



SETTING THE TOTAL COST OF ATTENDANCE AT UC

NOVEMBER 2019

Table of Contents

Executive Summary 3

 Setting Student Expense Budgets at UC 3

 2019 Cost of Attendance Survey (COAS:19) 3

Setting Student Expense Budgets at UC 5

 Background 5

 Recent Innovations 5

 2020-21 Student Expense Budgets 6

2019 Cost of Attendance Survey (COAS:19) 7

 Student Focus Groups and Instrument Vetting 7

 Administering COAS:19 7

 Findings 10

 Living arrangements and expenses 10

 Transportation 16

 Entertainment and incidentals 18

 Books and Supplies 19

 Work 20

 Sending Money Home 21

 Other Data Sources 21

Appendix: 2020-21 Student Expense Budgets 22

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

Therefore, estimating costs is the first step in building a student’s financial aid package 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 2019 administration of the UC Cost of Attendance Survey (COAS:19).

SETTING STUDENT EXPENSE BUDGETS AT UC

The systemwide Education Financing Model (EFM) 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 grant across the nine undergraduate campuses. Elements include:
 - Separate budgets for those living on-campus, off-campus, and at home with family.
 - Allowances for Books & Supplies, Living (housing and food), Personal Expenses, Transportation, Healthcare, Campus Fees, and Tuition and Student Services Fees.
- Direct expenses are derived from administrative data while indirect expenses are estimated from COAS.

In response to concerns about basic needs as well as feedback from student focus groups, the EFM Steering Committee has implemented the following innovations in how it sets Student Expense Budgets:

- The new methodology will exclude all responses from students who share a bedroom with more than 1 other person. Off-campus housing is not typically built with triple occupancy in mind. Furthermore, students choosing this housing circumstance may be making other financial decisions under duress.
- Localized Housing and Urban Development (HUD) data will augment the COAS:19 results when estimating off-campus rent. HUD figures will act as a “floor” for rents self-reported by students, affecting about 30 percent of responses. This results in a Living allowance 6 percentage points higher than under the prior methodology.
- Books & Supplies and Personal allowances will 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. This results in a Books & Supplies allowance 32 percentage points and a Personal allowance 13 percentage points higher than under the prior methodology.
- Administrative data replaced survey data for Course Materials and Technology Fees in 2018-19.

2019 COST OF ATTENDANCE SURVEY (COAS:19)

During the spring of 2019, over 16,000 University of California undergraduates participated in the seventh COAS. Response rates were above the target; 36 percent of sampled students completed the survey,

sufficient to estimate average expenses with reasonable precision. Survey respondents are representative of the general population of UC undergraduates. Other observations:

- Books and Supplies and Personal expenses declined between the 2013 and 2016 surveys, and that trend continues with the 2019 survey. These declines were somewhat offset by the methodological changes to setting Student Expense Budgets (see above).
- Monthly off-campus rent rose, but did not keep pace with CPI. Food expenses were over 4% lower than those reported 3 years ago. These declines were somewhat offset by the methodological changes to setting Student Expense Budgets (see above).
- Transportation Changes made to the 2019 format of transportation questions do not allow for direct comparisons to previous surveys.
- Students reported modest shifts in their chosen living situation, with 3 percent more students choosing to have a roommate with whom they share a bedroom than in 2016 (50 versus 47 percent). The same proportion (15 percent) of students reported having more than one roommate.
- Slightly more students reported working during the school year (59 percent versus 56 percent) and the same percent who did not work reported that they were unable to find a job (15 percent).
- The 2019 survey was the first time UC asked students if they send money to family with whom they do not live during the school year; 20 percent of respondents said that they sent money home.

The COAS:19 results were compared with a statewide Student Expense and Resources Survey (SEARS) conducted by the California Student Aid Commission. This was the first SEARS conducted in over ten years.

- The SEARS survey confirmed some observed trends in student choices, e.g., declines in spending on books and supplies.
- Roughly 30 percent of UC respondents to SEARS were 25 years of age or older, while only about 7 percent of UC students are 25 and older. Older students spend significantly more than younger students, which makes some of the SEARS results unrepresentative of UC student spending behavior.
- SEARS was designed to provide regional, not campus-specific, cost estimates, which makes it less useful to UC for allocating its own need-based grant under the EFM.

SETTING STUDENT EXPENSE BUDGETS AT UC

BACKGROUND

The University of California's undergraduate financial assistance program is built around the goal of ensuring that UC is 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 employs an integrated conceptual framework to guide the implementation of this policy called the Education Financing Model. The EFM guides the awarding of financial aid to UC students, defines the goals for affordability, and allocates funding across the system to remove cost as a consideration when choosing a UC campus. The EFM is overseen by a systemwide Steering Committee that includes administrative representatives from all campuses, 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 the Total Cost of Attendance Working Group established by the Regents and the President in 2017. 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 in order 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 are generated for each campus based on living arrangement: 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. In 2016, changes were made

to the survey instrument, which is covered in the section on the survey below. In 2019, the changes were innovations to how the survey results are used and 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. The Steering Committee noted that off-campus housing is not typically built to accommodate triple occupancy and therefore not want 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. This did not have a large impact on the average Student Expense Budgets, but the Steering Committee felt it was important on principle.
- Books and Supplies/Personal Expenses: The calculation of all subcategories for Books & Supplies and Personal expenses now only include positive responses. 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 experiencing 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.

This results in a Books & Supplies allowance 32 percentage points and a Personal allowance 13 percentage points higher than under the prior methodology.

- Augmenting Off-Campus Rent Responses with HUD Data: Calculation of off-campus rent now incorporates the Fair Market Rent amounts produced by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) in cases where the HUD value exceeds the amount of off-campus rent a student reported in the COAS:19. Students were assigned a HUD housing type and rental value based on the number of housemates and roommates they reported on the COAS:19; if the HUD calculation was higher than the figure reported on COAS:19, 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.

This results in a Living allowance 6 percentage points higher than under the prior methodology.

- Administrative Data Replaced Survey Data: Based on a recommendation from the Total Cost of Attendance Working Group, the EFM Steering Committee began using administrative data collected from campuses to create an allowance for Course Materials and Technology Fees in 2018-19.

2020-21 STUDENT EXPENSE BUDGETS

Preliminary 2020-21 Student Expense Budgets using the revised Standard Methodology are in the Appendix, along with a comparison to the 2019-20 budgets. These are preliminary and will be revised as updates are received on direct expenses from UC campuses and adjustment are made to the Consumer Price Index.

2019 COST OF ATTENDANCE SURVEY (COAS:19)

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 1990's. 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).

STUDENT FOCUS GROUPS AND INSTRUMENT VETTING

In preparation for COAS:19, 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 the students were incorporated into the survey, including:

- Adding options for students to report new forms of transportation expenses, e.g., ride share
- Include internet expense as a utility cost, not a books and supplies cost
- Include more items in the books and supplies category, such as interactive tools or apps faculty are requiring for class
- Ask about sending money home to family

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.

