
**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT**



**FINDINGS FROM THE
UNDERGRADUATE
COST OF ATTENDANCE SURVEY
2009-2010**

**OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS
STUDENT FINANCIAL SUPPORT**

OCTOBER 2010

Questions about this report may be directed to Kerry Franzetta, Student Financial Support,
Department of Student Affairs, University of California Office of the President at (510) 987-0542
or by e-mail to kerry.franzetta@ucop.edu.

Review of 2010 Cost of Attendance Survey Results

During the Spring of 2010, more than 9,000 UC undergraduates were surveyed as part of the fifth Cost of Attendance Survey. Response rates exceeded the target of 50% (52% of sampled students completed the survey), data was collected from a sufficient number of students to estimate average expenses with reasonable precision and survey respondents appear to be representative of the population of UC undergraduates.

Additional attachments explain the use of Cost of Attendance data in setting Standard Methodology student expense budgets and compare the proposed 2011-12 Standard Methodology budgets, which are based on the new survey data, with older information. This report summarizes the Student Financial Support unit's initial findings from the new survey, particularly how 2009-10 average expenses compare with those measured in the 2005-06 survey.

Several categories of expenses increased very little between 2005-06 and 2009-10. These categories include expenses for entertainment and snacks/meals out, clothing and incidentals, course textbooks, computer-related supplies and services and vehicle expenses including car payments, maintenance, gas and local travel. We may speculate that these changes are due to a combination of student efforts to economize (e.g., fewer students have cars on campus and greater proportions of off-campus students are choosing to live with more roommates), as well as changes in technology (e.g., media of all types, including textbooks, movies and music are increasingly available electronically, often at lower cost).

In the largest expense category, housing costs, students living off-campus spent \$661 per month, on average, for rent in 2009-10—a 10% increase over 2005-06. Increases in off-campus rent were relatively consistent across campuses, ranging from 10% to 13% at all campuses except Riverside and San Diego, where off-campus rents increased 4% and 7%, respectively.

Survey development

The Cost of Attendance Survey was originally developed in 1995 by financial aid and institutional research staff at UC campuses and the Office of the President. Since the first administration of the survey in 1996-97, relatively minor changes have been made to individual survey questions and the survey has shifted from a paper format to a mixed-mode survey and finally to an entirely web-based survey. In most respects, however, COAS:10 was quite similar to each of the previous four administrations of the survey. The Merced campus participated in the COAS for the first time in 2009-10.

Sampling

The appropriate sample sizes were determined in the same manner as the previous administrations of the survey.¹ Assumptions were made based on COAS:06 concerning the average campus variance in reported expenses, the likely percentage of respondents who would

¹ We selected the samples by determining a target number of both on and off-campus respondents that would estimate mean costs with an error rate of between 2% and 3%, making use of a 95% confidence interval for all campuses and assuming a 50% response rate.

be commuters and the likely percentage of respondents who would either be married or have dependents who live with them.² To estimate average expenses with an adequate level of precision, it was determined that approximately 350 on-campus respondents and 500 off-campus respondents from each campus, except Merced, would be needed. Because the undergraduate student population at Merced is considerably smaller than at other campuses, it was determined that approximately 300 on-campus respondents and 360 off-campus respondents from Merced would be needed. The COAS:10 sample included commuter students but made no special allowance for over-sampling them.

Response rates in previous administrations of the survey ranged between 52% and 62%. Total sample sizes for COAS:10 (714 on-campus students per campus, 609 on-campus students at Merced and between 1,100 and 1,600 off-campus and commuter students per campus, 861 off-campus and commuter students at Merced) were set such that response rates of at least 50% would yield the desired number of respondents. Samples were drawn in February 2010 from the population of students enrolled during the Fall 2009 and Winter 2010 quarters or the Spring 2010 semester.

Administering COAS:10

The original plan for inviting sampled students to complete the survey included contacting students through an invitation letter and reminder emails from survey staff and recognizable campus figures (e.g., Vice Chancellors for Student Affairs, Financial Aid Directors) and through reminder phone calls to non-respondents. We awarded incentive prizes of \$500 Amazon.com gift cards and one grand prize of \$1,000 to encourage students to complete the survey. Once a student completed the survey, his or her name would be entered into weekly drawings for the gift cards in addition to the grand prize drawing, so 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 process, we noticed that response rates at some campuses were lagging, and we worked with campus staff to advertize and offer additional campus-specific incentive prizes. Six campuses offered additional campus-specific incentive prizes such as money added to student id card accounts or gift certificates to campus book stores. Two campuses posted COAS reminder messages on their campus web portals, and one campus posted a similar message on the Financial Aid office webpage. These local publicity efforts succeeded in boosting response rates.

² We adjusted for the anticipated proportion of respondents who are single without dependents on each campus (the only responses used to calculate our budget estimates). We determined one target number for on-campus students that would achieve this for all campuses except Merced. Off-campus targets were calculated in the same way and were additionally adjusted to account for the percent of off-campus students on each campus that are commuter students. As this proportion varies greatly by campus, the total number of off-campus students sampled varies accordingly. Because the student population at Merced is much smaller than the population at any of the other campuses, we used a finite population correction factor to adjust the target sample sizes down for Merced.

Table 1
COAS Response Rates, 1996-97 to 2009-10

Campus	1996-97	1999-00	2002-03	2005-06	2009-10
Berkeley	63.8%	66.9%	59.7%	47.7%	57.8%
Davis	63.1%	53.9%	58.0%	54.8%	61.9%
Irvine	60.9%	52.5%	59.9%	61.5%	45.8%
Los Angeles	60.8%	59.8%	55.1%	57.3%	46.4%
Riverside	61.5%	55.9%	56.6%	49.2%	42.2%
San Diego	60.8%	59.9%	60.1%	49.3%	54.3%
Santa Barbara	60.9%	54.4%	57.0%	47.9%	59.0%
Santa Cruz	60.4%	50.2%	55.0%	48.4%	45.3%
<i>Systemwide</i>	<i>61.5%</i>	<i>56.7%</i>	<i>57.7%</i>	<i>52.2%</i>	<i>52.2%</i>

In the end, 9,075, or 52% of 17,309 students in the COAS sample submitted a complete, or nearly complete, survey. Systemwide, response rates were the same as the 2005-06 administration of the survey, although lower than past survey cycles (see Table 1). Response rates compare very favorably with those of other major student surveys, such as UCUES (response rate of 39% in 2008). The numbers of respondents were sufficient for estimating expense budgets with the requisite level of precision (see Table 2).

