

---

MARCH 2026

---



# Cost of Attendance Adjustments in California Higher Education:

Campus Perspectives on Access, Barriers, and  
Impacts for Students with Experience in Foster Care



JOHN BURTON  
Advocates  
for Youth

Bursar  
EntranceBursar  
Exit

## Executive Summary

California has made significant investments to ensure current and former foster youth can succeed in higher education. The creation of a statewide network of public campus support programs, funded at \$68 million annually, is among its most significant achievements. The current analysis examines how the Cost of Attendance (COA) adjustment process is functioning across California's public higher education systems and whether it enables students participating in foster youth campus support programs to access the financial support these programs are designed to provide. Key survey findings include:

**Students are losing access to available financial support.** Over half of campuses (55%) reported that students have been unable to receive financial aid from their campus support program due to COA limits, and 46% reported that students turn down financial aid, including but not limited to foster youth support program funds, because they cannot access adjustments.

**The COA adjustment process is not easily accessible.** Only 22% of respondents rated the process as highly accessible, while 60% identified limited or unclear website information as a key barrier. A total of 39% of respondents reported that eligible expense categories are too restrictive or limited, and more than one-quarter (28%) reported that there is no clear or accessible appeal process.

**Barriers have serious impacts on student stability and success.** Campuses reported impacts including stress (77%), housing instability (62%), food insecurity (52%), reduced course loads (46%), and student dropout (44%).

**The COA adjustment process does not consistently enable students to access financial support.** While 69% of campuses report assisting students with adjustment requests, 46% report that students still turn down financial support due to barriers in the process.

**There are significant gaps in knowledge and tracking.** A substantial share of respondents were unsure whether students are affected by COA limits or whether COA reflects actual costs, indicating limited systematic monitoring.

# Background

---

A college or university's "Cost of Attendance" (COA) represents the total estimated cost of attending school, and is a central factor in determining a student's financial aid eligibility and the maximum amount of aid they can receive. Federal and state policies allow institutions to adjust a student's COA to reflect special circumstances, such as unexpected or higher than average expenses.

This process is especially critical for students facing the greatest financial instability, including those with experience in foster care. Children and youth are removed from their family and placed into foster care due to abuse, neglect or abandonment. Once in foster care, their trauma is often compounded by placement and school instability. Together, these factors lead to low rates of post-secondary participation and completion. By age 23, 10% of young adults who were in foster care will have earned an Associates Degree or higher as compared to 49% the same age non-foster youth population.<sup>1</sup> The availability of financial aid has been shown to be a critical predictor of college success, increasing the likelihood that students will enroll, persist, and complete their education. Students who receive financial aid have approximately 80% higher odds of enrolling, about twice the odds of persisting to a second year, and more than double the odds of earning a credential.<sup>2</sup>

In California, students with experience in foster care are eligible for specialized financial support through campus-based programs designed to promote retention and degree completion. Each of the state's three public higher education segments operates specialized programs intended to support their academic success. These programs receive \$68 million annually from the State of California. At the community college level, the program is known as NextUp and is available at all 116 campuses. At the 23 CSU campuses and nine UC campuses, the programs operate under a variety of names, but they provide a similar set of core services designed to address the unique needs of students with foster care experience. In the 2024-25 academic year, a total of 7,819 students with experience in foster care were served by the network of campus support programs, 1,797 students in the CSU system, 1,308 in the UC system and 4,714 in the community college system.

One of the core services provided by foster youth campus support programs is direct financial support. Some campuses provide this support as a regular stipend, while others make funds available in response to a specific hardship, such as job loss or a housing crisis. Because direct cash assistance is a central component of foster youth support programs in California's public colleges and universities, it is important to ensure that students are actually able to receive it and are not prevented from accessing it because of restrictive or unclear COA policies. More specifically, it is important that the COA adjustment is accessible for students who participate in these campus support programs.