Changes to the 2016 instrument were carried forward to the 2019 instrument, including:

- In 2016, the COAS instrument was modified to ask about weekly, not monthly food expenses. This was done in response to feedback from student focus groups, where participants expressed more confidence in reporting expenses in the shorter timeframe. This resulted in a 60 percent increase in estimated grocery expenses for off-campus students.
- In order to better assess the quality of student housing, the instrument also began distinguishing between housemates (those with whom a student shares a dwelling) and roommates (those with whom a student shares a bedroom).

ADMINISTERING COAS:19

UCOP survey staff determined the appropriate sample sizes in the same manner as in the previous administrations of the survey.¹ Data from COAS:16 informed assumptions concerning the average campus variance in reported expenses, the likely percentage of respondents who would be commuters, and the likely percentage of respondents who would either be married or have dependents who live with them.

¹ Survey staff selected the sample sizes by determining a target number of both on and off-campus respondents that would estimate mean costs with an error rate of between two and three percent at all campuses, making use of a 95 percent confidence interval and assuming a 30 percent response rate.

In April 2019, the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs (VCSA) from each campus sent the sampled students on his or her campus 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 VCSAs.

To encourage students to complete the survey, UCOP offered systemwide incentive prizes (\$75 and \$500 Amazon gift cards) over the course of ten weeks while the survey was open. Once a student completed the survey, he or she was entered into weekly drawings for the gift cards as well as the grand prize drawing. The earlier a student completed the survey, the more opportunities he or she had to win one of the prizes.

A few weeks into the survey administration, response rates at some campuses were lagging behind other campuses, and UCOP staff worked with campus staff to devise more aggressive advertising campaigns promoting the additional campus-specific incentive prizes. Special targeted incentives were offered to campuses with lagging rates to ensure that all campuses achieved a minimum response rate of 30%.

Table 1

COAS Response Rates, 1999 -00 to 2018-19

Campus	1999-00	2002-03	2005-06	2009-10	2012-13	2015-16	2018-19
Berkeley	66.9%	59.7%	47.7%	57.8%	39.7%	47.9%	37.5%
Davis	53.9%	58.0%	54.8%	61.9%	40.1%	38.4%	41.2%
Irvine	52.5%	59.9%	61.5%	45.8%	43.6%	49.1%	32.8%
Los Angeles	59.8%	55.1%	57.3%	46.4%	27.2%	38.7%	34.6%
Merced				63.3%	45.7%	44.6%	40.2%
Riverside	55.9%	56.6%	49.2%	42.2%	35.5%	42.4%	33.9%
San Diego	59.9%	60.1%	49.3%	54.3%	45.7%	31.1%	35.1%
Santa Barbara	54.4%	57.0%	47.9%	59.0%	38.1%	43.6%	33.7%
Santa Cruz	50.2%	55.0%	48.4%	45.3%	38.3%	39.0%	33.8%
<i>Systemwide</i>	<i>56.7%</i>	<i>57.7%</i>	<i>52.2%</i>	<i>52.2%</i>	<i>39.2%</i>	<i>41.8%</i>	<i>35.6%</i>

In the end, 16,431, or 36 percent of the 46,139 students in the COAS sample submitted a complete or nearly complete survey. Systemwide, response rates were 6 points lower than the 2016 survey, following a trend in declining response rates also seen for other systemwide surveys (see Table 1). Nonetheless, COAS:19 response rates exceeds 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
COAS:19 Sample Sizes and Response Rates

Campus	On-campus			Off-campus & Commuter			All Students		
	Sampled	Responded	Rate	Sampled	Responded	Rate	Sampled	Responded	Rate
Berkeley	1,584	745	47.0%	3,111	1,017	32.7%	4,695	1,762	37.5%
Davis	1,618	668	41.3%	3,309	1,360	41.1%	4,927	2,028	41.2%
Irvine	1,618	646	39.9%	4,653	1,414	30.4%	6,271	2,060	32.8%
Los Angeles	1,635	630	38.5%	3,529	1,159	32.8%	5,164	1,789	34.6%
Merced	1,549	707	45.6%	2,307	842	36.5%	3,856	1,549	40.2%
Riverside	1,654	630	38.1%	4,983	1,617	32.5%	6,637	2,247	33.9%
San Diego	1,618	675	41.7%	3,673	1,183	32.2%	5,291	1,858	35.1%
Santa Barbara	1,618	648	40.0%	3,004	911	30.3%	4,622	1,559	33.7%
Santa Cruz	1,600	648	40.5%	3,076	931	30.3%	4,676	1,579	33.8%
Systemwide	14,494	5,997	41.4%	31,645	10,434	33.0%	46,139	16,431	35.6%

The breakdown of COAS:19 respondents resemble the overall UC undergraduate population fairly closely, however variances in a couple of categories have widened compared with the 2016 survey. For example, respondents were more likely to be female; this is a trend seen for several survey cycles but the gender gap increased by 2 percentage points from COAS:16. Nonetheless, differences between respondents and the populations were small, and when appropriate, were corrected through weighting responses. This comparison suggests that COAS:19 respondents constitute a representative sample of UC undergraduate students (see Table 3).

Table 3
2018-19 Population versus COAS:19 Respondents

Student Level	Population	Respondents
Freshman	18.3%	20.2%
Sophomore	19.1%	20.1%
Junior	28.6%	29.4%
Senior	33.9%	30.3%
Ethnicity	Population	Respondents
African American	4.3%	4.8%
Asian American	46.0%	42.2%
Chicano/Latino	23.3%	28.2%
Native American	1.6%	1.7%
White	21.3%	20.3%
Other	3.4%	2.8%
Gender	Population	Respondents
Female	54.3%	62.5%
Male	45.7%	37.5%
Parent income	Population	Respondents
Dependent	92.8%	92.1%
Less than \$58K	33.5%	38.3%
\$58K-\$115K	21.2%	21.1%
\$115K-\$173K	13.5%	12.5%
\$173K or more	24.6%	20.2%
Independent	7.2%	7.9%

FINDINGS

LIVING ARRANGEMENTS AND EXPENSES

Table 4
COAS:19 Housing Type, by Student Level

	Systemwide	Student Level			
		Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior
Commuter	8.0%	5.9%	6.8%	8.6%	9.2%
With parent(s) or legal guardian(s)	7.2%	5.5%	6.5%	7.6%	8.2%
With other relative(s)	0.8%	0.4%	0.3%	1.0%	1.0%
On-campus	39.0%	84.6%	54.2%	30.2%	13.8%
UC dorm or residence hall	26.4%	78.2%	35.7%	14.6%	3.8%
UC apartment or house	12.6%	6.4%	18.5%	15.6%	9.9%
Off-campus	53.1%	9.5%	39.1%	61.3%	77.0%
Off-campus non-UC apt, house, or room you are renting	49.9%	8.6%	36.3%	57.8%	72.8%
Off-campus non-UC dorm or residence hall	1.8%	0.8%	1.5%	2.0%	2.3%
House you own or are buying	0.4%	0.1%	0.6%	0.3%	0.4%
Co-op	0.8%	0.0%	0.4%	1.0%	1.3%
Homeless (no local home, couch-surfing, living in car, etc.)	0.2%	0.0%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%