Table 2
COAS:10 Sample Sizes and Response Rates

Campus	<i>On-campus</i>			<i>Off-campus & Commuter</i>			<i>All Students</i>		
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Response</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Response</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Response</i>
	<i>Sampled</i>	<i>Responded</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>Sampled</i>	<i>Responded</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>Sampled</i>	<i>Responded</i>	<i>Rate</i>
Berkeley	714	408	57.1%	1,131	658	58.2%	1,845	1,066	57.8%
Davis	714	457	64.0%	1,171	709	60.5%	1,885	1,166	61.9%
Irvine	714	342	47.9%	1,582	710	44.9%	2,296	1,052	45.8%
Los Angeles	714	364	51.0%	1,251	548	43.8%	1,965	912	46.4%
Merced	609	382	62.7%	861	549	63.8%	1,470	931	63.3%
Riverside	714	310	43.4%	1,569	654	41.7%	2,283	964	42.2%
San Diego	714	441	61.8%	1,259	630	50.0%	1,973	1,071	54.3%
Santa Barbara	714	419	58.7%	1,109	656	59.2%	1,823	1,075	59.0%
Santa Cruz	714	351	49.2%	1,136	487	42.9%	1,850	838	45.3%
<i>Systemwide</i>	<i>6,321</i>	<i>3,474</i>	<i>55.0%</i>	<i>11,069</i>	<i>5,601</i>	<i>50.6%</i>	<i>17,390</i>	<i>9,075</i>	<i>52.2%</i>

COAS:10 respondents were compared, in terms of various demographic and financial aid information, with the population of UC undergraduates. Respondents exhibited the

characteristics we have come to associate with survey respondents. These students were more likely to be female and lower-level students than UC students in general. Nonetheless, differences between respondents and the populations were small, and when appropriate, were corrected through weighting responses. This comparison suggests that COAS:10 respondents constitute a representative sample of UC undergraduate students (see Table 3 for system-level statistics; see Appendix Table 1 for campus-level statistics).

Table 3
2009-10 Population versus COAS:10
Respondents

Student Level	Population	Respondents
Freshman	19.8%	21.1%
Sophomore	19.0%	20.2%
Junior	27.3%	27.4%
Senior	33.9%	31.3%
Ethnicity	Population	Respondents
African American	3.5%	2.8%
Asian American	40.7%	40.7%
Chicano	12.7%	12.8%
Latino	4.1%	3.8%
Native American	0.6%	0.6%
White	32.3%	33.2%
Other	1.8%	1.8%
Decline to state	4.4%	4.2%
Gender	Population	Respondents
Female	53.6%	57.3%
Male	46.4%	42.7%
Parent income	Population	Respondents
Dependent	92.9%	93.1%
Less than \$40,000	25.7%	26.7%
\$40,000-\$79,999	19.6%	19.4%
\$80,000 to \$119,999	15.9%	16.0%
\$120,000 or more	31.7%	31.0%
Independent	7.1%	6.9%

Findings

Caveats

Please note that the following findings are not limited to the students represented in the Standard Methodology expense budgets (i.e., students who are not married and do not have dependents who live with them). Likewise, these findings deal with all the categories of expenses covered in

the survey, including expenses that are not included in the Standard Methodology expense budgets.

Average expenses reported here may also vary from amounts that are incorporated in the Standard Methodology budgets because these results rely on the COAS:10 “research weights,” which represent students who were actually in the survey sample frame (i.e., enrolled the entire academic year and not enrolled in the Education Abroad Program). The COAS-based elements of the Standard Methodology budgets are calculated using “dynamic weights,” which are updated over time to represent all students enrolled in the specific year associated with each version of the budgets.

Living arrangements and expenses

Most undergraduates (58%) lived off-campus during the 2009-10 academic year. Approximately 10% of students lived in a parent’s or relative’s home³ and 32% lived in on-campus housing. Table 4a shows where students at each campus lived during 2009-10. Among freshmen, 81% lived on-campus (see Table 4 for system-level statistics; see Appendix Table 2 for campus-level statistics). Compared to COAS:06, these results show no significant change in housing patterns.

Table 4
COAS:10 Housing Type, by Student Level

	Systemwide	Student Level			
		Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior
<u>Commuter</u>	9.8%	8.8%	8.6%	11.2%	10.0%
With parent(s) or legal guardian(s)	9.2%	8.5%	8.2%	10.1%	9.4%
With other relative(s)	0.6%	0.3%	0.3%	1.1%	0.6%
<u>On-campus</u>	32.3%	81.1%	43.1%	17.7%	5.6%
UC dorm or residence hall	24.5%	76.5%	26.4%	9.1%	2.1%
UC apartment or house	7.8%	4.6%	16.7%	8.6%	3.5%
<u>Off-campus</u>	58.0%	10.2%	48.4%	71.2%	84.4%
Off-campus non-UC apt, house, or room you are renting	55.1%	9.3%	46.4%	67.7%	80.2%
Off-campus non-UC dorm or residence hall	1.5%	0.5%	1.5%	1.4%	2.2%
House you own or are buying	0.8%	0.2%	0.2%	1.4%	1.0%
Co-op	0.6%	0.1%	0.3%	0.7%	1.0%

Two percent of students reported that they were married during 2009-10 and less than one percent indicated that they were in a registered domestic partnership. Approximately 4% reported that they have children or other dependents that live with them. Compared to COAS:06, there is no significant change in patterns of marital status among undergraduates as a whole. However, among students reporting children or dependents, 84% of students in COAS:10

³ 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.

indicated their current marital status as single, compared with 76% of students in COAS:06 (see Table 5 for system-level statistics; see Appendix Table 3 for campus-level statistics).

Table 5
COAS:10 Marital Status and Children/Dependents

	<i>Systemwide</i>
Marital status	
Single (never married, separated, divorced, or widowed)	98.0%
Married	1.9%
Registered domestic partner	0.1%
Number of children/dependents	
None	95.8%
One or more	4.2%
Marital status among students with children/dependents	
Single (never married, separated, divorced, or widowed)	84.4%
Married	15.6%

Persistent inter-campus differences suggest that the available rental housing stock in the areas where students live is a key determinant of living arrangements and average rents. At Berkeley, for example, off-campus students were more likely to live alone or with only one roommate than students at other campuses. Off-campus students at Santa Barbara, at the other extreme, were more likely than other students to live with four or more roommates (see Table 6). In contrast, within a campus, variations in living arrangements by parent income or other variables were modest.

