: Budget calculations now exclude responses from students living off campus who shared a bedroom with two or more roommates. This change did not significantly affect averages, but the committee deemed it appropriate because off-campus housing is not typically built to accommodate triple occupancy, and such students may be under financial duress.
- Books and supplies/personal expenses: Subcategory averages now only include positive responses. If a student reported no expense, then zero is excluded so allowances reflect the cost for those who actually incur it.

The steering committee wanted to provide for an allowance that would be adequate for anyone incurring a given expense. For example, with health care 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 health care expense at all.

- Augmenting off-campus rent responses with HUD data: Calculation of off-campus rent 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:25. Students were assigned a HUD housing type and rental value based on the number of housemates and roommates they reported on the COAS:25; if the HUD calculation was higher than the figure reported on COAS:25, 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:25 that is below the USDA amount, the latter will become the replacement value for calculation of the budgets.
- Administrative data replaced survey data: Beginning in 2018–19, the EFM steering committee began using administrative campus data to create an allowance for course materials and technology fees.

2025 COST OF ATTENDANCE SURVEY (COAS:25)

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 survey has transitioned to a fully online instrument, and the questions have 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:25, staff followed recommendations from the total cost of attendance working group to gather feedback from students and survey experts regarding the survey instrument. Student Financial Support staff met with a student workgroup with representatives from several campuses to review survey questions, discuss interpretations, and request suggestions for improving the survey. Several student recommendations were incorporated into the survey, including:

- Revising the dollar-range answer options for questions relating to snacks and meals out, travel to visit home, health spending, and educational supplies.
- Specifying whether CalFresh spending should be included in grocery costs reporting.
- Increasing maximum wage range option from \$30 to \$35.

In addition to student feedback, staff 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:

- Adopting recommendations offered by the student workgroup.
- Removing questions asking whether students have a meal plan and the number of meals included.
- Removing the question asking how many meals are purchased per week outside of what is prepared at home.

ADMINISTERING COAS:25

Beginning with the 2023 survey, and continuing in COAS:25, the sampling methodology draws approximately 35 percent of the total enrolled undergraduates. Additionally, UCOP invited all independent students, constituting about 6 percent of undergraduates, to take the survey to better inform the University's understanding of the unique spending habits of that population. These changes resulted in a sample size of more than 83,000 students.

In April 2025, vice chancellors for Student Affairs emailed sampled students informing them that they had been selected to participate in the survey, emphasizing the importance of their participation, and encouraging them to respond once 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

gift cards and grand prize. The earlier a student completed the survey, the more opportunities they had to win a prize.

Response rates lagged at some campuses in the first few weeks of the survey administration; additional messaging and campus-specific incentive prizes were employed to help boost rates. All campuses achieved a minimum 21 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 | 2024-25 |
|---------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Berkeley | 48% | 58% | 40% | 48% | 38% | 36% | 28% | 26% |
| Davis | 55% | 62% | 40% | 38% | 41% | 37% | 30% | 32% |
| Irvine | 62% | 46% | 44% | 49% | 33% | 24% | 27% | 26% |
| Los Angeles | 57% | 46% | 27% | 39% | 35% | 30% | 29% | 21% |
| Merced | | 63% | 46% | 45% | 40% | 37% | 32% | 27% |
| Riverside | 49% | 42% | 36% | 42% | 34% | 31% | 25% | 27% |
| San Diego | 49% | 54% | 46% | 31% | 35% | 29% | 30% | 27% |
| Santa Barbara | 48% | 59% | 38% | 44% | 34% | 26% | 30% | 24% |
| Santa Cruz | 48% | 45% | 38% | 39% | 34% | 28% | 26% | 23% |
| Systemwide | 52% | 52% | 39% | 42% | 36% | 30% | 28% | 26% |

Twenty-six percent, or 19,847 of the 76,014 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 percentage points lower than the 2023 survey and four percentage points lower than the 2021 survey, following a trend in declining response rates observed in other systemwide surveys (see Table 1). Nonetheless, COAS:25 response rates exceeded those of other major student surveys, and the number of respondents was 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 & Commuter | | | All Students | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|------------|-----------------------|--------------|------------|---------------|---------------|------------|
| | Invited | Responded | Rate | Invited | Responded | Rate | Invited | Responded | Rate |
| Berkeley | 3,275 | 1,139 | 35% | 7,278 | 1,657 | 23% | 10,553 | 2,796 | 26% |
| Davis* | 3,066 | 1,271 | 41% | 4,529 | 1,467 | 32% | 10,714 | 3,389 | 32% |
| Irvine | 4,407 | 1,356 | 31% | 5,031 | 1,097 | 22% | 9,438 | 2,453 | 26% |
| Los Angeles | 6,123 | 1,493 | 24% | 3,909 | 634 | 16% | 10,032 | 2,127 | 21% |
| Merced | 1,314 | 399 | 30% | 1,340 | 319 | 24% | 2,654 | 718 | 27% |
| Riverside | 2,671 | 749 | 28% | 4,771 | 1,248 | 26% | 7,442 | 1,997 | 27% |
| San Diego | 5,720 | 1,930 | 34% | 5,920 | 1,215 | 21% | 11,640 | 3,145 | 27% |
| Santa Barbara | 2,945 | 943 | 32% | 4,678 | 918 | 20% | 7,623 | 1,861 | 24% |
| Santa Cruz | 2,910 | 769 | 26% | 3,008 | 592 | 20% | 5,918 | 1,361 | 23% |
| System | 32,431 | 10,049 | 31% | 40,464 | 9,147 | 23% | 76,014 | 19,847 | 26% |
| *Some records for this campus had missing housing data. Unknown housing is included in "all students" totals. | | | | | | | | | |

The breakdown of COAS:25 respondents resembles the overall UC undergraduate population, although, a couple of categories narrowed or widened compared with COAS:23. For example, the trend for respondents to lean more toward underclassmen continued from the prior survey, with a larger percentage of first-year students and sophomores completing the survey, proportionally to the population, than juniors and seniors. Respondents are also more likely to be female, a trend observed in the last several survey cycles, although the gender gap narrowed by four percentage points from COAS:23. Analysis on non-binary respondents is also now included. Differences between the general population and the respondents categorized by ethnicity and income also narrowed for COAS:25. This comparison suggests that COAS:25 respondents constitute a representative sample of UC undergraduate students (see **Table 3**).