- Among the survey respondents, 53% report living off-campus during the 2018-19 academic year. Approximately eight percent of students live in a parent’s or relative’s home² and 39 percent live in on-campus housing (see Table 4).
- Compared to COAS:16, COAS:19 results show a higher percentage of students living on campus beyond freshman year; this is aligned with campus efforts to expand the availability of on-campus housing.
- Fewer than 1 percent (0.2%) of respondents identifies their living situation as homeless; this figure is unchanged from COAS:16.³

Table 5
COAS:19 Marital Status and Children/Dependents

	Systemwide
Marital status	
Single (separated, divorced, widowed or never married)	98.2%
Married	1.6%
Registered domestic partner	0.2%
Number of children/dependents	
None	93.1%
One or more	6.9%
Marital status among students with children/dependents	
Single (never married, separated, divorced, or widowed)	89.7%
Married	9.2%
Registered domestic partner	1.1%

² Depending on their campus and circumstances, a student living with a relative other than their parent or legal guardian may or may not be considered a commuter by their financial aid office. For the purposes of this report, such students are considered commuters.

³ The 2013 administration of the COAS included homeless as a housing type for the first time. The same share of students reported being homeless in COAS:19 as in COAS:13 and COAS:16.

- Two percent of students report that they are married and fewer than 1 percent indicate that they are in a registered domestic partnership (see Table 5).
- Compared to COAS:16, there is a slight decrease (from 8.3% to 6.9%) in the proportion of undergraduates with one or more child/dependent. Among students reporting children or dependents, a slightly higher proportion of students in COAS:19 than in COAS:16 report their current marital status as single (from 7.4% to 9.2%).

Starting with the COAS:16, the survey introduced a distinction between housemates and roommates. This change was intended to help the University better understand the quality of living arrangements. The definitions used in COAS:19 are below.

“In the context of these questions, “housemates” refers to the number of people with whom you share a whole apartment or suite and “roommates” refers to the number of people with whom you share a bedroom.”

Table 6a

COAS:19 Number of Housemates among Off-Campus Students, by Campus

	<i>System-wide</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>
Number of Housemates										
None	7.2%	7.9%	6.7%	7.3%	6.8%	5.7%	13.3%	6.2%	5.6%	6.1%
One	11.6%	13.3%	12.4%	9.9%	10.9%	7.4%	12.7%	11.6%	11.7%	10.0%
Two	15.4%	18.6%	16.6%	14.3%	16.2%	11.4%	11.7%	18.0%	10.9%	13.0%
Three	27.4%	29.5%	30.1%	22.5%	25.8%	21.1%	26.6%	36.5%	23.2%	19.7%
Four	18.0%	11.5%	17.7%	30.6%	22.3%	20.9%	20.1%	16.7%	10.6%	17.7%
Five	9.5%	5.3%	10.8%	9.8%	6.8%	19.6%	10.0%	7.4%	13.9%	12.1%
Six +	11.0%	13.9%	5.7%	5.6%	11.2%	13.8%	5.6%	3.6%	24.2%	21.4%
<i>All students</i>	7.2%	7.9%	6.7%	7.3%	6.8%	5.7%	13.3%	6.2%	5.6%	6.1%

- Table 6a above shows the proportion of students by self-reported housemates.
- Table 6b below shows the change in these proportions between COAS:16 and COAS:19.

Table 6b

COAS:19 Percent Change in Number of Housemates from COAS:16

	<i>System-wide</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>
Number of housemates										
None	-1.4%	-2.8%	0.1%	-0.4%	-3.8%	-2.6%	-1.1%	-2.2%	0.6%	-1.7%
One	-1.7%	-1.2%	-2.6%	-1.4%	-3.5%	-5.1%	-0.3%	-2.3%	0.0%	0.6%
Two	-0.6%	0.6%	-0.1%	0.2%	0.4%	-5.7%	-3.4%	-5.3%	2.6%	-0.2%
Three	2.4%	6.2%	1.5%	-2.4%	5.5%	4.2%	-3.8%	6.4%	-0.8%	2.3%
Four	1.6%	2.9%	0.1%	3.9%	4.8%	-0.1%	4.5%	-1.1%	-0.7%	2.1%
Five	0.6%	-1.0%	1.6%	0.2%	-2.1%	7.3%	3.2%	2.1%	0.7%	-1.6%
Six +	-0.8%	-4.9%	-0.6%	0.0%	-1.3%	2.0%	0.9%	2.4%	-2.4%	-1.5%

- Compared to COAS:16, smaller proportions of students reported living alone or with two or fewer housemates, while the proportion of those living with three or more housemates increased by 4%.
- The increased proportion of students reporting that they have 3 or more housemates helps explain why rental costs at most campuses did not keeping pace with the housing inflation rate in California.

Table 6c
COAS:19 Number of Roommates (sharing bedroom) among Off-Campus Students, by Campus

	<i>System-wide</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>
Number of roommates										
None	35.4%	33.3%	42.7%	27.4%	19.0%	64.0%	65.4%	41.5%	18.0%	41.5%
One	49.5%	52.5%	50.6%	45.5%	50.4%	31.5%	28.8%	53.1%	59.7%	49.2%
Two +	15.1%	14.3%	6.6%	27.1%	30.6%	4.5%	5.8%	5.4%	22.4%	9.4%

- Table 6c shows the number of roommates that respondents reported in COAS:19.
- Systemwide, the vast majority (85%) of students report sharing a sleeping space with no one or with one other person.
- The proportion reporting two or more roommates varies across campuses from a low of 4-6% at Davis, Merced, Riverside, and San Diego to a high of 22-31% at Irvine, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara.

Table 6d
COAS:19 Percent Change in Number of Roommates from COAS:16

	<i>System-wide</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>
Number of roommates										
None	-2.9%	-5.6%	-0.1%	-3.4%	-6.2%	-5.4%	-0.5%	-7.8%	3.2%	-1.4%
One	2.8%	5.5%	-2.3%	0.4%	6.3%	4.1%	-0.7%	11.7%	-1.2%	1.8%
Two +	0.1%	0.1%	2.4%	3.0%	0.0%	1.3%	1.2%	-3.9%	-2.1%	-0.4%

- Table 6d illustrates the percent change in roommate categories since 2016.
- Compared to COAS:16, three percent fewer students reported not sharing a bedroom (35% compared to 38% in 2016).