Table 6
COAS:10 Number of Roommates among Off-Campus Students, by 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>
Number of roommates										
None	8.6%	12.1%	6.1%	10.2%	10.3%	10.7%	14.6%	6.7%	4.3%	6.0%
One	18.5%	25.6%	14.8%	14.5%	18.2%	19.0%	20.0%	18.8%	18.0%	17.5%
Two	18.5%	22.3%	22.3%	19.8%	15.0%	14.9%	16.7%	19.8%	10.0%	19.1%
Three	28.1%	18.9%	28.5%	34.9%	32.9%	24.7%	26.7%	30.2%	28.5%	27.0%
Four	12.3%	8.1%	13.4%	13.1%	12.0%	17.0%	12.0%	17.9%	10.0%	13.0%
Five	6.1%	2.6%	9.2%	5.0%	6.1%	9.6%	4.9%	3.7%	9.6%	6.7%
Six +	7.8%	10.5%	5.8%	2.5%	5.5%	4.2%	5.2%	2.8%	19.8%	10.7%

For most off-campus students, the largest expense (and the expense that is most sensitive to the student’s number of roommates) is rent. Most off-campus students reported paying between \$440 (at Merced) and \$740 (at Berkeley) per month for rent (see Table 7). As one might expect,

students at campuses in the higher cost areas of the state reported higher rents, on average, than other students. As shown in Table 7, students clearly derived significant savings from sharing housing. In addition, it appears that greater proportions of students are choosing to live with more roommates. In 2009-10, 54% of students living in off-campus housing reported living with three or more roommates, up from 47% in 2005-06 (see Appendix Table 4).

Table 7
Average Off-campus Rent by Number of Roommates

	Systemwide	Campus								
		Berkeley	Davis	Irvine	Los Angeles	Merced	Riverside	San Diego	Santa Barbara	Santa Cruz
Number of roommates										
None	\$885	\$938	\$864	\$875	\$883	\$645	\$831	\$909	\$940	\$827
One	\$734	\$770	\$612	\$791	\$795	\$514	\$650	\$770	\$740	\$760
Two	\$650	\$708	\$575	\$636	\$742	\$407	\$536	\$668	\$670	\$714
Three	\$611	\$660	\$525	\$600	\$684	\$381	\$597	\$569	\$649	\$694
Four	\$585	\$682	\$506	\$575	\$647	\$378	\$492	\$552	\$651	\$690
Five	\$575	\$694	\$439	\$564	\$667	\$377	\$494	\$505	\$690	\$709
Six +	\$637	\$725	\$466	\$497	\$635	\$422	\$441	\$589	\$729	\$634
<i>All students</i>	<i>\$661</i>	<i>\$742</i>	<i>\$557</i>	<i>\$655</i>	<i>\$727</i>	<i>\$439</i>	<i>\$606</i>	<i>\$645</i>	<i>\$700</i>	<i>\$712</i>

Overall, the average off-campus rent increased by 10% between 2005-06 and 2009-10 (see Table 8).⁴ Increases in off-campus rent ranged from between 4% at Riverside to 13% at Santa Barbara. For the remainder of campuses, off-campus rents increased between 10% and 12% (see Appendix Table 4). Off-campus students reported monthly spending of \$53 for utilities (down 5% from \$56 in 2005-06) and \$157 for groceries and household supplies (up 8% from \$145 in 2005-06) (see Table 8 for system-level statistics; see Appendix Table 6 for campus-level statistics).

⁴ Because UC Merced did not participate in the 2005-06 COAS, the systemwide comparisons between 2009-10 and 2005-06 were conducted both with UC Merced included in the systemwide total and with UC Merced excluded from the systemwide total. The average off-campus rent increased by 10% regardless of whether UC Merced was included in the systemwide total or not.

Table 8
Average Monthly Rent, Utilities, & Groceries Expenses
for Commuter and Off-campus Students

	COAS:06	COAS:10	DIFFERENCE	
			Dollars	Percent
Off-campus				
Rent	\$603	\$661	\$58	10%
Utilities	\$56	\$53	(\$3)	-5%
Groceries	\$145	\$157	\$12	8%
Commuter				
Rent	\$186	\$239	\$53	28%
Utilities	\$32	\$40	\$8	25%
Groceries	\$75	\$87	\$12	16%

Expenses increased more rapidly between 2005-06 and 2009-10 for commuter students than for students living off-campus. While off-campus rent increased by 10% and utilities declined by 5% for off-campus students between 2005-06 and 2009-10, rent increased by 28% and utilities increased by 25% for commuters (Table 8). Nevertheless, average expenses for commuters remained much less than those for students living off-campus.

Most commuter students did not report having to spend anything for rent or utilities. However, lower income commuters, approximately two-thirds of whom reported having to pay for rent and one-half of whom reported having to pay for utilities, were more likely to have these expenses than higher income commuters (Table 9). It appears that many students from lower income families must still “pay their way” when they live at home. Commuters reported spending \$239 and \$40 per month, on average, for rent and utilities (see Table 8). Regardless of parent income, commuters tended to report having to incur expenses for groceries and household supplies averaging \$87 per month for 2009-10 (Table 8).

Table 9
COAS:10 Any Rent, Utilities, or Groceries Expenses for
Commuter Students, by Parent Income

	All commuters	Parent Income			
		Less than \$40,000	\$40,000-\$79,999	\$80,000 to \$119,999	\$120,000 or more
Pays rent	51.9%	63.7%	51.0%	49.3%	35.5%
Pays utilities	41.2%	47.7%	38.6%	41.1%	32.7%
Pays groceries	71.9%	79.4%	72.2%	67.7%	63.5%

Expenses for meals out and snacks are substantial for commuters, on-campus students and off-campus students alike. In 2009-10, students reported spending just over \$100 per month, on average, on snacks and meals out, and this amount is unchanged from 2005-06 (see Table 10 for system-level statistics; see Appendix Table 7 for campus-level statistics).

Table 10
Average Monthly Snacks & Meals Out Expenses

	COAS:06	COAS:10	DIFFERENCE	
			Dollars	Percent
All Students	\$108	\$108	(\$0)	0%
Commuter	\$108	\$97	(\$11)	-10%
On-campus	\$102	\$102	\$0	0%
Off-campus	\$112	\$112	\$0	0%

Since the 2005-06 survey, the percent of students who reported that their only phone was a cellular phone increased by 33%, from 67% to 89%. Since the last survey, cell phone usage among students has become ubiquitous. In 2009-10, less than one-half of one percent of students reported that they did not have a cell phone (Table 11).

Table 11
Telephone Use

	COAS:06	COAS:10	DIFFERENCE
			Percent
Residential phone line only	2.0%	0.3%	-85%
Cellular/mobile phone only	67.0%	88.8%	33%
Both a residential & a cell/mobile phone	31.0%	10.9%	-65%

Students with cell phones reported spending \$32 per month, on average, for their phone plan and \$13 per month for additional cell phone services and overages. While the costs of cell phone plans are slightly lower than what students reported spending in 2005-06, students in 2009-10 reported spending slightly more on additional cell phone services and overages, making their average total cell phone expenses relatively unchanged since 2005-06. Students who reported having a residential phone, about 11% of students, spent only \$11, on average, for residential phone service. Unlike in prior cycles of the survey, we did not ask respondents to distinguish between local phone service and long distance charges (see Table 12 for system-level statistics; see Appendix Table 8 for campus-level statistics).