# Methodology

---

The current analysis examines how the Cost of Attendance (COA) adjustment process is implemented across California’s public higher education systems, and the extent to which it enables students with a history of foster care to access available financial assistance provided by the State’s network of campus support programs. To inform this inquiry, an electronic survey was conducted during the first two weeks of March 2026 and distributed to representatives of campus support programs serving students with foster care experience across all three public higher education segments.

A total of 76 responses were received. Respondents represented campus support programs across all major regions of California: Northern California (16%), the Bay Area (16%), the Central Valley (7%), the Central Coast (13%), the Los Angeles region (31%), the Inland Empire (7%), and the San Diego/Imperial region (9%). The programs represented varied in size, including those serving fewer than 25 students (13%), 26 to 50 students (22%), 51 to 100 students (33%), 101 to 200 students (22%), and more than 200 students (9%), reflecting a wide range of institutional capacities and program models. Combined, they serve an estimated 4,700 students with experience in foster care.

Respondents had the option to provide their identifying information or submit responses anonymously. In some cases, multiple responses may have been submitted from a single campus. Response counts are provided for each question and may vary due to partial survey completion. Analyses draw on all available responses, including partially completed surveys, to maximize use of respondent input while maintaining transparency about the number of responses to each item.

Findings are based on self-reported responses and reflect the perspectives of campus professionals. The survey captures reported experiences and observations and does not independently verify student-level outcomes. While the response rate is sufficient to identify key patterns, results may not be fully representative of all campuses. The survey reflects a point-in-time snapshot of campus practices during March 2026. Provided below is a description of key findings, with data tables included in the report appendix. Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number and may not sum to 100%.



# Findings

## Campus Familiarity with the COA Adjustment Process Is Limited and Largely Moderate Across All Sectors

Overall, the level of familiarity with the Cost of Attendance (COA) adjustment process was low. A full 42% of campus representatives reported that they were somewhat familiar with the process. This pattern was consistent across the three sectors, with 64% of UC representatives, 50% of CSU representatives, and 36% of community college representatives reporting that they were somewhat familiar with COA adjustment process. For all three sectors, moderate familiarity was the most commonly reported response, suggesting that while most campus professionals have some awareness of the process, a minority have a strong or detailed understanding of how it works in practice. A total of 36% of UC representatives reported being either very or extremely familiar with the COA adjustment process, compared to 41% of CSU representatives and 28% of community college representatives.

## UC and CSU Campus Support Programs Primarily Disburse Financial Support Through Institutional Accounts, While Community Colleges More Often Provide Funds Directly to Students

Survey responses indicate a clear difference in how financial support is disbursed across sectors. At UC and CSU campuses, the predominant method is applying funds directly to the student's institutional billing account, reported by 75% of CSU respondents and 88% of UC respondents. In contrast, only 20% of community college respondents reported using this method. Instead, community colleges are more likely to issue funds directly to students, with 67% reporting disbursement via check or direct deposit, compared to 25% of CSU respondents and 13% of UC respondents. These findings show that UC and CSU campuses have more similar disbursement practices, while community colleges rely more heavily on direct-to-student disbursement methods.



---

## FINDINGS

---

### **Funds Applied to Institutional Accounts Are Typically Used to Cover Charges Before Students Receive Remaining Financial Support**

Among campuses that disburse funds through a student's institutional billing account, the majority report that those funds are automatically applied to outstanding charges before any remaining balance is released to the student. Overall, 67% of respondents indicated that funds are first applied to charges such as current fees or prior-term balances, including 83% of CSU respondents and 71% of UC respondents. Across all sectors, 10% reported that this does not occur, while 24% were unsure. These findings indicate that, at many campuses, financial support routed through institutional accounts is used to satisfy existing obligations before students receive any remaining funds. This structure may affect the timing and amount of funds available to students for non-institutional expenses, particularly when students have outstanding balances.