Table 7a

COAS:19 Average Off-campus Rent, by Number of Housemates and Campus

	<i>System-wide</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>
Number of Housemates										
None	\$1,109	\$1,377	\$971	\$984	\$1,393	\$641	\$818	\$1,092	\$1,156	\$1,105
One	\$985	\$1,162	\$808	\$1,121	\$1,054	\$496	\$742	\$1,019	\$916	\$1,107
Two	\$858	\$1,024	\$712	\$828	\$923	\$454	\$687	\$894	\$766	\$974
Three	\$743	\$909	\$584	\$766	\$892	\$413	\$625	\$687	\$739	\$868
Four	\$688	\$879	\$566	\$646	\$796	\$424	\$563	\$649	\$755	\$848
Five	\$652	\$835	\$544	\$601	\$845	\$398	\$529	\$601	\$700	\$813
Six +	\$787	\$962	\$574	\$599	\$1,016	\$353	\$474	\$674	\$774	\$788
<i>All students</i>	<i>\$801</i>	<i>\$1,001</i>	<i>\$651</i>	<i>\$764</i>	<i>\$937</i>	<i>\$428</i>	<i>\$642</i>	<i>\$775</i>	<i>\$790</i>	<i>\$893</i>

- For most off-campus students, rent is the largest expense. It is also sensitive to the student’s number of housemates.
- Students at campuses in the higher cost areas of the state report higher rents, on average, than other students. Off-campus students report paying an average of between \$428 (UC Merced) and \$1,001 (UC Berkeley) per month for rent (see Table 7a).

Table 7b

Percent Change in Rent from 2016 to 2019 (constant dollars)

	<i>System-wide</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>
Number of Housemates										
None	-7.4%	3.8%	-4.7%	-17.7%	-3.9%	2.0%	-2.9%	-23.5%	-5.2%	4.3%
One	6.8%	6.1%	7.2%	10.7%	2.6%	0.1%	6.5%	0.8%	3.3%	17.4%
Two	7.9%	4.7%	14.1%	-1.2%	3.3%	16.1%	15.2%	4.5%	4.6%	16.5%
Three	7.3%	5.6%	4.4%	8.6%	12.4%	5.3%	6.6%	1.5%	1.5%	9.3%
Four	8.0%	8.4%	9.6%	3.5%	8.2%	13.1%	1.8%	2.4%	-0.8%	16.0%
Five	-4.3%	-9.6%	0.1%	-1.2%	11.8%	1.5%	-2.2%	-1.0%	-6.3%	-2.7%
Six +	2.5%	1.0%	26.2%	13.7%	12.5%	-5.3%	-1.8%	24.3%	-3.9%	11.6%
<i>All students</i>	<i>1.5%</i>	<i>0.2%</i>	<i>5.2%</i>	<i>0.5%</i>	<i>3.3%</i>	<i>2.1%</i>	<i>2.3%</i>	<i>-5.3%</i>	<i>-2.1%</i>	<i>8.5%</i>

- Between COAS:16 and COAS:19, average off-campus rent for the system was relatively flat in constant dollars when adjusted by rent-specific CPI. (See Table 7b).
- Changes at the campus level, however, varied considerably. Across all students, for example, Santa Cruz’s off-campus rent increased by about 9% in constant dollars. Most campuses saw modest increases of 1% to 3% whereas Santa Barbara and San Diego saw a decline in reported rent (-2% and -5%, respectively). (See Tables 7a, b, c)
- The declines reflected above are somewhat mitigated by the changes to the use of these data described above in the Student Expense Budget section.

Table 7c

COAS:19 Average Off-campus Rent, by Number of Roommates (share bedroom) and Campus

	<i>System-wide</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>
Number of Roommates										
None	\$933	\$1,244	\$800	\$946	\$1,234	\$464	\$696	\$931	\$1,036	\$1,024
One	\$732	\$890	\$542	\$721	\$896	\$355	\$529	\$669	\$759	\$809
Two +	\$724	\$852	\$516	\$648	\$823	\$422	\$596	\$653	\$688	\$752
<i>All students</i>	<i>\$801</i>	<i>\$1,001</i>	<i>\$651</i>	<i>\$764</i>	<i>\$937</i>	<i>\$428</i>	<i>\$642</i>	<i>\$775</i>	<i>\$790</i>	<i>\$893</i>

- As expected, costs are lower for students sharing a bedroom – between 68 and 79 percent of rental cost for students with no roommates.
- Compared to COAS:16, there is slightly less cost savings to sharing a room but the rate at which students do not share a room still declined.

Table 7d

COAS:19 Average Off-campus Rent, <10 miles and >10 Miles from Campus

	<i>System-wide</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	93.8%	95.1%	95.1%	91.4%	94.1%	93.5%	90.2%	92.9%	95.8%	94.1%
Rent	\$753	\$977	\$631	\$754	\$934	\$422	\$637	\$766	\$776	\$880
% >10 miles	6.2%	4.9%	4.9%	8.6%	5.9%	6.5%	9.8%	7.1%	4.2%	5.9%
Rent	\$723	\$1,009	\$682	\$694	\$927	\$511	\$584	\$680	\$835	\$786

- Another measure of quality of housing is how far a student must travel to get to campus. The hypothesis being tested was that students were moving farther from campus in order to secure lower rents.
- Systemwide, the proportion of students who live within 10 miles of campus increased by nearly 4% (to 94%); at all of the campuses where average rent within 10 miles is higher than average rent outside of 10 miles, the proportion of students living close to campus still grew since 2016.
- In COAS:16 students who lived further than 10 miles from campus reported higher rents across all of the campuses; in COAS:19 only four of the nine campuses (Berkeley, Davis, Merced, and Santa Barbara) reported higher rents further away campus than reported by those who live within 10 miles of campus.

Table 8

**Average Monthly Rent, Utilities, & Groceries Expenses for Commuter and Off-campus Students
(2018-19 dollars)**

	COAS:13	COAS:16	COAS:19	DIFFERENCE COAS:16 to COAS:19	
				Dollars	Percent
Off-campus					
Rent	\$816	\$789	\$802	\$13	2%
Utilities	\$59	\$60	\$57	(\$3)	-6%
Groceries	\$177	\$281	\$254	(\$27)	-10%
Commuter					
Rent	\$282	\$255	\$268	\$13	5%
Utilities	\$44	\$39	\$44	\$5	13%
Groceries	\$96	\$179	\$184	\$5	3%

- Expenses for rent and utilities for both off-campus and commuter students remained relatively stable systemwide between 2015-16 and 2018-19, though there were modest declines reported by off-campus students for utilities and groceries (see Table 8).
- Average expenses for commuters remain much less than those for students living off-campus.
- At \$254, the reported grocery expense for off campus students is aligned with the USDA “Moderate” cost plan for weekly groceries for females, aged 19-50 (\$257, compared to men’s \$302 cost plan).
- California CPI groceries between 2016 and 2019 rose by only 1% compared to an all-items rise of 10%.