Table 12
COAS:10 Average Monthly Telephone Expenses

	COAS:06	COAS:10	DIFFERENCE	
			Dollars	Percent
All Students				
Residential phone	\$11	\$11	\$0	1%
Cell phone plan	\$36	\$32	(\$4)	-10%
Additional cell phone charges	\$10	\$13	\$3	35%
Commuter				
Residential phone	\$7	\$8	\$1	14%
Cell phone plan	\$31	\$29	(\$2)	-6%
Additional cell phone charges	\$11	\$12	\$1	9%
On-campus				
Residential phone	\$12	\$6	(\$6)	-50%
Cell phone plan	\$37	\$32	(\$5)	-14%
Additional cell phone charges	\$11	\$14	\$3	27%
Off-campus				
Residential phone	\$13	\$16	\$3	23%
Cell phone plan	\$39	\$33	(\$6)	-15%
Additional cell phone charges	\$10	\$12	\$2	20%

Transportation

Overall, on-campus and off-campus students were less likely to indicate that they had a motor vehicle during the 2009-10 academic year than were on-campus and off-campus students in 2005-06. The overall decrease was eight percentage points, and the drop occurred widely, was substantial for several campuses, and continued the pattern of decline observed between 2002-03 and 2005-06 (see Table 13).

Table 13
Percent of Students Owning Motor Vehicles, 2005-06 and 2009-10

Campus	All Students		On-campus		Off-campus	
	COAS:06	COAS:10	COAS:06	COAS:10	COAS:06	COAS:10
Berkeley	31.9%	27.0%	8.0%	12.0%	39.0%	33.0%
Davis	60.2%	56.0%	19.0%	14.0%	70.0%	67.0%
Irvine	80.5%	72.0%	55.0%	38.0%	89.0%	83.0%
Los Angeles	53.0%	43.0%	24.0%	15.0%	67.0%	62.0%
Merced	--	60.0%	--	25.0%	--	76.0%
Riverside	73.6%	68.0%	46.0%	41.0%	84.0%	81.0%
San Diego	67.5%	59.0%	36.0%	26.0%	83.0%	80.0%
Santa Barbara	64.0%	51.0%	40.0%	24.0%	74.0%	62.0%

Santa Cruz	51.7%	44.0%	28.0%	16.0%	73.0%	69.0%
Systemwide	59.6%	52.0%	31.0%	23.0%	70.0%	66.0%

It is possible that the economic downturn, changes in campus policies or the availability of parking may have led students to leave their cars at home. Among commuter, on-campus and off-campus students who had cars at school, gas and parking expenses for local travel increased only 2%--from \$104 per month, on average, in 2005-06 to \$106 per month in 2009-10 (see Table 14 for system-level statistics; see Appendix Table 9 for campus-level statistics). This appears consistent with changes in gas prices in the past 4 years.⁵

The survey also asked car-owners to report how much they spent for vehicle repairs and routine maintenance and for registration and insurance. Students reported annualized spending of \$273 for maintenance and \$811 for insurance and registration, a 12% decline from the \$926 reported for insurance and registration in 2005-06 (Table 14; Appendix Table 9).

Only 27% of students reported incurring any expenses for public transit. Other students may use public transit, but they pay for it through campus fees. Students who reported expenses for public transit beyond fees spent \$33 per month, on average—a \$4 increase over what was spent in 2005-06. On average, commuter students spend twice as much, on public transit beyond fees than do students living off-campus (\$65 vs. \$32). Students also reported spending an average of \$365 per year on expenses traveling to visit their parents. This was 5% more than what students reported spending in 2005-06 (Table 14).

⁵ Based on historical gas price data found at http://www.CaliforniaGasPrices.com/retail_price_chart.aspx?city1=California&city2=&city3=&crude=n&tme=60&units=us

Table 14
Average Transportation Expenses

	COAS:06	COAS:10	DIFFERENCE	
			Dollars	Percent
All Students				
Vehicle payment (per month)	\$91	\$91	\$0	0%
Insurance & registration (per academic year)	\$926	\$811	(\$115)	-12%
Vehicle maintenance (per academic year)	\$272	\$273	\$1	1%
Gas & parking for local travel (per month)	\$104	\$106	\$2	2%
Travel to visit parents (per academic year)	\$349	\$365	\$16	5%
Commuter				
Vehicle payment (per month)	\$93	\$106	\$13	14%
Insurance & registration (per academic year)	\$897	\$792	(\$105)	-12%
Vehicle maintenance (per academic year)	\$282	\$287	\$5	2%
Gas & parking for local travel (per month)	\$138	\$149	\$11	8%
Travel to visit parents (per academic year)	\$229	\$284	\$55	24%
On-campus				
Vehicle payment (per month)	\$100	\$113	\$13	13%
Insurance & registration (per academic year)	\$1,022	\$951	(\$71)	-7%
Vehicle maintenance (per academic year)	\$260	\$282	\$22	8%
Gas & parking for local travel (per month)	\$94	\$98	\$4	4%
Travel to visit parents (per academic year)	\$371	\$373	\$2	1%
Off-campus				
Vehicle payment (per month)	\$88	\$84	(\$4)	-5%
Insurance & registration (per academic year)	\$910	\$788	(\$122)	-13%
Vehicle maintenance (per academic year)	\$272	\$269	(\$3)	-1%
Gas & parking for local travel (per month)	\$99	\$99	\$0	0%
Travel to visit parents (per academic year)	\$358	\$373	\$15	4%

Table 15
COAS:10 Average Monthly Public Transportation Expenses Among Students Reporting any Public Transit Expenses, by Campus

	System-wide	Campus								
		Berkeley	Davis	Irvine	Los Angeles	Merced	Riverside	San Diego	Santa Barbara	Santa Cruz
All students	\$33	\$39	\$33	\$40	\$23	\$46	\$45	\$32	\$28	\$30
Commuter	\$65	\$92	\$62	\$77	\$47	\$57	\$57	\$51	\$51	\$46
On-campus	\$26	\$28	\$26	\$27	\$18	\$51	\$45	\$27	\$26	\$31
Off-campus	\$32	\$36	\$32	\$37	\$23	\$39	\$39	\$33	\$29	\$29

Entertainment and incidentals

The survey asked students to report how much they spend on miscellaneous items including clothing, shoes, laundry and hair care. Students reported spending \$82 per month, on average, for these incidentals in 2009-10. This was a 4% decrease from what students reported spending in 2005-06. Students also reported a similar pattern of spending for entertainment and recreation. In 2009-10, students spent \$77 per month, on average—7% less than students reported in 2005-06 (see Table 16 for system-level statistics; see Appendix Table 10 for campus-level statistics).