Table 3: Student Population versus COAS Respondents, COAS: 23 and COAS:25

| | COAS:23 | | | COAS:25 | | |
|------------------|------------|-------------|------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| Student Level | Population | Respondents | Difference | Population | Respondents | Difference |
| Freshman | 17.7% | 21.4% | 3.7% | 16.3% | 21.8% | 5.5% |
| Sophomore | 19.2% | 21.0% | 1.8% | 19.6% | 22.2% | 2.6% |
| Junior | 26.7% | 28.8% | 2.1% | 27.2% | 28.4% | 1.2% |
| Senior | 36.4% | 28.8% | -7.6% | 36.9% | 27.6% | -9.3% |
| Ethnicity | Population | Respondents | Difference | Population | Respondents | Difference |
| African American | 4.5% | 4.4% | -0.1% | 4.9% | 4.9% | 0.0% |
| Asian American | 46.5% | 43.7% | -2.8% | 45.7% | 44.0% | -1.7% |
| Chicano/Latino | 23.5% | 26.7% | 3.2% | 24.5% | 28.4% | 3.9% |
| Native American | 1.6% | 1.8% | 0.2% | 1.7% | 1.9% | 0.2% |
| White | 20.4% | 20.5% | 0.1% | 19.8% | 17.9% | -1.9% |
| Other | 3.5% | 3.0% | -0.5% | 3.5% | 3.0% | -0.5% |
| Gender | Population | Respondents | Difference | Population | Respondents | Difference |
| Female | 54.0% | 64.8% | 10.8% | 55.9% | 62.5% | 6.6% |
| Male | 46.0% | 35.2% | -10.8% | 43.6% | 35.4% | -8.2% |
| Non-Binary | N/A | N/A | N/A | 0.5% | 2.1% | 1.6% |
| Parent income | Population | Respondents | Difference | Population | Respondents | Difference |
| Dependent | | | | | | 0.0% |
| Less than \$60K | 29.7% | 33.8% | 4.1% | 27.8% | 32.2% | 4.4% |
| \$60K-\$120K | 19.6% | 20.2% | 0.6% | 19.0% | 21.0% | 2.0% |
| \$120K-\$200K | 16.7% | 15.9% | -0.8% | 16.6% | 16.0% | -0.6% |
| \$200K or more | 27.8% | 23.2% | -4.6% | 30.9% | 25.2% | -5.7% |
| Independent | 6.2% | 6.9% | 0.7% | 5.7% | 5.7% | 0.0% |

FINDINGS

LIVING ARRANGEMENTS AND EXPENSES

Questions on the COAS are designed to more accurately understand the student's living situation and how much they pay for rent. 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 might reflect a high number of roommates sharing a space. The following tables detail the COAS:25 living arrangements.

Table 4: COAS:25 Housing Type, by Student Level

| | Systemwide | Student Level | | | |
|--|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | Freshman | Sophomore | Junior | Senior |
| Commuter | 11.3% | 9.6% | 9.1% | 12.7% | 12.9% |
| With parent(s) or legal guardian(s) | 10.6% | 9.1% | 8.7% | 11.7% | 12.0% |
| With other relative(s) | 0.7% | 0.5% | 0.4% | 1.0% | 0.9% |
| On-campus | 51.1% | 83.0% | 62.2% | 41.7% | 27.1% |
| UC dorm or residence hall | 35.6% | 78.7% | 47.3% | 19.9% | 8.9% |
| UC apartment or house | 15.5% | 4.3% | 14.9% | 21.8% | 18.2% |
| Off-campus | 38.0% | 7.8% | 29.1% | 46.1% | 60.4% |
| Off-campus non-UC apt, house, or room you are renting | 35.8% | 7.0% | 27.2% | 43.3% | 57.0% |
| Off-campus non-UC dorm or residence hall | 1.2% | 0.3% | 1.1% | 1.5% | 1.8% |
| House you own or are buying | 0.4% | 0.2% | 0.2% | 0.5% | 0.5% |
| Co-op | 0.5% | 0.2% | 0.4% | 0.6% | 0.9% |
| Unhoused (no local home, couch-surfing, living in car, etc.) | 0.1% | 0.1% | 0.2% | 0.2% | 0.2% |

Since COAS:23, many campuses have added new university owned or managed residence halls and apartments. This is reflected in the COAS:25 data, which shows more students living in on-campus facilities in their sophomore, junior, and senior years. Additionally, COAS:25 revealed the following observations:

- The commuter student population decreased by 1.2 percentage points to 11.3 percent. The on-campus population increased substantially, by 9.5 percentage points to 51.1 percent, while the off campus population declined by nearly eight percentage points to 38 percent of respondents.
- The changes in commuter, on-campus and off-campus living patterns are most notable for upperclassmen, with a larger percentage of them living on-campus and a decline in upperclassmen commuting or living off-campus.
- Fewer than 1 percent (0.1 percent) of respondents identified their living situation as unhoused; this figure has declined since COAS:23 (from 0.2 percent).

Table 5: COAS:25 Marital Status and Children/Dependents

| | Systemwide |
|---|------------|
| Marital status | |
| Single (separated, divorced, widowed or never married) | 98.6% |
| Married/Registered domestic partner | 1.4% |
| Has Dependents | |
| Yes | 1.6% |
| No | 98.4% |
| Marital status among students with children/dependents | |
| Single (never married, separated, divorced, or widowed) | 72.3% |
| Married/Registered domestic partner | 27.7% |

- Fewer than two percent of students report that they are married or in a registered domestic partnership (see Table 5).
- The proportion of undergraduates reporting they have one or more children/dependents remained the same as in COAS:23. Among students reporting children or dependents, a higher proportion of students in COAS:25 reported their current marital status as single (from 70.4 percent to 72.3 percent).

Following the pandemic, COAS:23 revealed that more students who lived off campus opted out of sharing a bedroom. COAS:25 shows a small systemwide increase in the proportion of students not sharing a room; however, the shifts vary significantly by campus. Table 6a shows the percentage of off-campus students by bedroom sharing and 6b shows how the trend in sharing a bedroom has shifted since COAS:23. Those trends include:

- A 1.3 percentage point increase in students who do not share a bedroom, to 51.7 percent.
- UC Merced, UC Riverside, and UC Irvine are the campuses with the highest proportions of students who do not share a bedroom. UC Merced had a steep increase in students not sharing a bedroom since COAS:23, which may be attributed to a cooling of the regional housing market following a post-pandemic spike in costs.