Table 9

COAS:19 Any Rent, Utilities, or Groceries Expenses for Commuter Students, by Income

	All commuters	Parent Income				
		Less than \$58,000	\$58,000-\$115,000	\$115,000-\$173,000	\$173,000 or more	Independent
Pays rent	50%	55%	47%	39%	22%	68%
Pays utilities	49%	53%	49%	32%	28%	65%
Pays groceries	80%	81%	79%	71%	66%	89%

- Many students from lower income families must still “pay their way” when they live at home.
- Half of all commuter students report rent or utilities expenses, lower-income commuters are more likely to have these expenses than higher-income commuters (Table 9).
- Compared to COAS:16, larger proportions of commuter students are paying for rent, utilities, and groceries; the percent of those who pay went up by 8% for rent, 9% for utilities, and 11% for groceries.

Table 10

Average Monthly Snacks & Meals Out Expenses

	COAS:13	COAS:16	COAS:19	DIFFERENCE COAS:13 to COAS:16	
				Dollars	Percent
All Students	\$117	\$174	\$162	(\$12)	-7%
Commuter	\$111	\$170	\$162	(\$8)	-4%
On-campus	\$116	\$146	\$137	(\$9)	-6%
Off-campus	\$119	\$193	\$166	(\$27)	-14%

- Expenses for meals out and snacks range from \$137 per month for on-campus students to \$166 per month for off campus students.
- Adjusting for inflation, the snacks and meals out cost reported by students declined 7% from that reported on COAS:16.
- The combined monthly expense for groceries, snacks, and meals out for off campus students is \$420.

TRANSPORTATION

Table 11

Percent of Students Owning Motor Vehicles, COAS:13 to COAS:19

Campus	All Students		On-campus			Off-campus			
	COAS:13	COAS:16	COAS:19	COAS:13	COAS:16	COAS:19	COAS:13	COAS:16	COAS:19
Berkeley	21%	21%	21%	7%	5%	7%	27%	27%	27%
Davis	57%	47%	48%	13%	14%	38%	67%	54%	49%
Irvine	61%	64%	57%	24%	34%	31%	73%	72%	66%
Los Angeles	32%	31%	30%	11%	13%	15%	49%	48%	43%
Merced	54%	50%	55%	12%	15%	18%	66%	67%	78%
Riverside	60%	58%	62%	31%	31%	32%	74%	73%	78%
San Diego	50%	43%	48%	26%	19%	22%	70%	62%	64%
Santa Barbara	40%	44%	41%	17%	26%	21%	53%	55%	53%
Santa Cruz	39%	37%	44%	14%	19%	23%	65%	60%	67%
Systemwide	45%	43%	43%	17%	19%	21%	59%	55%	55%

- Systemwide, the proportion of students reporting they have a car is the same for students living off campus but the on campus population owning a car increased by two percent. Car ownership varies by campus, ranging from 21% at Berkeley to 62% at Riverside for all students, and ranging from 27% at Berkeley and 78% at both Riverside and Merced for off campus students.
- Since 2016, trends in car ownership have increased the most at Santa Cruz, San Diego, and Merced (by 7%, 5%, and 5%) and have decreased the most at Irvine and Santa Barbara (by 7% and 3%).

Table 12a

Percent Reporting Vehicle Expenses COAS:16 and COAS:19

	<i>COAS:16</i>	<i>COAS:19</i>	<i>DIFFERENCE</i>
Vehicle payment	35%	23%	-12%
Insurance and Registration	85%	62%	-23%
Vehicle maintenance	86%	23%	-63%
Gas and Parking	94%	53%	-41%
Travel to visit parents	68%	79%	11%

Table 12b

Modes of Transportation for Off Campus and Commuters by Campus

	Walk	Drive	Bike or Scooter	Public Trans.	Car or Ride Share
Berkeley	88%	27%	18%	75%	56%
Davis	71%	49%	62%	67%	31%
Irvine	56%	66%	20%	32%	24%
Los Angeles	81%	43%	12%	35%	52%
Merced	33%	78%	14%	54%	23%
Riverside	55%	78%	18%	29%	14%
San Diego	56%	64%	17%	77%	50%
Santa Barbara	76%	53%	70%	34%	23%
Santa Cruz	66%	67%	23%	85%	35%
<i>System</i>	<i>68%</i>	<i>55%</i>	<i>31%</i>	<i>54%</i>	<i>36%</i>

Table 12c

Annual Expense for Non-Vehicle Transportation

	Public transit	Rideshare or Carshare	Bike/Scooter
Commuter	\$129	\$101	\$7
On Campus	\$31	\$200	\$17
Off Campus	\$35	\$180	\$14
All students	\$40	\$182	\$14

- One advantage of the revised format for transportation questions on COAS:19 is that it accounts for new methods students are using to get around, e.g., rideshare, car share, and bike or scooter share options.
- Table 12b illustrates the proportion of survey respondents at each campus reporting various methods for getting to school, work, and to run local errands.
- Many students walk; Berkeley and Los Angeles had the highest proportion of students reporting they walk and these campuses also have a below system average proportion of students who drive.
- Biking or riding a scooter is a preferred method at the Santa Barbara and Davis campuses, but all of the other campuses have much lower bike use.
- Merced and Riverside have the largest percent of students (both 78%) who drive their own vehicles, while Berkeley, Los Angeles, and San Diego have the highest levels of car or ride share use.

ENTERTAINMENT AND INCIDENTALS

Table 13

COAS:19 Average Personal Expenses

	COAS:13	COAS:16	COAS:19	DIFFERENCE	
				COAS:16 to COAS:19 Dollars	Percent
All Students					
Clothing & incidentals	\$96	\$77	\$59	(\$18)	-23%
Entertainment & recreation	\$93	\$71	\$58	(\$13)	-19%
Health care costs not covered by insurance	\$35	\$26	\$20	(\$6)	-23%
Commuter					
Clothing & incidentals	\$107	\$79	\$69	(\$10)	-12%
Entertainment & recreation	\$98	\$68	\$62	(\$6)	-9%
Health care costs not covered by insurance	\$40	\$24	\$20	(\$4)	-16%
On-campus					
Clothing & incidentals	\$94	\$76	\$56	(\$20)	-26%
Entertainment & recreation	\$84	\$66	\$54	(\$12)	-18%
Health care costs not covered by insurance	\$32	\$25	\$19	(\$6)	-24%
Off-campus					
Clothing & incidentals	\$96	\$78	\$59	(\$19)	-24%
Entertainment & recreation	\$98	\$75	\$60	(\$15)	-19%
Health care costs not covered by insurance	\$37	\$27	\$20	(\$7)	-26%

- In every category of personal expenses – clothing, entertainment, and health care items – students reported lower costs than on previous surveys; while some decline in clothing costs may be expected and in alignment with a decline in CPI for apparel items, declines in the other categories do not reflect broader cost trends.
- While commuters spend about \$10 more per month on clothing than on or off campus students, the variation in entertainment and health categories are not significantly different by housing type.