Table 16
Average Personal Expenses

	COAS:06	COAS:10	DIFFERENCE	
			Dollars	Percent
All Students				
Clothing & incidentals	\$85	\$82	(\$3)	-4%
Entertainment & recreation	\$83	\$77	(\$6)	-7%
Commuter				
Clothing & incidentals	\$97	\$93	(\$4)	-4%
Entertainment & recreation	\$92	\$84	(\$8)	-9%
On-campus				
Clothing & incidentals	\$79	\$79	\$0	0%
Entertainment & recreation	\$72	\$66	(\$6)	-8%
Off-campus				
Clothing & incidentals	\$81	\$81	\$0	0%
Entertainment & recreation	\$87	\$82	(\$5)	-6%

Independent students spent more on both clothing and incidentals and entertainment and recreation than their dependent student counterparts. Among dependent students, spending on clothing and incidentals decreased slightly with parent income, while spending on entertainment was relatively constant across parent income levels. Male students reported significantly higher spending on entertainment than female students, who, as a group, reported higher average expenses on incidental items than did male students (Table 17).

Table 17
COAS:10 Average Personal Expenses, by Parent Income and Gender

	<i>Systemwide</i>	
	<i>Clothing & incidentals</i>	<i>Entertainment & recreation</i>
Parent Income		
Less than \$40,000	\$90	\$77
\$40,000-\$79,999	\$83	\$76
\$80,000 to \$119,999	\$74	\$72
\$120,000 or more	\$73	\$76
Independent	\$101	\$96
Gender		
Female	\$90	\$73
Male	\$70	\$83
All students	\$82	\$77

Books and Supplies

Students were asked how much they spent for course textbooks per quarter or semester during the 2009-10 academic year. On average, students reported annualized spending of \$835 on textbooks—just \$1 more than what students reported in 2005-06. This observed lack of change in spending continues the trend we observed in 2005-06 when we observed only a 4% increase in the amount students spent on books, despite steep increases in the price of textbooks.

Table 18
Average Annual Expenses for Textbooks and Educational Supplies

	<i>COAS:06</i>	<i>COAS:10</i>	<i>DIFFERENCE</i>	
			<i>Dollars</i>	<i>Percent</i>
All students				
Textbooks	\$836	\$835	(\$1)	0%
Supplies	\$143	\$146	\$3	2%
Course materials fees	\$78	\$91	\$13	17%
Additional computer hardware	\$167	\$156	(\$11)	-7%
Educational software	\$33	\$41	\$8	24%

Internet services	\$152	\$146	(\$6)	-4%
-------------------	-------	-------	-------	-----

Average reported spending for other necessary educational supplies increased by only 2% from \$143 in 2005-06 to \$146 for the 2009-10 academic year (see Table 18 for system-level statistics; see Appendix Table 11 for campus-level statistics).

Students reported spending relatively small amounts on course materials fees and course-related supplies such as paper, pens and pencils and photocopying. Approximately 70% of students reported having to pay some amount for course materials fees, up from around two-thirds of students in 2005-06 (see Appendix Table 12). These students reported spending \$129, on average, on course fees—a 9% increase over 2005-06 (see Appendix Table 13).

Students reported substantial spending on supplies and services related to their computers and internet access. Forty-seven percent of all students and (71% of freshmen) reported that they purchased a computer for school-related purposes during the 2009-10 academic year (Appendix Table 12). Among those who said they bought a computer during the year, the average amount spent was \$1,090, a decline of almost 20% from what students spent on computers in 2005-06. Students with parent incomes of \$120,000 or more reported spending around \$140 more, on average, than students with parent incomes less than \$40,000 (Appendix Table 14).

A separate question asked students how much they spent on hardware and computer peripherals, beyond the cost of the computer itself, and on computer repairs. Students reported spending \$156, on average, on additional hardware and repairs (Table 18). This was 7% lower than what students reported spending in 2005-06 and continued the downward trend observed between 2002-03 and 2005-06. This decrease could be consonant with trends in the pricing of peripherals, or with more students entering UC with the equipment that they require. In 2005-06 68% of students reported some amount of spending in this category compared with 54% in 2009-10 (Appendix Table 12). Among those who reported some amount of spending, there was almost no change in average expenses for additional hardware and repairs—from \$288 in 2005-06 to \$284 in 2009-10 (Appendix Table 13).

As was the case in 2005-06, most students did not report having to incur any expenses for school-related software. Among the 37% of students who did report some spending for software, average annualized spending remained unchanged at \$107, compared with \$108 in 2005-06 (Appendix Tables 12 and 13). Additionally, average expenses for internet services continued the pattern of decline first observed between 2002-03 and 2005-06. We may speculate that students are making increasing use of shared wireless networks in their residences as well as internet connectivity provided by mobile devices.

Summary

Generally, the survey shows modest growth in expenses for the following categories: off-campus rent, groceries and household expenses; commuter rent, utilities and groceries; public transit; course materials fees. In contrast the survey shows either no change or slight declines in expenses in the categories of: off-campus utilities; snacks and meals out; vehicle insurance and registration; vehicle payments; cell phones; clothing and incidentals; entertainment and recreation; books and supplies; and additional computer hardware. These changes most likely

result from a combination of 1) the current economic recession which may have depressed certain costs; 2) changes in student behavior (e.g., living with more roommates, deciding not to have a car) that have reduced student costs; and 3) technological changes that have reduced expenses for books, entertainment, etc. with the availability through technology of lower cost alternatives to traditional sources of media.