Table 6a: Percent of Respondents by Number of Roommates (share bedroom) and Campus

| | System-wide | Campus | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------|----------|--------|--------|-------------|--------|-----------|-----------|---------------|------------|
| | | Berkeley | Davis | Irvine | Los Angeles | Merced | Riverside | San Diego | Santa Barbara | Santa Cruz |
| Number of Roommates | | | | | | | | | | |
| None | 51.7% | 50.8% | 59.4% | 64.9% | 32.4% | 75.9% | 74.0% | 55.4% | 19.6% | 47.3% |
| One | 41.2% | 42.4% | 37.1% | 29.4% | 56.2% | 17.4% | 20.6% | 40.4% | 63.9% | 44.3% |
| Two + | 7.1% | 6.7% | 3.4% | 5.7% | 11.4% | 6.7% | 5.5% | 4.1% | 16.5% | 8.4% |
| <i>All students</i> | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

Table 6b: Percent Change in Bedroom Sharing from 2023 to 2025

| | System-wide | Campus | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------|----------|-------|--------|-------------|--------|-----------|-----------|---------------|------------|
| | | Berkeley | Davis | Irvine | Los Angeles | Merced | Riverside | San Diego | Santa Barbara | Santa Cruz |
| Number of Roommates | | | | | | | | | | |
| None | 1.3% | 2.5% | 8.9% | 13.8% | -20.5% | 46.8% | -4.5% | -20.1% | -30.9% | 26.3% |
| One | -2.4% | -1.9% | -6.7% | -16.0% | 16.2% | -38.3% | 2.2% | 21.0% | 20.2% | -18.0% |
| Two + | 1.1% | -0.7% | -2.3% | 2.2% | 4.4% | -8.5% | 2.3% | -1.0% | 10.7% | -8.3% |

At most campuses, fewer off-campus students chose to share a bedroom, but the differences across campuses vary widely. UC Santa Barbara, UCLA, and UC San Diego saw substantial declines in the share of students who do not share a bedroom, while UC Merced had a sizable increase. It is likely that campuses showing an increase in students living with multiple roommates are experiencing scarcity of housing in the areas closest to campus. Table 7a shows the average rent reported by roommate number and campus on COAS:25 and Table 7b shows the percentage change in average rent compared to COAS:23 (inflation adjusted to 2025 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 |
| Number of Roommates | | | | | | | | | | |
| None | \$1,314 | \$1,505 | \$1,175 | \$1,391 | \$1,601 | \$755 | \$1,039 | \$1,422 | \$1,599 | \$1,403 |
| One | \$1,037 | \$1,163 | \$795 | \$1,073 | \$1,178 | \$753 | \$817 | \$991 | \$1,125 | \$1,113 |
| Two + | \$1,067 | \$1,168 | \$978 | \$1,147 | \$1,006 | \$680 | \$1,062 | \$1,055 | \$1,086 | \$1,060 |
| None or One Roommate | \$1,191 | \$1,350 | \$1,028 | \$1,293 | \$1,332 | \$755 | \$990 | \$1,239 | \$1,237 | \$1,263 |
| All students | \$1,182 | \$1,338 | \$1,027 | \$1,285 | \$1,296 | \$750 | \$994 | \$1,232 | \$1,212 | \$1,246 |

Table 7b: Percent Change in Rent from 2023 to 2025 (constant dollars)

| | System-wide | Campus | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------|----------|-------|--------|-------------|--------|-----------|-----------|---------------|------------|
| | | Berkeley | Davis | Irvine | Los Angeles | Merced | Riverside | San Diego | Santa Barbara | Santa Cruz |
| Number of Roommates | | | | | | | | | | |
| None | -3% | -4% | 2% | -1% | -5% | -6% | 1% | 1% | 0% | -6% |
| One | -2% | -4% | 1% | -6% | 0% | 0% | -9% | -7% | 6% | -6% |
| Two + | 0% | 3% | 13% | -5% | -2% | -39% | 14% | 2% | 1% | 0% |
| None or One Roommate | -2% | -4% | 5% | 0% | -1% | -5% | -1% | -1% | 3% | -6% |
| All students | -2% | -3% | 5% | 0% | -1% | -7% | 0% | -1% | 3% | -6% |

- The systemwide average rent is \$1,182 for all students and \$1,191 for students who share a bedroom with one or no roommates.
- Overall average rent declined by 2 percent from COAS:23 to COAS:25.
- Ranges varied by campus, from -7 percent at UC Merced to 5 percent at UC Davis.
- Surprisingly, some of the largest percentage changes were reported for students sharing a bedroom with two or more roommates. 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 percentage of students who reported living more than 10 miles from campus decreased from COAS:23 to COAS:25 from 12 to 11 percent. UCOP tested the hypothesis that students were moving farther from campus to secure more space and lower rents. While a greater percentage of students who live more than 10 miles from campus do not share a bedroom, those who live farther away reported higher rents at most campuses (UC Irvine and

UC Santa Cruz were the exception) 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 percentage 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:25 Average Off-campus Rent, <=10 miles and >10 Miles from Campus

| | <i>System-wide</i> | <i>Campus</i> | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| | | <i>Berkeley</i> | <i>Davis</i> | <i>Irvine</i> | <i>Los Angeles</i> | <i>Merced</i> | <i>Riverside</i> | <i>San Diego</i> | <i>Santa Barbara</i> | <i>Santa Cruz</i> |
| % <10 miles | 89.1% | 90.4% | 91.9% | 82.0% | 84.7% | 91.4% | 80.8% | 87.1% | 96.5% | 92.5% |
| Rent | \$1,190 | \$1,354 | \$1,027 | \$1,297 | \$1,311 | \$755 | \$1,014 | \$1,248 | \$1,206 | \$1,297 |
| % >10 miles | 10.9% | 9.6% | 8.1% | 18.0% | 15.3% | 8.6% | 19.3% | 12.9% | 3.5% | 7.6% |
| Rent | \$1,293 | \$1,386 | \$1,240 | \$1,219 | \$1,481 | \$1,059 | \$1,165 | \$1,345 | \$1,347 | \$1,219 |

Table 8 shows the average monthly amount that off-campus and commuter students spend on rent, utilities and groceries. The off-campus grocery average reported by students is slightly higher than the USDA moderate amount. Not all commuter students report expenses in rent, utilities and grocery categories; Table 9 shows the percentage of commuter students by family income who report these costs.