Table 14

COAS:19 Average Personal Expenses, by Parent Income and Gender

	Systemwide		
	Clothing & incidentals	Entertainment & recreation	Health care not covered by insurance
Parent Income			
Less than \$58,000	\$61	\$57	\$19
\$58,000-\$115,000	\$58	\$57	\$19
\$115,000 to \$173,000	\$53	\$55	\$18
\$173,000 or more	\$55	\$63	\$20
Independent	\$70	\$57	\$28
Gender			
Female	\$62	\$56	\$21
Male	\$52	\$58	\$17
All students	\$59	\$58	\$20

- Independent students spend more on clothing, incidentals, and health care than their dependent student counterparts (see Table 14). This is consistent with the finding that older students spend more on the SEARS survey.
- Among dependent students, those in the \$115,000 to \$173,000 category spend less in all areas of personal expenses than both lower income and higher income students.
- Male students report higher spending on entertainment than female students, who, as a group, report higher average expenses on incidental items and health care than do male students. This was also the trend in 2016.

BOOKS AND SUPPLIES

Table 15

Average Annual Expenses for Textbooks and Educational Supplies

	COAS:13	COAS:16	COAS:19	DIFFERENCE	
				Dollars	Percent
All students					
Textbooks	\$844	\$687	\$451	(\$236)	-34%
Supplies	\$174	\$131	\$122	(\$9)	-7%
Additional computer hardware	\$160	\$247	\$238	(\$9)	-4%
Educational software	\$44	\$93	\$90	(\$3)	-3%

Table 16

COAS:19 Percent of Students Incurring Expenses for Selected Supplies

	2013	2016	2019
Purchased a new computer	47%	45%	29%
Purchased a tablet	20%	11%	11%
Any additional computer hardware purchases	47%	19%	19%
Any educational software purchases	37%	20%	20%

- Students report average annualized spending of \$451 on textbooks—34 percent less than what students reported in 2015-16 in constant dollars. This decrease in spending on textbooks continues the declining trend in textbooks over the past 3 COAS surveys. (see Table 15).
- Reported spending on supplies, computer hardware, and computer software also declined since COAS:16 but the same percent of students claiming they incurred those costs remained the same.
- The survey no longer asks students about course materials or lab fees; fee amounts are calculated according to per capita fee revenue reported directly from the campuses.
- The percent of students who reported purchasing a computer in the current academic year declined from 45% in 2016 to 29% in 2019.

WORK

Table 17

COAS:19 Student work during the academic year

	COAS 2016	COAS 2019
Any Paid Work During the Academic Year		
Yes	56%	59%
No	44%	41%
Work Location		
On-campus	48%	50%
Off-campus	38%	37%
Both on-and off-campus	14%	13%
Weeks worked		
All	45%	46%
Most	29%	30%
Half	10%	10%
Less than half	16%	14%
Hours worked per week		
Did not work	45%	42%
1 to 10 hours	21%	20%
11 to 20 hours	26%	29%
> 20 hours	9%	10%
Average hours worked per week	16	16
Average hourly wage	\$13	\$14
Average total earnings	\$2,313	\$4,321
Reason not working, if no work		
Could not find a job	15%	15%
School work did not allow time for a job	58%	56%
Family obligations did not allow time for a job	6%	4%
Did not need the additional income	13%	14%
Did not want to work	10%	10%

- The percent of students who work during the school year has increased steadily with each recent survey, from 51% in 2013 to 56% in 2016 to 59% in 2019.
- Of those who work, 50% percent work on-campus, while 37 percent work off-campus, and 13% have jobs both on and off campus (see Table 17).
- Students work an average of 16 hours a week, with 29 percent of students working between 11 and 20 hours per week (up from 26%) and 10% percent of students working more than the recommended 20 hours per week (up from 9 percent in 2015-16).
- Student wages and total earnings increased in constant dollars compared to 2016; students reported a wage average of \$14 per hour with total earnings averaging of \$4,321 per academic year.
- Of the students who do not work, nearly 60 percent report that their school work does not allow enough time to work, and only 15 percent report that they were unable to find 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, staff added the question “Do you send money to parents or siblings to assist with family expenses?” to the COAS:19.

Table 18

Sending Money Home by Campus

Campus	Sending Money Home
Berkeley	16.4%
Davis	16.1%
Irvine	23.1%
Los Angeles	17.6%
Merced	27.3%
Riverside	28.1%
San Diego	17.1%
Santa Barbara	14.9%
Santa Cruz	17.8%
<i>Systemwide</i>	20.0%

- 20 percent of UC students reported sending money home to their families.
- The proportion of students sending money home varies by campus, from a low of 14.9 percent at Santa Barbara to a high of 28.1 percent at 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 compared the results of COAS:19 with other data sources including,

- As mentioned above, the food allowance was compared with USDA allowances for men and women. The COAS:19 results fall between those for men and women in the typical age range of UC students.
- As mentioned in the *Setting Student Expense Budgets at UC* section, Housing and Urban Development rents replace those reported by students on COAS:19 if the self-reported amounts are lower than the Fair Market Rents for the same or similar housing circumstance (i.e., housemates and roommates).

The COAS:19 results were compared with a statewide Student Expense and Resources Survey (SEARS) conducted by the California Student Aid Commission. This was the first SEARS conducted in over ten years.

- The SEARS response rate for UC students (10%) was much lower than the COAS response rate (36%).
- The SEARS survey confirmed some observed trends in student choices, e.g., declines in spending on books and supplies.
- Roughly 30 percent of UC respondents to SEARS were 25 years of age or older, while only about 7 percent of UC students are 25 and older. Older students spend significantly more than younger students, which makes some of the SEARS results unrepresentative of UC student spending behavior.
- SEARS was designed to provide regional, not campus-specific, cost estimates, which makes it less useful to UC for allocating its own need-based grant under the EFM.