### **More Than Half of Campuses Report Students Losing Access to Financial Support Due to COA Limits, While Many Remain Unsure**

Over half (55%) of campus representatives reported that there have been instances in which a student was unable to receive financial assistance from their campus support program due to reaching their Cost of Attendance (COA) limit. This was most commonly reported among UC representatives (63%), followed by CSU representatives (60%) and community college representatives (52%). Notably, 26% of respondents were unsure whether this had occurred, indicating a lack of clarity into how frequently students are affected by COA limits. The combination of more than half reporting that this occurs and one-quarter being unsure suggests that campuses may not be consistently tracking when students lose access to aid due to COA limits.

### **Campuses Primarily Assist with COA Adjustments, with Limited Use of Alternative Strategies**

When students were unable to receive financial support due to reaching the COA cap, the most common response was assisting the student in requesting a COA adjustment, reported by 59% of respondents overall (61% community colleges, 50% CSU, 67% UC). Consulting with the Financial Aid Office to identify alternative disbursement methods was the next most common response (44%). Other strategies were less frequently reported. Only 3% indicated using foundation funds to fill gaps, while 13% reported determining that no action was necessary, all from community colleges. Additionally, 18% selected "other," including 33% of UC respondents, indicating some variation in campus approaches.

### **Students Frequently Turn Down Available Financial Support Due to Barriers in Accessing COA Adjustments**

Campus representatives also reported that students are frequently unable to access additional financial support even when it is available. Nearly half (46%) indicated that, in a typical academic year, students had to turn down financial assistance, including but not limited to campus support program funds, because they could not successfully navigate the COA adjustment process. Most respondents characterized this as affecting a small or moderate proportion of students, and no respondents reported that a majority of students were affected. However, the consistency of this finding across campuses suggests that this is a widespread issue rather than an isolated occurrence affecting only a small number of institutions.

---

## FINDINGS

---

### **Most Campuses Do Not Consider Their COA Adjustment Process to Be Accessible**

Respondents did not rate their campus COA adjustment processes as accessible. Only 22% described the process as extremely or very accessible, while half (50%) rated it as slightly or moderately accessible. An additional 10% reported that the process was not accessible at all. Taken together, 60% of respondents rated the process as only slightly accessible or not accessible, indicating that a majority of campuses do not view the process as readily navigable for students. This pattern was consistent across sectors, with no sector reporting high levels of accessibility.

### **Limited and Unclear Website Information Is the Most Commonly Identified Barrier, Followed by Documentation Requirements and Processing Times**

Limited or unclear information on campus websites was the most commonly identified barrier, cited by 60% of respondents. However, respondents also identified several additional structural challenges that make the COA adjustment process difficult to navigate. Nearly half (46%) reported a lack of clarity regarding required documentation, suggesting that even when students are aware of the process, they may not understand what is needed to successfully complete a request. Similarly, 44% of respondents identified lengthy or unpredictable processing timelines as a barrier, indicating that delays may prevent students from accessing funds when they are most needed.

In addition, 39% of respondents reported that eligible expense categories are too restrictive or limited, which may prevent students from requesting adjustments for legitimate costs that fall outside predefined categories. More than one-quarter (28%) also reported that there is no clear or accessible appeal process, limiting students' ability to challenge or revisit decisions when requests are denied. Taken together,

these findings indicate that barriers extend beyond awareness and include unclear requirements, delays in processing, and limited flexibility within the system. These challenges likely compound one another, making it difficult for students to successfully access adjustments even when they initiate the process.

### **Barriers to COA Adjustments Are Widely Reported to Contribute to Student Stress, Basic Needs Insecurity and Academic Impacts**

Campus professionals reported that these challenges have significant consequences for students. Increased stress or anxiety was the most commonly identified impact (74%), followed by housing instability (62%) and food insecurity (56%). These findings underscore that barriers to accessing financial support are not merely administrative issues but have direct implications for students' basic needs and well-being. The fact that a majority of respondents identified impacts related to basic needs indicates that COA-related barriers are closely tied to students' ability to maintain stable housing and meet daily living expenses. Respondents also noted substantial academic impacts. Forty-six percent reported that students reduced their course load or shifted to part-time enrollment, and 44% reported that students dropped out as a result of financial barriers related to the COA cap. These findings, in combination with the reported rates of housing instability and food insecurity, indicate that financial support limitations are contributing to both reduced academic engagement and attrition.