TABLE 8: Average Monthly Rent, Utilities, & Groceries Expenses for Commuter and Off-campus Students (2025 dollars)

| | <i>COAS:23</i> | <i>COAS:25</i> | <i>DIFFERENCE COAS:23 to COAS:25</i> | |
|-------------------|----------------|----------------|--|----------------|
| | | | <i>Dollars</i> | <i>Percent</i> |
| Off-campus | | | | |
| Rent | \$1,202 | \$1,182 | (\$20) | -2% |
| Utilities | \$89 | \$84 | (\$5) | -6% |
| Groceries | \$409 | \$393 | (\$16) | -4% |
| Commuter | | | | |
| Rent | \$431 | \$404 | (\$27) | -6% |
| Utilities | \$68 | \$61 | (\$7) | -10% |
| Groceries | \$290 | \$282 | (\$8) | -3% |

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 | 58.0% | 67.0% | 53.0% | 42.0% | 33.0% | 79.0% |
| Pays utilities | 60.0% | 67.0% | 56.0% | 47.0% | 37.0% | 79.0% |
| Pays groceries | 84.0% | 91.0% | 80.0% | 72.0% | 67.0% | 98.0% |

TABLE 10: Average Monthly Snacks & Meals Out Expenses (2025 Dollars)

| | <i>COAS:23</i> | <i>COAS:25</i> | <i>DIFFERENCE</i> | |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------------|----------------|
| | | | <i>COAS:23 to COAS:25</i> | |
| | | | <i>Dollars</i> | <i>Percent</i> |
| All Students | \$240 | \$253 | \$13 | 6% |
| Commuter | \$245 | \$248 | \$3 | 1% |
| On-campus | \$208 | \$235 | \$27 | 13% |
| Off-campus | \$244 | \$261 | \$17 | 7% |

- A larger percentage of lower-income commuter students pay rent, utilities and groceries than their higher-income counterparts.
- Adjusting for inflation, the snacks and meals-out cost reported by students increased 6 percent from that reported on COAS:23.
- The increased availability of food delivery, with fees and tipping, may be contributing to the increase in the snacks and meals category.

TRANSPORTATION

Since COAS:23, a smaller percentage of students reported living farther away from campus, and fewer reported driving a car. Students who drive a car reported lower cost in gas and parking expenses but higher costs in maintenance and registration. Students reported lower expenses in non-car transportation than in COAS:23. A decrease in transportation expenses may be attributed to students living closer to campus and resuming pre-pandemic transportation patterns.

Table 11: Percent of Students Owning Motor Vehicles, COAS:21 to COAS:25

| Campus | All Students | | | On-campus | | | Off-campus/Commuter | | |
|---------------|--------------|---------|---------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---------|---------|
| | COAS:21 | COAS:23 | COAS:25 | COAS:21 | COAS:23 | COAS:25 | COAS:21 | COAS:23 | COAS:25 |
| Berkeley | 21% | 22% | 18% | 21% | 8% | 10% | 48% | 27% | 24% |
| Davis | 48% | 46% | 38% | 36% | 18% | 18% | 68% | 59% | 56% |
| Irvine | 57% | 69% | 48% | 53% | 33% | 28% | 81% | 79% | 73% |
| Los Angeles | 30% | 26% | 27% | 43% | 14% | 17% | 65% | 44% | 50% |
| Merced | 55% | 50% | 50% | 34% | 24% | 30% | 75% | 78% | 75% |
| Riverside | 62% | 58% | 55% | 45% | 30% | 30% | 81% | 75% | 70% |
| San Diego | 48% | 50% | 36% | 39% | 23% | 20% | 73% | 68% | 62% |
| Santa Barbara | 41% | 40% | 32% | 52% | 25% | 21% | 64% | 52% | 42% |
| Santa Cruz | 44% | 47% | 40% | 47% | 26% | 23% | 70% | 69% | 62% |
| Systemwide | 43% | 44% | 37% | 42% | 21% | 21% | 68% | 59% | 54% |

- COAS:21 data are included here but are considered anomalous due to living and commuting changes caused by the pandemic.
- Systemwide, the proportion of students reporting they have a car declined, from 44 percent to 37 percent. However, this trend varies by campus and housing type. More on-campus students reported having a car at UC Berkeley, UCLA, and UC Merced. Only one campus, UCLA, reported that more off-campus students had a car compared with 2023.

Table 12: Average Vehicle Expenses per Academic Year (in 2025 dollars)

| | COAS:23 | COAS:25 * | DIFFERENCE COAS:23 to COAS:25 | |
|--------------------------------|---------|-----------|-------------------------------|---------|
| | | | Dollars | Percent |
| All Students | | | | |
| Vehicle payment | \$1,619 | \$862 | (\$757) | -47% |
| Insurance & registration | \$1,040 | \$1,192 | \$152 | 15% |
| Vehicle maintenance | \$361 | \$381 | \$20 | 5% |
| Gas & parking for local travel | \$1,619 | \$1,464 | (\$155) | -10% |
| Travel to visit parents | \$517 | \$407 | (\$110) | -21% |

Adjusted to 2025 dollars using transportation CPI

*A 99th percentile was placed on all off-campus reporting due to some large outliers. A 10th percentile floor was also placed on reporting for all housing types and categories.

- 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.
- The increase in insurance and registration reflects the general trend of insurance and registration expenses rising at a higher rate than general inflation over the past few years.
- Students reported a decline in costs for many transportation categories. Due to the wide range of costs that students report - depending on whether they have an old versus a new car with a payment, or gas-powered versus an electric vehicle – this analysis accounts for outlier costs at both the high and low ends.