Appendix: Preliminary 2020-21 Student Expense Budgets

2020-21 Standard Methodology Budgets

Table 1. Standard Methodology Budgets

	Berkeley	Davis	Irvine	Los Angeles	Merced	Riverside	San Diego	Santa Barbara	Santa Cruz	Systemwide
COMMUTER										
Books & supplies	\$1,093	\$1,184	\$1,360	\$1,412	\$1,045	\$1,538	\$1,132	\$1,306	\$1,167	\$1,257
Living	\$6,837	\$6,837	\$6,837	\$6,837	\$6,837	\$6,837	\$6,837	\$6,837	\$6,837	\$6,837
Personal	\$1,761	\$1,761	\$1,761	\$1,761	\$1,761	\$1,761	\$1,761	\$1,761	\$1,761	\$1,761
Transportation	\$1,955	\$1,955	\$1,955	\$1,955	\$1,955	\$1,955	\$1,955	\$1,955	\$1,955	\$1,955
Healthcare	\$3,483	\$2,778	\$2,008	\$2,668	\$2,402	\$1,879	\$2,162	\$3,749	\$3,197	\$2,275
Total non-fee expenses	\$15,129	\$14,515	\$13,920	\$14,633	\$14,000	\$13,971	\$13,847	\$15,608	\$14,917	\$14,085
Systemwide fees	\$12,570	\$12,570	\$12,570	\$12,570	\$12,570	\$12,570	\$12,570	\$12,570	\$12,570	\$12,570
Campus fees	\$1,767	\$2,021	\$1,215	\$703	\$1,016	\$1,347	\$1,937	\$1,912	\$1,492	\$1,396
Total fees for residents	\$14,337	\$14,591	\$13,785	\$13,274	\$13,586	\$13,917	\$14,507	\$14,482	\$14,062	\$13,966
TOTAL BUDGET	\$29,467	\$29,106	\$27,705	\$27,906	\$27,586	\$27,888	\$28,354	\$30,090	\$28,979	\$28,051
# students	1,337	2,059	8,101	2,504	740	5,959	3,201	370	650	24,921
% of campus	4%	7%	27%	8%	9%	28%	10%	2%	4%	11%
ON-CAMPUS										
Books & supplies	\$1,093	\$1,184	\$1,360	\$1,412	\$1,045	\$1,538	\$1,132	\$1,306	\$1,167	\$1,257
Living	\$19,383	\$16,256	\$16,241	\$16,813	\$17,285	\$16,261	\$14,508	\$15,630	\$16,632	\$16,473
Personal	\$1,440	\$1,341	\$1,548	\$1,422	\$1,603	\$1,644	\$1,390	\$1,371	\$1,380	\$1,440
Transportation	\$593	\$585	\$758	\$589	\$756	\$798	\$737	\$574	\$776	\$672
Healthcare	\$3,483	\$2,778	\$2,008	\$2,668	\$2,402	\$1,879	\$2,162	\$3,749	\$3,197	\$2,751
Total non-fee expenses	\$25,992	\$22,144	\$21,915	\$22,904	\$23,091	\$22,120	\$19,929	\$22,630	\$23,152	\$22,593
Systemwide fees	\$12,570	\$12,570	\$12,570	\$12,570	\$12,570	\$12,570	\$12,570	\$12,570	\$12,570	\$12,570
Campus fees	\$1,767	\$2,021	\$1,215	\$704	\$1,016	\$1,347	\$1,937	\$1,912	\$1,492	\$1,468
Total fees for residents	\$14,337	\$14,591	\$13,785	\$13,274	\$13,586	\$13,917	\$14,507	\$14,482	\$14,062	\$14,038
TOTAL BUDGET	\$40,329	\$36,735	\$35,700	\$36,178	\$36,677	\$36,037	\$34,436	\$37,112	\$37,214	\$36,631
# students	8,653	6,885	6,636	14,993	3,825	6,341	11,540	9,470	8,669	77,012
% of campus	27%	22%	22%	47%	48%	30%	37%	40%	48%	34%
OFF-CAMPUS										
Books & supplies	\$1,093	\$1,184	\$1,360	\$1,412	\$1,045	\$1,538	\$1,132	\$1,306	\$1,167	\$1,257
Living	\$15,638	\$11,050	\$14,034	\$15,241	\$8,650	\$11,495	\$13,749	\$13,188	\$14,453	\$13,375
Personal	\$1,475	\$1,391	\$1,618	\$1,650	\$1,524	\$1,716	\$1,537	\$1,544	\$1,459	\$1,526
Transportation	\$863	\$970	\$1,580	\$1,028	\$1,336	\$1,431	\$1,287	\$934	\$1,224	\$1,131
Healthcare	\$3,483	\$2,778	\$2,008	\$2,668	\$2,402	\$1,879	\$2,162	\$3,749	\$3,197	\$2,764
Total non-fee expenses	\$22,552	\$17,373	\$20,600	\$21,999	\$14,957	\$18,059	\$19,867	\$20,721	\$21,500	\$20,053
Systemwide fees	\$12,570	\$12,570	\$12,570	\$12,570	\$12,570	\$12,570	\$12,570	\$12,570	\$12,570	\$12,570
Campus fees	\$1,767	\$2,021	\$1,215	\$704	\$1,016	\$1,347	\$1,937	\$1,912	\$1,492	\$1,618
Total fees for residents	\$14,337	\$14,591	\$13,785	\$13,274	\$13,586	\$13,917	\$14,507	\$14,482	\$14,062	\$14,188
TOTAL BUDGET	\$36,889	\$31,964	\$34,385	\$35,273	\$28,543	\$31,976	\$34,374	\$35,203	\$35,562	\$34,241
# students	21,601	22,325	15,394	14,671	3,470	9,128	16,198	13,666	8,813	125,266
% of campus	68%	71%	51%	46%	43%	43%	52%	58%	49%	55%
ALL STUDENTS										
Books & supplies	\$1,093	\$1,184	\$1,360	\$1,412	\$1,045	\$1,538	\$1,132	\$1,306	\$1,167	\$1,257
Living	\$16,291	\$11,919	\$12,585	\$15,320	\$12,594	\$11,610	\$13,317	\$14,072	\$15,222	\$13,708
Personal	\$1,478	\$1,404	\$1,641	\$1,552	\$1,583	\$1,707	\$1,505	\$1,478	\$1,432	\$1,523
Transportation	\$835	\$950	\$1,500	\$896	\$1,117	\$1,389	\$1,151	\$805	\$1,036	\$1,066
Healthcare	\$3,483	\$2,778	\$2,008	\$2,668	\$2,402	\$1,879	\$2,162	\$3,749	\$3,197	\$2,706
Total non-fee expenses	\$23,180	\$18,235	\$19,094	\$21,848	\$18,741	\$18,123	\$19,267	\$21,410	\$22,054	\$20,260
Systemwide fees	\$12,570	\$12,570	\$12,570	\$12,570	\$12,570	\$12,570	\$12,570	\$12,570	\$12,570	\$12,570
Campus fees	\$1,767	\$2,021	\$1,215	\$704	\$1,016	\$1,347	\$1,937	\$1,912	\$1,492	\$1,543
Total fees for residents	\$14,337	\$14,591	\$13,785	\$13,274	\$13,586	\$13,917	\$14,507	\$14,482	\$14,062	\$14,113
TOTAL BUDGET	\$37,517	\$32,826	\$32,879	\$35,122	\$32,327	\$32,040	\$33,774	\$35,892	\$36,116	\$34,373
# students	31,591	31,269	30,131	32,168	8,035	21,428	30,939	23,506	18,132	227,199
% of campus	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

**2020-21 Standard Methodology Budgets
Table 2. Dollar Difference Between 2019-20 (COAS16) and 2020-21 (COAS19) Standard Methodology Budgets**