## FINDINGS

### Many Campus Professionals Do Not Believe COA Reflects Actual Student Costs, and a Large Share Are Unsure

A significant share of campus professionals (43%) do not believe that the official Cost of Attendance reflects the actual expenses of current and former foster youth. This concern was most pronounced among UC representatives (71%), followed by CSU representatives (60%) and community college representatives (33%). At the same time, 41% of respondents were unsure whether the COA accurately reflects these students' costs, with the highest level of uncertainty among community college representatives (46%). Together, these findings show that only a minority of respondents affirmatively believe that COA reflects actual student expenses, while the majority either do not believe it does or are unsure.

### There Is Strong Cross-Sector Consensus on the Importance of Ensuring COA Adjustment Accessibility

Despite these challenges, there was strong consensus about the importance of ensuring the accessibility of the COA adjustment process. Across all three sectors, 64% of respondents reported that it is extremely important, 24% reported that it is very important, and 7% reported that it is moderately important. No respondents indicated that it was unimportant. In total, 88% of respondents rated accessibility as extremely or very important, indicating broad agreement across campuses on the need for improvement.

### Current COA Adjustment Practices Do Not Consistently Enable Students to Access Available Financial Support

Although 69% of campuses report assisting students with COA adjustment requests, 46% also report that students still have to turn down financial support because they are unable to successfully navigate the process. At the same time, only 22% of respondents rated the COA adjustment process as extremely or very accessible, while 60% identified limited or unclear website information as a key barrier and 46% cited lack of clarity on required documentation. Taken together, these findings indicate that while campuses are frequently attempting to support students through case-by-case adjustments, the process itself remains difficult to access and does not consistently result in students receiving the support for which they are eligible.



## FINDINGS

### High Levels of Uncertainty Suggest Limited Institutional Tracking of COA Impacts and Cost Accuracy

The presence of uncertainty across multiple measures indicates that many campuses may not be systematically tracking or assessing the impacts of COA limits or the adequacy of their COA budgets. Specifically, 26% of respondents were unsure whether students at their campus had been unable to receive financial support due to reaching the COA cap, and 41% were unsure whether the official COA reflects the actual expenses of current and former foster youth. Uncertainty was also evident in operational areas, with 24% of respondents unsure whether funds disbursed through institutional accounts are automatically applied to outstanding charges before being released to students, and 14% reporting that they were unsure about challenges in the COA adjustment process overall. Taken together, these findings suggest that many campuses may not be systematically tracking or assessing how COA policies function in practice or how they affect student outcomes.

### Differences Across Sectors Indicate Uneven Awareness and Capacity to Address COA-Related Challenges

Differences across sectors suggest variation in awareness and concern. UC respondents reported the highest rates of both observed impact (63% reporting that students have been unable to receive support due to COA limits) and concern about COA accuracy (71% indicating that COA does not reflect actual costs). CSU respondents also reported relatively high levels of observed impact (60%) and concern (60%), aligning more closely with UC patterns. In contrast, community college respondents reported lower rates of concern about COA accuracy (33%) and the highest levels of uncertainty (46% unsure), as well as lower reported rates of observed impact (52%). These differences indicate uneven levels of information, awareness, and capacity across systems, with UC and CSU campuses more consistently recognizing COA-related challenges and community colleges more likely to report uncertainty about both the existence and extent of these issues.