Table 13: Modes of Transportation for Off Campus and Commuters by Campus and Percent Change from 2023

| | Walk | % Change | Drive | % Change | Bike or Scooter | % Change | Public Trans. | % Change | Car or Ride Share | % Change |
|---------------|------|-------------|-------|-------------|--------------------|-------------|------------------|-------------|-------------------------|-------------|
| Berkeley | 80% | -4% | 24% | -3% | 18% | -3% | 69% | 0% | 24% | -2% |
| Davis | 60% | -1% | 56% | -3% | 46% | 1% | 62% | 3% | 14% | -1% |
| Irvine | 35% | -1% | 73% | -6% | 11% | 0% | 17% | 2% | 15% | 0% |
| Los Angeles | 66% | -10% | 50% | 6% | 17% | -7% | 33% | -1% | 21% | 1% |
| Merced | 23% | 0% | 75% | -3% | 17% | 4% | 31% | -2% | 16% | -2% |
| Riverside | 41% | 1% | 70% | -5% | 20% | 4% | 17% | 1% | 13% | 0% |
| San Diego | 47% | -3% | 62% | -6% | 14% | -3% | 66% | -2% | 19% | -1% |
| Santa Barbara | 73% | -3% | 42% | -10% | 51% | -8% | 35% | 5% | 16% | 2% |
| Santa Cruz | 55% | 3% | 62% | -7% | 22% | 4% | 77% | 5% | 27% | 5% |
| System | 57% | -1% | 54% | -5% | 25% | -1% | 47% | 2% | 18% | 0% |

- Table 13 shows the modes of transportation students are using and the change since 2023; systemwide, car use decreased by 5 percent, walking and biking have remained relatively stable at most campuses, and public transportation use increased.
- While most shifts were small, the UCLA campus saw a large change in the proportion of students who walked and biked, down 10 and 7 percent respectively, and an increase in students who drove. Santa Barbara and Santa Cruz both saw declines in the proportion of students who drove, 10 and 7 percent respectively, and 5 percent increases in the proportion of students who use public transportation.

Table 14: Annual Expense for Non-Vehicle Transportation

| | Public transit | Ride/ Carshare | Bike/Scooter |
|--------------|----------------|-------------------|--------------|
| Commuter | \$483 | \$975 | \$125 |
| On Campus | \$105 | \$528 | \$64 |
| Off Campus | \$166 | \$565 | \$104 |
| All students | \$145 | \$566 | \$78 |

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 health care 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.

Table 15: Average Monthly Personal Expenses (2025 Dollars)

| | COAS:23 | COAS:25 | DIFFERENCE | |
|--|---------|---------|-------------------------------|---------|
| | | | COAS:23 to COAS:25 Dollars | Percent |
| All Students | | | | |
| Clothing & incidentals | \$107 | \$105 | (\$2) | -2% |
| Entertainment & recreation | \$93 | \$89 | (\$4) | -5% |
| Health care costs not covered by insurance | \$36 | \$60 | \$24 | 65% |
| Commuter | | | | |
| Clothing & incidentals | \$116 | \$114 | (\$2) | -1% |
| Entertainment & recreation | \$93 | \$89 | (\$5) | -5% |
| Health care costs not covered by insurance | \$33 | \$54 | \$22 | 66% |
| On-campus | | | | |
| Clothing & incidentals | \$101 | \$100 | (\$1) | 0% |
| Entertainment & recreation | \$90 | \$86 | (\$4) | -5% |
| Health care costs not covered by insurance | \$35 | \$58 | \$23 | 66% |
| Off-campus | | | | |
| Clothing & incidentals | \$111 | \$110 | (\$1) | -1% |
| Entertainment & recreation | \$96 | \$93 | (\$3) | -4% |
| Health care costs not covered by insurance | \$37 | \$63 | \$26 | 71% |

- Table 15 shows that expenses for clothing and incidentals and entertainment categories remained relatively the same, with slight declines, for all housing types between COAS:23 and COAS:25.
- Health care costs not covered by insurance increased for all housing types between COAS:23 and COAS:25 by an average of 65 percent, or about \$24 per month.
- While there are no significant differences in spending across housing types, commuter students spend a little more on clothing and incidentals, while off campus students spend more on entertainment and health costs.

Table 16: Average Personal Expenses, by Parent Income and Gender

| | Systemwide | | |
|------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| | Clothing & incidentals | Entertainment & recreation | Health care costs not covered by insurance |
| Parent Income | | | |
| Less than \$60,000 | \$113 | \$88 | \$57 |
| \$60,000-\$120,000 | \$105 | \$87 | \$60 |
| \$120,000 to \$200,000 | \$96 | \$86 | \$58 |
| \$200,000 or more | \$94 | \$89 | \$58 |
| Independent | \$137 | \$104 | \$84 |
| Gender | | | |
| Female | \$110 | \$89 | \$61 |
| Male | \$98 | \$89 | \$56 |
| Non-Binary | \$95 | \$83 | \$65 |
| All students | \$105 | \$89 | \$60 |

- As shown in Table 16, independent students spend more on clothing, incidentals and health care than their dependent student counterparts.

- There is no significant difference in entertainment and health expenses between lower and higher income students, although lower income students report spending more on clothing and incidentals.
- Female students spent more on clothing and incidentals than male and non-binary students; non-binary students spent less on entertainment as female and male students but did spend a little more on health costs not covered by insurance.

BOOKS AND SUPPLIES

The books and supplies section of COAS:25 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 are collected directly from the campuses.

Table 17: Average Annual Expenses for Textbooks and Educational Supplies

| | COAS:21 | COAS:23 | COAS:25 | DIFFERENCE COAS:23 to COAS:25 | |
|------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|-------------------------------|---------|
| | | | | Dollars | Percent |
| All students | | | | | |
| Textbooks | \$484 | \$409 | \$391 | (\$18) | -4% |
| Supplies | \$161 | \$278 | \$160 | (\$118) | -42% |
| Additional computer hardware | \$355 | \$343 | \$333 | (\$10) | -3% |
| Educational software | \$99 | \$122 | \$119 | (\$3) | -2% |

Table 18: Percent of Students Incurring Expenses for Selected Supplies

| | 2019 | 2021 | 2023 | 2025 |
|--|------|------|------|------|
| Purchased a new computer | 29% | 31% | 44% | 48% |
| Purchased a tablet | 11% | 20% | 27% | 29% |
| Any additional computer hardware purchases | 19% | 23% | 17% | 15% |
| Any educational software purchases | 20% | 22% | 21% | 22% |

- As Table 17 shows, the costs for all books and supplies categories decreased between 2023 and 2025. Supplies had increased in 2023 but returned to levels from prior surveys; all other categories followed similar patterns.
- The decrease in supplies expenses is notable and may be attributed to increased use of free online resources and open educational resources (OER).
- 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 slight increase since COAS:23 in the percentage of students who purchased a computer, tablet, or software, and a small decline in those purchasing hardware.