	Berkeley	Davis	Irvine	Los Angeles	Merced	Riverside	San Diego	Santa Barbara	Santa Cruz	Systemwide
COMMUTER										
Books & supplies	\$223	\$26	(\$30)	(\$51)	\$29	\$102	\$4	\$122	\$82	\$51
Living	\$258	\$258	\$258	\$258	\$258	\$258	\$258	\$258	\$258	\$258
Personal	\$113	\$113	\$113	\$113	\$113	\$113	\$113	\$113	\$113	\$113
Transportation	\$443	\$443	\$443	\$443	\$443	\$443	\$443	\$443	\$443	\$443
Healthcare	\$197	\$157	\$114	\$151	\$136	\$106	\$122	\$212	\$181	\$113
Total non-fee expenses	\$1,234	\$997	\$897	\$914	\$979	\$1,023	\$940	\$1,148	\$1,077	\$978
Systemwide fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Campus fees	\$84	\$96	\$58	\$33	\$48	\$64	\$92	\$91	\$71	\$57
Total fees for residents	\$84	\$96	\$58	\$34	\$48	\$64	\$92	\$91	\$71	\$57
TOTAL BUDGET	\$1,319	\$1,093	\$955	\$947	\$1,027	\$1,087	\$1,032	\$1,239	\$1,148	\$1,035
ON-CAMPUS										
Books & supplies	\$223	\$26	(\$30)	(\$51)	\$29	\$102	\$4	\$122	\$82	\$51
Living	\$278	\$481	\$106	\$188	\$239	\$179	\$237	\$110	(\$319)	\$163
Personal	(\$23)	(\$58)	(\$35)	(\$82)	(\$40)	\$75	(\$74)	(\$123)	(\$187)	(\$69)
Transportation	\$194	\$98	\$124	\$145	\$292	\$124	\$206	(\$65)	\$89	\$128
Healthcare	\$197	\$157	\$114	\$151	\$136	\$106	\$122	\$212	\$181	\$156
Total non-fee expenses	\$869	\$704	\$279	\$351	\$656	\$586	\$495	\$256	(\$154)	\$429
Systemwide fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Campus fees	\$84	\$96	\$58	\$34	\$48	\$64	\$92	\$91	\$71	\$63
Total fees for residents	\$84	\$96	\$58	\$34	\$48	\$64	\$92	\$91	\$71	\$63
TOTAL BUDGET	\$953	\$800	\$337	\$385	\$704	\$650	\$587	\$347	(\$83)	\$492
OFF-CAMPUS										
Books & supplies	\$223	\$26	(\$30)	(\$51)	\$29	\$102	\$4	\$122	\$82	\$51
Living	\$867	\$462	\$1,173	\$938	\$55	\$509	\$68	\$370	\$1,237	\$530
Personal	(\$28)	(\$12)	(\$195)	(\$71)	\$14	(\$14)	(\$68)	(\$80)	\$31	(\$60)
Transportation	\$293	\$138	\$103	\$140	\$203	\$142	\$172	\$50	\$226	\$167
Healthcare	\$197	\$157	\$114	\$151	\$136	\$106	\$122	\$212	\$181	\$145
Total non-fee expenses	\$1,552	\$771	\$1,165	\$1,107	\$437	\$845	\$298	\$674	\$1,757	\$833
Systemwide fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Campus fees	\$84	\$96	\$58	\$34	\$48	\$64	\$92	\$91	\$71	\$107
Total fees for residents	\$84	\$96	\$58	\$34	\$48	\$64	\$92	\$91	\$71	\$107
TOTAL BUDGET	\$1,636	\$867	\$1,223	\$1,141	\$485	\$909	\$390	\$765	\$1,828	\$940
ALL STUDENTS										
Books & supplies	\$223	\$26	(\$30)	(\$51)	\$29	\$102	\$4	\$122	\$82	\$51
Living	\$494	\$351	\$325	\$424	(\$949)	(\$87)	\$68	\$127	\$247	\$138
Personal	(\$18)	(\$14)	(\$75)	(\$56)	(\$17)	\$49	(\$44)	(\$88)	(\$73)	(\$40)
Transportation	\$284	\$156	\$233	\$183	\$360	\$256	\$246	\$22	\$185	\$210
Healthcare	\$197	\$157	\$114	\$151	\$136	\$106	\$122	\$212	\$181	\$139
Total non-fee expenses	\$1,180	\$676	\$567	\$651	(\$441)	\$426	\$396	\$395	\$622	\$498
Systemwide fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Campus fees	\$84	\$96	\$58	\$34	\$48	\$64	\$92	\$91	\$71	\$88
Total fees for residents	\$84	\$96	\$58	\$34	\$48	\$64	\$92	\$91	\$71	\$88
TOTAL BUDGET	\$1,264	\$772	\$625	\$685	(\$393)	\$490	\$488	\$486	\$693	\$586

2020-21 Standard Methodology Budgets
Table 3. Percent Difference Between 2019-20 (COAS16) and 2020-21 (COAS19) Standard Methodology Budgets

	Berkeley	Davis	Irvine	Los Angeles	Merced	Riverside	San Diego	Santa Barbara	Santa Cruz	Systemwide
COMMUTER										
Books & supplies	26%	2%	-2%	-4%	3%	7%	0%	10%	8%	4%
Living	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%
Personal	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%
Transportation	29%	29%	29%	29%	29%	29%	29%	29%	29%	29%
Healthcare	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	5%
Total non-fee expenses	9%	7%	7%	7%	8%	8%	7%	8%	8%	7%
Systemwide fees	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Campus fees	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	4%
Total fees for residents	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%
TOTAL BUDGET	5%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%
ON-CAMPUS										
Books & supplies	26%	2%	-2%	-4%	3%	7%	0%	10%	8%	4%
Living	1%	3%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	-2%	1%
Personal	-2%	-4%	-2%	-5%	-2%	5%	-5%	-8%	-12%	-5%
Transportation	49%	20%	20%	33%	63%	18%	39%	-10%	13%	24%
Healthcare	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%
Total non-fee expenses	3%	3%	1%	2%	3%	3%	3%	1%	-1%	2%
Systemwide fees	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Campus fees	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	4%
Total fees for residents	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%
TOTAL BUDGET	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%	2%	2%	1%	0%	1%
OFF-CAMPUS										
Books & supplies	26%	2%	-2%	-4%	3%	7%	0%	10%	8%	4%
Living	6%	4%	9%	7%	1%	5%	0%	3%	9%	4%
Personal	-2%	-1%	-11%	-4%	1%	-1%	-4%	-5%	2%	-4%
Transportation	51%	17%	7%	16%	18%	11%	15%	6%	23%	17%
Healthcare	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%
Total non-fee expenses	7%	5%	6%	5%	3%	5%	2%	3%	9%	4%
Systemwide fees	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Campus fees	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	7%
Total fees for residents	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%
TOTAL BUDGET	5%	3%	4%	3%	2%	3%	1%	2%	5%	3%
ALL STUDENTS										
Books & supplies	26%	2%	-2%	-3%	3%	7%	0%	10%	8%	4%
Living	3%	3%	3%	3%	-7%	-1%	1%	1%	2%	1%
Personal	-1%	-1%	-4%	-3%	-1%	3%	-3%	-6%	-5%	-3%
Transportation	52%	20%	18%	26%	48%	23%	27%	3%	22%	25%
Healthcare	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	5%
Total non-fee expenses	5%	4%	3%	3%	-2%	2%	2%	2%	3%	3%
Systemwide fees	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Campus fees	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	6%
Total fees for residents	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%
TOTAL BUDGET	3%	2%	2%	2%	-1%	2%	1%	1%	2%	2%