Appendix Table 1
 2009-10 Population versus COAS:10 Respondents, by Campus

	Systemwide		Berkeley		Davis		Irvine		Los Angeles		Merced		Riverside		San Diego		Santa Barbara		Santa Cruz		
	Pop.	Resp.	Pop.	Resp.	Pop.	Resp.	Pop.	Resp.	Pop.	Resp.	Pop.	Resp.	Pop.	Resp.	Pop.	Resp.	Pop.	Resp.	Pop.	Resp.	
Student Level																					
Freshman	20%	21%	12%	10%	21%	22%	19%	16%	14%	18%	45%	45%	32%	34%	16%	18%	25%	29%	24%	27%	
Sophomore	19%	20%	18%	20%	18%	21%	19%	18%	16%	19%	21%	21%	23%	23%	17%	19%	19%	21%	23%	23%	
Junior	27%	27%	29%	31%	27%	25%	28%	32%	29%	28%	17%	20%	23%	22%	28%	27%	29%	26%	26%	27%	
Senior	34%	31%	41%	38%	34%	33%	34%	35%	41%	35%	17%	14%	22%	21%	40%	35%	27%	25%	27%	23%	
Ethnicity																					
African American	3%	3%	4%	2%	3%	2%	2%	1%	4%	3%	7%	6%	8%	7%	2%	2%	3%	3%	3%	3%	
Asian American	41%	41%	45%	48%	41%	39%	55%	54%	42%	42%	33%	36%	41%	38%	52%	53%	18%	20%	22%	20%	
Chicano	13%	13%	9%	11%	10%	11%	10%	10%	11%	11%	28%	27%	23%	25%	10%	8%	17%	15%	13%	13%	
Latino	4%	4%	3%	3%	3%	4%	4%	3%	4%	4%	5%	5%	6%	6%	3%	3%	5%	5%	5%	4%	
Native American	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	
White	32%	33%	31%	28%	35%	35%	23%	25%	34%	34%	22%	21%	17%	19%	26%	28%	50%	50%	48%	54%	
Other	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%	
Decline to state	4%	4%	6%	5%	4%	5%	4%	4%	3%	3%	2%	2%	3%	3%	5%	5%	5%	4%	6%	5%	
Gender																					
Female	54%	57%	53%	60%	56%	59%	53%	55%	56%	58%	49%	54%	52%	58%	52%	54%	54%	56%	53%	57%	
Male	46%	43%	47%	40%	44%	41%	47%	45%	44%	42%	51%	46%	48%	42%	48%	46%	46%	44%	47%	43%	
Parent income																					
Dependent	93%	93%	91%	91%	93%	92%	95%	94%	92%	94%	94%	94%	93%	91%	92%	93%	95%	96%	94%	95%	
Less than \$40,000	26%	27%	23%	25%	27%	29%	23%	24%	25%	26%	34%	34%	33%	34%	30%	31%	22%	24%	22%	19%	
\$40,000-\$79,999	20%	19%	17%	16%	19%	17%	20%	19%	19%	18%	25%	27%	23%	23%	20%	22%	19%	19%	20%	23%	
\$80,000 to \$119,999	16%	16%	15%	16%	16%	16%	18%	19%	16%	15%	15%	16%	15%	14%	16%	16%	16%	15%	17%	15%	
\$120,000 or more	32%	31%	36%	34%	31%	30%	33%	32%	32%	34%	20%	17%	22%	20%	26%	25%	38%	38%	36%	37%	
Independent	7%	7%	9%	9%	7%	8%	5%	6%	8%	6%	6%	6%	7%	9%	8%	7%	5%	4%	6%	5%	

Appendix Table 2
COAS:10 Housing Type, 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>
<u>Commuter</u>	10%	5%	5%	22%	10%	11%	25%	8%	2%	2%
With parent(s) or legal guardian(s)	9%	4%	5%	21%	9%	10%	24%	7%	2%	2%
With other relative(s)	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%
<u>On-campus</u>	32%	26%	20%	26%	42%	32%	33%	39%	31%	48%
UC dorm or residence hall	25%	22%	19%	14%	39%	30%	20%	22%	29%	30%
UC apartment or house	8%	4%	1%	12%	3%	1%	13%	16%	1%	19%
<u>Off-campus</u>	58%	69%	75%	52%	49%	58%	42%	54%	67%	50%
Off-campus non-UC apt, house, or room you are renting	55%	64%	72%	50%	45%	54%	39%	51%	65%	49%
Off-campus non-UC dorm or residence hall	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	0%
House you own or are buying	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	0%	0%
Co-op	1%	2%	0%	.	1%	0%	.	.	0%	0%

Appendix Table 3
COAS:10 Marital Status and Children/Dependents, by 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>
Marital status										
Single (never married, separated, divorced, or widowed)	98.0%	96.9%	97.4%	98.4%	97.4%	97.9%	97.5%	98.4%	99.5%	99.3%
Married	1.9%	2.9%	2.5%	1.5%	2.6%	1.8%	2.4%	1.5%	0.5%	0.7%
Registered domestic partner	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	.	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	.	.
Number of children/dependents										
None	95.8%	98.0%	96.6%	93.5%	96.4%	93.8%	90.8%	94.8%	97.8%	97.9%
One or more	4.2%	2.0%	3.4%	6.6%	3.6%	6.2%	9.2%	5.2%	2.2%	2.1%
Marital status among respondents with children or dependents										
Single (never married, separated, divorced, or widowed)	84.4%	52.9%	73.0%	88.6%	89.9%	89.8%	87.7%	86.8%	92.9%	88.7%
Married	15.6%	47.1%	27.0%	11.4%	10.1%	10.2%	12.3%	13.2%	7.1%	11.3%

Appendix Table 4
Number of Roommates, COAS:06 and COAS:10, by Campus

	<i>Campus</i>																			
	<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>	
	<i>COAS :06</i>	<i>COAS :10</i>	<i>COAS :06</i>	<i>COAS :10</i>	<i>COAS :06</i>	<i>COAS :10</i>	<i>COAS :06</i>	<i>COAS :10</i>	<i>COAS :06</i>	<i>COAS :10</i>	<i>COAS :06</i>	<i>COAS :10</i>	<i>COAS :06</i>	<i>COAS :10</i>	<i>COAS :06</i>	<i>COAS :10</i>	<i>COAS :06</i>	<i>COAS :10</i>	<i>COAS :06</i>	<i>COAS :10</i>
Number of roommates																				
None	11.0%	8.6%	14.3%	12.1%	7.8%	6.1%	9.6%	10.2%	14.7%	10.3%		10.7%	16.4%	14.6%	9.5%	6.7%	6.8%	4.3%	10.3%	6.0%
One	22.1%	18.5%	32.3%	25.6%	17.4%	14.8%	15.7%	14.5%	21.9%	18.2%		19.0%	28.0%	20.0%	20.6%	18.8%	19.1%	18.0%	23.0%	17.5%
Two	19.7%	18.5%	20.8%	22.3%	20.2%	22.3%	19.9%	19.8%	14.8%	15.0%		14.9%	20.7%	16.7%	25.4%	19.8%	14.4%	10.0%	24.2%	19.1%
Three	26.3%	28.1%	17.1%	18.9%	30.2%	28.5%	34.0%	34.9%	31.8%	32.9%	n/a	24.7%	19.1%	26.7%	27.5%	30.2%	25.3%	28.5%	21.8%	27.0%
Four	9.8%	12.3%	2.4%	8.1%	12.3%	13.4%	13.9%	13.1%	9.3%	12.0%		17.0%	8.4%	12.0%	12.3%	17.9%	11.4%	10.0%	9.6%	13.0%
Five	5.3%	6.1%	3.8%	2.6%	7.1%	9.2%	4.0%	5.0%	3.7%	6.1%		9.6%	4.0%	4.9%	4.2%	3.7%	9.0%	9.6%	5.9%	6.7%
Six +	5.8%	7.8%	9.4%	10.5%	5.0%	5.8%	3.0%	2.5%	3.7%	5.5%		4.2%	3.6%	5.2%	0.7%	2.8%	13.9%	19.8%	5.3%	10.7%