WORK

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

Table 19: Student work during the academic year

| | COAS 2019 | COAS 2021 | COAS 2023 | COAS 2025 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Any Paid Work During the Academic Year | | | | |
| Yes | 59% | 52% | 58% | 50% |
| No | 41% | 48% | 42% | 50% |
| Weeks worked | | | | |
| All | 46% | 43% | 46% | 47% |
| Most | 30% | 30% | 29% | 28% |
| Half | 10% | 11% | 11% | 9% |
| Less than half | 14% | 16% | 14% | 14% |
| Hours worked per week | | | | |
| Did not work | 42% | 48% | 42% | 50% |
| 1 to 10 hours | 20% | 16% | 18% | 18% |
| 11 to 20 hours | 29% | 21% | 28% | 24% |
| > 20 hours | 10% | 15% | 11% | 8% |
| Average hours worked per week | 16 | 17 | 16 | 15 |
| Average hourly wage | \$18 | \$18 | \$19 | \$19 |
| Average total earnings | \$5,496 | \$7,674 | \$6,967 | \$6,591 |
| Reason not working, if no work | | | | |
| Could not find a job | 15% | 22% | 17% | 29% |
| School work did not allow time for a job | 56% | 46% | 53% | 43% |
| Family obligations did not allow time for a job | 4% | 11% | 6% | 5% |
| Did not need the additional income | 14% | 13% | 14% | 13% |
| Did not want to work | 10% | 8% | 10% | 10% |

- Half of students reported working for pay in 2025; this is an 8 percent decline from what was reported in 2023.
- Seventy-five percent of students reported working all or most weeks of the academic year and averaged 15 hours per week.
- Students reported an average hourly wage of \$19 and estimated their total earnings for the year to be about \$6,600.
- There was a surprising jump since 2023 in students who reported that they did not work because they were unable to find a job, and a decline in students stating their reason for not working was because of lack of time resulting from school obligations.

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*

| Campus | 2019 | 2023 | 2025 | Difference |
|---------------|------|------|------|------------|
| Berkeley | 16% | 20% | 20% | 0% |
| Davis | 16% | 15% | 15% | 0% |
| Irvine | 23% | 22% | 22% | 0% |
| Los Angeles | 18% | 19% | 19% | 0% |
| Merced | 27% | 29% | 32% | 3% |
| Riverside | 28% | 29% | 29% | 0% |
| San Diego | 17% | 20% | 18% | -2% |
| Santa Barbara | 15% | 14% | 14% | 0% |
| Santa Cruz | 18% | 18% | 19% | 1% |
| Systemwide | 20% | 20% | 20% | 0% |

*2021 data was omitted due to inconsistent results from the pandemic.

- Twenty percent of UC students reported sending money home to their families; this share has been constant 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 32 percent at UC Merced.
- Preliminary analysis shows that students from low-income or underrepresented backgrounds are more likely to send money home.

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:25 results are nearly the same as 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:25 if the self-reported amounts were lower than the fair market rents for the same or similar housing circumstance (i.e., housemates and roommates).

Appendix: 2025-26 Student Expense Budgets

Table 1 in this appendix uses the COAS:23 data to create hypothetical standard methodology budgets for 2025–26. Tables 2 and 3 compare these figures with those based on COAS:23, adjusted for inflation.

2025-26 Standard Methodology Budgets

Table 1. Standard Methodology Budgets

| | Berkeley | Davis | Irvine | Los Angeles | Merced | Riverside | San Diego | Santa Barbara | Santa Cruz | System |
|--------------------------|----------|----------|----------|-------------|----------|-----------|-----------|---------------|------------|----------|
| COMMUTER | | | | | | | | | | |
| Books & supplies | \$1,254 | \$1,179 | \$1,431 | \$1,526 | \$1,087 | \$1,655 | \$1,179 | \$1,406 | \$1,150 | \$1,331 |
| Living | \$8,426 | \$8,426 | \$8,426 | \$8,426 | \$8,426 | \$8,426 | \$8,426 | \$8,426 | \$8,426 | \$8,426 |
| Personal | \$2,980 | \$2,980 | \$2,980 | \$2,980 | \$2,980 | \$2,980 | \$2,980 | \$2,980 | \$2,980 | \$2,980 |
| Transportation | \$2,756 | \$2,756 | \$2,756 | \$2,756 | \$2,756 | \$2,756 | \$2,756 | \$2,756 | \$2,756 | \$2,756 |
| Health care | \$4,858 | \$3,771 | \$2,846 | \$3,580 | \$2,733 | \$2,606 | \$2,958 | \$3,728 | \$3,757 | \$3,118 |
| Total non-fee expenses | \$20,274 | \$19,112 | \$18,439 | \$19,268 | \$17,982 | \$18,423 | \$18,299 | \$19,296 | \$19,069 | \$18,611 |
| Systemwide fees | \$14,934 | \$14,934 | \$14,934 | \$14,934 | \$14,934 | \$14,934 | \$14,934 | \$14,934 | \$14,934 | \$14,934 |
| Campus fees | \$2,229 | \$2,362 | \$1,286 | \$790 | \$1,357 | \$1,169 | \$2,349 | \$1,996 | \$1,651 | \$1,541 |
| Total fees for residents | \$17,163 | \$17,296 | \$16,220 | \$15,724 | \$16,291 | \$16,103 | \$17,283 | \$16,930 | \$16,585 | \$16,475 |
| TOTAL BUDGET | \$37,437 | \$36,408 | \$34,659 | \$34,992 | \$34,273 | \$34,526 | \$35,582 | \$36,226 | \$35,654 | \$35,086 |
| ON-CAMPUS | | | | | | | | | | |
| Books & supplies | \$1,254 | \$1,179 | \$1,431 | \$1,526 | \$1,087 | \$1,655 | \$1,179 | \$1,406 | \$1,150 | \$1,331 |
| Living | \$25,031 | \$20,677 | \$19,713 | \$18,902 | \$22,587 | \$20,494 | \$19,551 | \$21,829 | \$20,888 | \$20,629 |
| Personal | \$2,747 | \$2,606 | \$2,671 | \$2,634 | \$2,682 | \$2,832 | \$2,708 | \$2,530 | \$2,602 | \$2,667 |
| Transportation | \$801 | \$973 | \$855 | \$922 | \$1,347 | \$1,254 | \$868 | \$982 | \$944 | \$957 |
| Health care | \$4,858 | \$3,771 | \$2,846 | \$3,580 | \$2,733 | \$2,606 | \$2,958 | \$3,728 | \$3,757 | \$3,462 |
| Total non-fee expenses | \$34,691 | \$29,206 | \$27,516 | \$27,564 | \$30,436 | \$28,841 | \$27,264 | \$30,475 | \$29,341 | \$29,046 |
| Systemwide fees | \$14,934 | \$14,934 | \$14,934 | \$14,934 | \$14,934 | \$14,934 | \$14,934 | \$14,934 | \$14,934 | \$14,934 |
| Campus fees | \$2,229 | \$2,362 | \$1,286 | \$790 | \$1,357 | \$1,169 | \$2,349 | \$1,996 | \$1,651 | \$1,684 |
| Total fees for residents | \$17,163 | \$17,296 | \$16,220 | \$15,724 | \$16,291 | \$16,103 | \$17,283 | \$16,930 | \$16,585 | \$16,618 |
| TOTAL BUDGET | \$51,854 | \$46,502 | \$43,736 | \$43,288 | \$46,727 | \$44,944 | \$44,547 | \$47,405 | \$45,926 | \$45,664 |
| OFF-CAMPUS | | | | | | | | | | |
| Books & supplies | \$1,254 | \$1,179 | \$1,431 | \$1,526 | \$1,087 | \$1,655 | \$1,179 | \$1,406 | \$1,150 | \$1,331 |
| Living | \$20,394 | \$16,585 | \$22,134 | \$20,628 | \$14,417 | \$17,271 | \$20,123 | \$19,012 | \$21,172 | \$19,428 |
| Personal | \$2,810 | \$2,591 | \$3,138 | \$3,001 | \$2,702 | \$2,946 | \$2,802 | \$2,731 | \$2,547 | \$2,798 |
| Transportation | \$1,180 | \$1,493 | \$2,383 | \$1,510 | \$2,756 | \$2,257 | \$2,043 | \$1,236 | \$1,877 | \$1,674 |
| Health care | \$4,858 | \$3,771 | \$2,846 | \$3,580 | \$2,733 | \$2,606 | \$2,958 | \$3,728 | \$3,757 | \$3,675 |
| Total non-fee expenses | \$30,496 | \$25,619 | \$31,932 | \$30,245 | \$23,695 | \$26,735 | \$29,105 | \$28,113 | \$30,503 | \$28,906 |
| Systemwide fees | \$14,934 | \$14,934 | \$14,934 | \$14,934 | \$14,934 | \$14,934 | \$14,934 | \$14,934 | \$14,934 | \$14,934 |
| Campus fees | \$2,229 | \$2,362 | \$1,286 | \$790 | \$1,357 | \$1,169 | \$2,349 | \$1,996 | \$1,651 | \$1,867 |
| Total fees for residents | \$17,163 | \$17,296 | \$16,220 | \$15,724 | \$16,291 | \$16,103 | \$17,283 | \$16,930 | \$16,585 | \$16,801 |
| TOTAL BUDGET | \$47,659 | \$42,915 | \$48,152 | \$45,969 | \$39,986 | \$42,838 | \$46,388 | \$45,043 | \$47,088 | \$45,707 |
| ALL STUDENTS | | | | | | | | | | |
| Books & supplies | \$1,254 | \$1,179 | \$1,431 | \$1,526 | \$1,087 | \$1,655 | \$1,179 | \$1,406 | \$1,150 | \$1,331 |
| Living | \$21,157 | \$17,105 | \$16,285 | \$18,565 | \$17,508 | \$15,962 | \$18,450 | \$19,746 | \$20,377 | \$18,369 |
| Personal | \$2,800 | \$2,638 | \$2,972 | \$2,773 | \$2,735 | \$2,910 | \$2,773 | \$2,664 | \$2,596 | \$2,770 |
| Transportation | \$1,149 | \$1,451 | \$2,184 | \$1,248 | \$2,062 | \$2,000 | \$1,508 | \$1,186 | \$1,480 | \$1,532 |
| Health care | \$4,858 | \$3,771 | \$2,846 | \$3,580 | \$2,733 | \$2,606 | \$2,958 | \$3,728 | \$3,757 | \$3,509 |
| Total non-fee expenses | \$31,218 | \$26,144 | \$25,718 | \$27,692 | \$26,125 | \$25,133 | \$26,868 | \$28,730 | \$29,360 | \$27,511 |
| Systemwide fees | \$14,934 | \$14,934 | \$14,934 | \$14,934 | \$14,934 | \$14,934 | \$14,934 | \$14,934 | \$14,934 | \$14,934 |
| Campus fees | \$2,229 | \$2,362 | \$1,286 | \$790 | \$1,357 | \$1,169 | \$2,349 | \$1,996 | \$1,651 | \$1,746 |
| Total fees for residents | \$17,163 | \$17,296 | \$16,220 | \$15,724 | \$16,291 | \$16,103 | \$17,283 | \$16,930 | \$16,585 | \$16,680 |
| TOTAL BUDGET | \$48,381 | \$43,440 | \$41,938 | \$43,416 | \$42,416 | \$41,236 | \$44,151 | \$45,660 | \$45,945 | \$44,191 |

2025-26 Standard Methodology Budgets
Table 2. Dollar Difference Between 2025-26 (COAS:23) and 2025-26 (COAS:25) Standard Methodology Budgets