Appendix Table 5
Average Monthly Rent for Off-campus Students, by Campus

	Campus																			
	Systemwide		Berkeley		Davis		Irvine		Los Angeles		Merced		Riverside		San Diego		Santa Barbara		Santa Cruz	
	COAS :06	COAS :10	COAS :06	COAS :10	COAS :06	COAS :10	COAS :06	COAS :10	COAS :06	COAS :10	COAS :06	COAS :10	COAS :06	COAS :10	COAS :06	COAS :10	COAS :06	COAS :10	COAS :06	COAS :10
Number of roommates																				
None	\$843	\$885	\$884	\$938	\$796	\$864	\$818	\$875	\$869	\$883		\$645	\$783	\$831	\$847	\$909	\$926	\$940	\$767	\$827
One	\$641	\$734	\$644	\$770	\$522	\$612	\$741	\$791	\$713	\$795		\$514	\$605	\$650	\$642	\$770	\$632	\$740	\$667	\$760
Two	\$590	\$650	\$627	\$708	\$494	\$575	\$595	\$636	\$629	\$742		\$407	\$536	\$536	\$599	\$668	\$628	\$670	\$656	\$714
Three	\$537	\$611	\$600	\$660	\$469	\$525	\$503	\$600	\$567	\$684	n/a	\$381	\$519	\$597	\$550	\$569	\$556	\$649	\$604	\$694
Four	\$526	\$585	\$643	\$682	\$461	\$506	\$521	\$575	\$551	\$647		\$378	\$461	\$492	\$504	\$552	\$586	\$651	\$610	\$690
Five	\$507	\$575	\$573	\$694	\$390	\$439	\$543	\$564	\$545	\$667		\$377	\$461	\$494	\$483	\$505	\$556	\$690	\$599	\$709
Six +	\$562	\$637	\$682	\$725	\$424	\$466	\$454	\$497	\$497	\$635		\$422	\$487	\$441	\$375	\$589	\$616	\$729	\$602	\$634
<i>All students</i>	\$603	\$661	\$667	\$742	\$500	\$557	\$591	\$655	\$650	\$727		\$439	\$582	\$606	\$600	\$645	\$617	\$700	\$648	\$712

Appendix Table 6
COAS:10 Average Monthly Rent, Utilities, & Groceries Expenses

	<i>Systemwide</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>
Off Campus										
Rent	\$661	\$742	\$557	\$655	\$727	\$439	\$606	\$645	\$700	\$712
Utilities	\$53	\$43	\$50	\$58	\$54	\$67	\$61	\$62	\$46	\$64
Groceries	\$157	\$152	\$149	\$149	\$169	\$138	\$147	\$163	\$167	\$174
Commuter										
Rent	\$239	\$227	\$318	\$201	\$273	\$181	\$258	\$207	\$290	\$200
Utilities	\$40	\$41	\$54	\$37	\$37	\$45	\$45	\$29	\$40	\$21
Groceries	\$87	\$78	\$107	\$80	\$100	\$84	\$94	\$62	\$98	\$76

Appendix Table 7
Average Monthly Snacks & Meals Out and Telephone Expenses

	<i>Systemwide</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>
All Students	\$108	\$118	\$91	\$112	\$107	\$96	\$113	\$121	\$96	\$102
Commuter	\$97	\$118	\$125	\$80	\$161	\$63	\$122	\$117	\$88	\$75
On Campus	\$102	\$98	\$85	\$102	\$93	\$111	\$131	\$115	\$91	\$106
Off Campus	\$112	\$121	\$112	\$100	\$119	\$181	\$138	\$56	\$103	\$219

Appendix Table 7
Average Monthly Snacks & Meals Out and Telephone Expenses

	<i>Systemwide</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>
All Students	\$108	\$118	\$91	\$112	\$107	\$96	\$113	\$121	\$96	\$102
Commuter	\$97	\$118	\$125	\$80	\$161	\$63	\$122	\$117	\$88	\$75
On Campus	\$102	\$98	\$85	\$102	\$93	\$111	\$131	\$115	\$91	\$106
Off Campus	\$112	\$121	\$112	\$100	\$119	\$181	\$138	\$56	\$103	\$219

Appendix Table 8
Average Monthly Snacks & Meals Out and Telephone Expenses

	<i>Systemwide</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>
All Students										
Residential phone	\$11	\$13	\$14	\$9	\$11	\$12	\$11	\$12	\$11	\$6
Cell phone plan	\$32	\$32	\$30	\$32	\$33	\$33	\$37	\$32	\$30	\$30
Additional cell phone charges	\$13	\$10	\$12	\$14	\$12	\$17	\$19	\$13	\$10	\$13
Commuter										
Residential phone	\$8	\$10	\$12	\$8	\$10	\$8	\$8	\$7	\$7	\$4
Cell phone plan	\$29	\$27	\$34	\$26	\$31	\$28	\$32	\$24	\$26	\$24
Additional cell phone charges	\$12	\$8	\$14	\$12	\$13	\$15	\$15	\$8	\$16	\$14
On Campus										
Residential phone	\$6	\$12	\$13	\$3	\$6	\$19	\$7	\$1	\$17	\$3
Cell phone plan	\$32	\$33	\$31	\$31	\$31	\$39	\$38	\$31	\$31	\$31
Additional cell phone charges	\$14	\$11	\$13	\$13	\$13	\$22	\$22	\$15	\$12	\$14
Off Campus										
Residential phone	\$16	\$15	\$15	\$14	\$17	\$17	\$24	\$22	\$14	\$14
Cell phone plan	\$33	\$32	\$30	\$35	\$35	\$31	\$39	\$34	\$30	\$30
Additional cell phone charges	\$12	\$9	\$12	\$14	\$11	\$15	\$18	\$12	\$9	\$11