| | Berkeley | Davis | Irvine | Los Angeles | Merced | Riverside | San Diego | Santa Barbara | Santa Cruz | System |
|--------------------------|----------|---------|---------|-------------|---------|-----------|-----------|---------------|------------|---------|
| COMMUTER | | | | | | | | | | |
| Books & supplies | (\$188) | (\$284) | (\$112) | (\$154) | (\$11) | (\$95) | (\$184) | (\$78) | (\$106) | (\$156) |
| Living | (\$542) | (\$542) | (\$542) | (\$542) | (\$542) | (\$542) | (\$542) | (\$542) | (\$542) | (\$542) |
| Personal | \$294 | \$294 | \$294 | \$294 | \$294 | \$294 | \$294 | \$294 | \$294 | \$294 |
| Transportation | (\$242) | (\$242) | (\$242) | (\$242) | (\$242) | (\$242) | (\$242) | (\$242) | (\$242) | (\$242) |
| Health care | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$30 |
| Total non-fee expenses | (\$678) | (\$774) | (\$602) | (\$644) | (\$501) | (\$585) | (\$674) | (\$568) | (\$596) | (\$616) |
| Systemwide fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Campus fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$30 |
| Total fees for residents | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$30 |
| TOTAL BUDGET | (\$678) | (\$774) | (\$602) | (\$644) | (\$501) | (\$585) | (\$674) | (\$568) | (\$596) | (\$586) |
| ON-CAMPUS | | | | | | | | | | |
| Books & supplies | (\$188) | (\$284) | (\$112) | (\$154) | (\$11) | (\$95) | (\$184) | (\$78) | (\$106) | (\$156) |
| Living | \$413 | \$240 | \$60 | (\$58) | (\$7) | \$78 | (\$81) | (\$146) | (\$41) | \$20 |
| Personal | \$360 | \$429 | \$388 | \$273 | \$299 | \$299 | \$345 | \$258 | \$283 | \$324 |
| Transportation | (\$38) | (\$41) | (\$88) | \$65 | \$263 | \$151 | (\$179) | (\$47) | (\$208) | (\$30) |
| Health care | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | (\$8) |
| Total non-fee expenses | \$547 | \$344 | \$248 | \$126 | \$544 | \$433 | (\$99) | (\$13) | (\$72) | \$150 |
| Systemwide fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Campus fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | (\$3) |
| Total fees for residents | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | (\$3) |
| TOTAL BUDGET | \$547 | \$344 | \$248 | \$126 | \$544 | \$433 | (\$99) | (\$13) | (\$72) | \$147 |
| OFF-CAMPUS | | | | | | | | | | |
| Books & supplies | (\$188) | (\$284) | (\$112) | (\$154) | (\$11) | (\$95) | (\$184) | (\$78) | (\$106) | (\$156) |
| Living | \$373 | \$628 | \$1,618 | \$740 | \$461 | \$463 | \$598 | \$1,289 | \$270 | \$777 |
| Personal | \$237 | \$287 | \$594 | \$520 | \$242 | \$295 | \$291 | \$289 | \$163 | \$319 |
| Transportation | \$1 | (\$123) | (\$157) | (\$136) | \$110 | (\$451) | (\$137) | (\$351) | (\$369) | (\$172) |
| Health care | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$4 |
| Total non-fee expenses | \$423 | \$508 | \$1,943 | \$970 | \$802 | \$212 | \$568 | \$1,149 | (\$42) | \$772 |
| Systemwide fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Campus fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$5 |
| Total fees for residents | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$5 |
| TOTAL BUDGET | \$423 | \$508 | \$1,943 | \$970 | \$802 | \$212 | \$568 | \$1,149 | (\$42) | \$777 |
| ALL STUDENTS | | | | | | | | | | |
| Books & supplies | (\$188) | (\$284) | (\$112) | (\$154) | (\$11) | (\$95) | (\$184) | (\$78) | (\$106) | (\$156) |
| Living | \$292 | \$128 | \$30 | \$21 | \$26 | (\$51) | (\$77) | \$663 | (\$59) | \$93 |
| Personal | \$277 | \$349 | \$440 | \$354 | \$282 | \$295 | \$326 | \$279 | \$231 | \$322 |
| Transportation | (\$15) | (\$63) | (\$141) | \$9 | \$127 | (\$159) | (\$128) | (\$228) | (\$271) | (\$97) |
| Health care | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | (\$6) |
| Total non-fee expenses | \$366 | \$130 | \$217 | \$230 | \$424 | (\$10) | (\$63) | \$636 | (\$205) | \$156 |
| 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 |
| TOTAL BUDGET | \$366 | \$130 | \$217 | \$230 | \$424 | (\$10) | (\$63) | \$636 | (\$205) | \$156 |

2025-26 Standard Methodology Budgets
Table 3. Percent Difference Between 2025-26 (COAS:23) and 2025-26 (COAS:25) Standard Methodology Budgets

| | Berkeley | Davis | Irvine | Los Angeles | Merced | Riverside | San Diego | Santa Barbara | Santa Cruz | System |
|--------------------------|----------|-------|--------|-------------|--------|-----------|-----------|---------------|------------|--------|
| COMMUTER | | | | | | | | | | |
| Books & supplies | -13% | -19% | -7% | -9% | -1% | -5% | -13% | -5% | -8% | -10% |
| Living | -6% | -6% | -6% | -6% | -6% | -6% | -6% | -6% | -6% | -6% |
| Personal | 11% | 11% | 11% | 11% | 11% | 11% | 11% | 11% | 11% | 11% |
| Transportation | -8% | -8% | -8% | -8% | -8% | -8% | -8% | -8% | -8% | -8% |
| Health care | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| Total non-fee expenses | -3% | -4% | -3% | -3% | -3% | -3% | -4% | -3% | -3% | -3% |
| 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% |
| TOTAL BUDGET | -2% | -2% | -2% | -2% | -1% | -2% | -2% | -2% | -2% | -2% |
| ON-CAMPUS | | | | | | | | | | |
| Books & supplies | -13% | -19% | -7% | -9% | -1% | -5% | -13% | -5% | -8% | -10% |
| Living | 2% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | -1% | 0% | 0% |
| Personal | 15% | 20% | 17% | 12% | 13% | 12% | 15% | 11% | 12% | 14% |
| Transportation | -5% | -4% | -9% | 8% | 24% | 14% | -17% | -5% | -18% | -3% |
| Health care | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Total non-fee expenses | 2% | 1% | 1% | 0% | 2% | 2% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| 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% |
| TOTAL BUDGET | 1% | 1% | 1% | 0% | 1% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| OFF-CAMPUS | | | | | | | | | | |
| Books & supplies | -13% | -19% | -7% | -9% | -1% | -5% | -13% | -5% | -8% | -10% |
| Living | 2% | 4% | 8% | 4% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 7% | 1% | 4% |
| Personal | 9% | 12% | 23% | 21% | 10% | 11% | 12% | 12% | 7% | 13% |
| Transportation | 0% | -8% | -6% | -8% | 4% | -17% | -6% | -22% | -16% | -9% |
| Health care | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Total non-fee expenses | 1% | 2% | 6% | 3% | 4% | 1% | 2% | 4% | 0% | 3% |
| 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% |
| TOTAL BUDGET | 1% | 1% | 4% | 2% | 2% | 0% | 1% | 3% | 0% | 2% |
| ALL STUDENTS | | | | | | | | | | |
| Books & supplies | -13% | -19% | -7% | -9% | -1% | -5% | -13% | -5% | -8% | -10% |
| Living | 1% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 3% | 0% | 1% |
| Personal | 11% | 15% | 17% | 15% | 11% | 11% | 13% | 12% | 10% | 13% |
| Transportation | -1% | -4% | -6% | 1% | 7% | -7% | -8% | -16% | -15% | -6% |
| Health care | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Total non-fee expenses | 1% | 0% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 0% | 0% | 2% | -1% | 1% |
| 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% |
| TOTAL BUDGET | 1% | 0% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 0% |