Appendix Table 9
COAS:10 Average Transportation Expenses, by Campus

	System-wide	Campus								
		Berkeley	Davis	Irvine	Los Angeles	Merced	Riverside	San Diego	Santa Barbara	Santa Cruz
Commuter										
Vehicle payment (per month)	\$106	\$36	\$130	\$114	\$111	\$75	\$107	\$83	\$134	\$138
Insurance & registration (per academic year)	\$792	\$581	\$947	\$817	\$806	\$762	\$816	\$625	\$889	\$659
Vehicle maintenance (per academic year)	\$287	\$178	\$320	\$266	\$388	\$232	\$284	\$267	\$215	\$367
Gas & parking for local travel (per month)	\$149	\$130	\$150	\$154	\$150	\$132	\$148	\$136	\$188	\$159
Public transit (per month)	\$18	\$73	\$17	\$13	\$21	\$10	\$10	\$12	\$11	\$7
Travel to visit parents (per academic year)	\$284	\$418	\$284	\$268	\$284	\$211	\$301	\$248	\$225	\$134
On Campus										
Vehicle payment (per month)	\$113	\$85	\$77	\$92	\$143	\$102	\$131	\$117	\$114	\$106
Insurance & registration (per academic year)	\$951	\$685	\$691	\$946	\$1,159	\$964	\$932	\$997	\$873	\$1,033
Vehicle maintenance (per academic year)	\$282	\$252	\$183	\$256	\$344	\$270	\$283	\$274	\$289	\$325
Gas & parking for local travel (per month)	\$98	\$96	\$61	\$107	\$105	\$99	\$112	\$95	\$86	\$88
Public transit (per month)	\$9	\$12	\$6	\$7	\$10	\$15	\$11	\$7	\$6	\$9
Travel to visit parents (per academic year)	\$373	\$429	\$345	\$354	\$390	\$372	\$358	\$390	\$349	\$346
Off Campus										
Vehicle payment (per month)	\$84	\$65	\$74	\$96	\$87	\$86	\$126	\$87	\$74	\$61
Insurance & registration (per academic year)	\$788	\$822	\$704	\$823	\$842	\$778	\$950	\$808	\$735	\$670
Vehicle maintenance (per academic year)	\$269	\$255	\$255	\$271	\$278	\$261	\$288	\$270	\$258	\$291
Gas & parking for local travel (per month)	\$99	\$81	\$91	\$125	\$104	\$112	\$102	\$106	\$77	\$94
Public transit (per month)	\$8	\$13	\$5	\$9	\$10	\$7	\$6	\$5	\$5	\$4
Travel to visit parents (per academic year)	\$373	\$411	\$388	\$354	\$381	\$313	\$353	\$386	\$346	\$325
All Students										
Vehicle payment (per month)	\$91	\$64	\$79	\$100	\$99	\$87	\$121	\$92	\$81	\$72
Insurance & registration (per academic year)	\$811	\$783	\$722	\$839	\$883	\$800	\$903	\$822	\$759	\$734
Vehicle maintenance (per academic year)	\$273	\$247	\$256	\$267	\$305	\$258	\$286	\$270	\$262	\$300
Gas & parking for local travel (per month)	\$106	\$87	\$94	\$130	\$111	\$113	\$119	\$107	\$80	\$96
Public transit (per month)	\$9	\$16	\$6	\$10	\$11	\$10	\$9	\$6	\$5	\$7
Travel to visit parents (per academic year)	\$365	\$416	\$374	\$335	\$376	\$320	\$342	\$376	\$344	\$331

Appendix Table 10
COAS:10 Average Personal Expenses

	<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>
All Students										
Clothing & incidentals	\$82	\$75	\$75	\$87	\$83	\$85	\$97	\$81	\$82	\$74
Entertainment & recreation	\$77	\$69	\$72	\$82	\$77	\$77	\$90	\$78	\$77	\$75
Commuter		\$94	\$95	\$89	\$95	\$88	\$99	\$80	\$90	\$105
Clothing & incidentals	\$93	\$94	\$95	\$89	\$95	\$88	\$99	\$80	\$90	\$105
Entertainment & recreation	\$84	\$73	\$96	\$85	\$74	\$66	\$93	\$74	\$99	\$91
On-campus		\$68	\$73	\$79	\$76	\$92	\$100	\$78	\$85	\$74
Clothing & incidentals	\$79	\$68	\$73	\$79	\$76	\$92	\$100	\$78	\$85	\$74
Entertainment & recreation	\$66	\$59	\$58	\$64	\$67	\$75	\$80	\$69	\$64	\$67
Off-campus		\$76	\$74	\$91	\$87	\$82	\$93	\$83	\$80	\$72
Clothing & incidentals	\$81	\$76	\$74	\$91	\$87	\$82	\$93	\$83	\$80	\$72
Entertainment & recreation	\$82	\$73	\$74	\$90	\$85	\$81	\$95	\$85	\$82	\$82

Appendix Table 11
Average Annual Expenses for Textbooks and Educational Supplies

	<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>
All students										
Textbooks	\$835	\$649	\$915	\$875	\$839	\$732	\$973	\$854	\$841	\$773
Supplies	\$146	\$117	\$149	\$153	\$148	\$135	\$181	\$147	\$137	\$151
Course materials fees	\$91	\$54	\$96	\$90	\$146	\$68	\$112	\$80	\$69	\$78
Additional computer hardware	\$156	\$145	\$157	\$151	\$140	\$198	\$210	\$152	\$142	\$163
Educational software	\$41	\$37	\$46	\$40	\$36	\$46	\$58	\$35	\$37	\$39
Internet services	\$146	\$148	\$165	\$169	\$129	\$153	\$164	\$138	\$130	\$119

Appendix Table 12
COAS:10 Percent of Students Incurring
Expenses for Selected Supplies

	Systemwide
Any course materials fees	70%
Purchased a new computer	47%
Freshman	71%
Sophomore	38%
Junior	44%
Senior	39%
Any additional computer hardware purchases	54%
Any educational software purchases	37%

Appendix Table 13
COAS:10 Average Annual Expenses for Textbooks and Educational Supplies, among Students Reporting Those Expenses

Campus	<i>Course materials fees</i>	<i>New computer</i>	<i>New hardware</i>	<i>New software</i>
Berkeley	\$84	\$1,081	\$268	\$104
Davis	\$128	\$1,077	\$270	\$111
Irvine	\$138	\$1,040	\$278	\$101
Los Angeles	\$182	\$1,121	\$267	\$100
Merced	\$92	\$1,054	\$332	\$111
Riverside	\$152	\$1,075	\$377	\$127
San Diego	\$113	\$1,073	\$281	\$102
Santa Barbara	\$104	\$1,149	\$261	\$106
Santa Cruz	\$110	\$1,126	\$291	\$105
<i>Systemwide</i>	\$129	\$1,090	\$284	\$107

Appendix Table 14
COAS:10 Average new computer expenses, by parent income

	<i>New computer expenses</i>
All Students	\$1,090
Parent Income	
Less than \$40,000	\$1,032
\$40,000-\$79,999	\$1,058
\$80,000 to \$119,999	\$1,067
\$120,000 or more	\$1,174
Independent	\$1,112