# Appendix

	Community Colleges		CSUs		UCs		Combined	
<b>Q1. What is your level of familiarity with the Cost of Attendance adjustment process on your campus?</b>								
Answer Choices	Responses		Responses		Responses		Responses	
Extremely familiar	9%	5	8%	1	18%	2	11%	8
Very familiar	19%	10	33%	4	18%	2	21%	16
Somewhat familiar	36%	19	50%	6	64%	7	42%	32
Not so familiar	21%	11	8%	1	0%	0	16%	12
Not at all familiar	15%	8	0%	0	0%	0	11%	8
	<b>Answered</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>76</b>
	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>0</b>
	Community Colleges		CSUs		UCs		Combined	
<b>Q2. Approximately how much financial support does your program provide per participating student in a typical academic year?</b>								
Answer Choices	Responses		Responses		Responses		Responses	
Less than \$500	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
\$500-\$1,000	7%	3	9%	1	11%	1	8%	5
\$1,001-\$2,500	22%	10	27%	3	0%	0	20%	13
\$2,501-\$5,000	52%	24	27%	3	44%	4	47%	31
More than \$5,000	13%	6	0%	0	22%	2	12%	8
Not Sure	7%	3	36%	4	22%	2	14%	9
	<b>Answered</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>66</b>
	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>10</b>

APPENDIX

	Community Colleges		CSUs		UCs		Combined	
<b>Q3. What is the primary method of disbursement for financial support?</b>								
Answer Choices	Responses		Responses		Responses		Responses	
Applied to the student's institutional billing account	20%	9	75%	6	88%	7	36%	22
Issued directly to the student (e.g., check or direct deposit)	67%	30	25%	2	13%	1	54%	33
Provided via a vendor card or pre-paid card	2%	1	0%	0	0%	0	2%	1
Other (please specify)	11%	5	0%	0	0%	0	8%	5
	<b>Answered</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>61</b>
	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>15</b>
	Community Colleges		CSUs		UCs		Combined	

**Q4. When funds are disbursed through a student's campus billing account, does the institution automatically apply those funds to outstanding charges (e.g., current fees, prior-term balances) before the student receives any remaining amount?**

Answer Choices	Responses		Responses		Responses		Responses	
Yes	50%	4	83%	5	71%	5	67%	14
No	13%	1	0%	0	14%	1	10%	2
Unsure	38%	3	17%	1	14%	1	24%	5
	<b>Answered</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>21</b>
	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>55</b>

APPENDIX

	Community Colleges		CSUs		UCs		Combined	
<b>Q5. Have there been instances in which a student was unable to receive financial aid from your campus support program due to reaching their Cost of Attendance (COA) limit?</b>								
Answer Choices	Responses		Responses		Responses		Responses	
Yes	52%	23	60%	6	63%	5	55%	34
No	23%	10	10%	1	13%	1	19%	12
Unsure	25%	11	30%	3	25%	2	26%	16
	<b>Answered</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>62</b>
	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>14</b>
	Community Colleges		CSUs		UCs		Combined	
<b>Q6. In this circumstance, what course of action did your program take? Check all that apply.</b>								
Answer Choices	Responses		Responses		Responses		Responses	
Assisted the student in requesting an adjustment to their Cost of Attendance	61%	14	50%	5	67%	4	59%	23
Consulted with the Financial Aid Office to determine an alternative disbursement method	43%	10	50%	5	33%	2	44%	17
Filled the gap with foundation funds	4%	1	0%	0	0%	0	3%	1
Determined that no action was necessary	22%	5	0%	0	0%	0	13%	5
Other (please specify)	22%	5	0%	0	33%	2	18%	7
	<b>Answered</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>39</b>
	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>37</b>

APPENDIX

	Community Colleges		CSUs		UCs		Combined	
<b>Q7. Approximately what proportion of students at your campus need a Cost of Attendance adjustment in a typical academic year?</b>								
Answer Choices	Responses		Responses		Responses		Responses	
None (0%)	9%	4	10%	1	0%	0	8%	5
Small proportion (1–10%)	40%	17	20%	2	13%	1	33%	20
Moderate proportion (11–30%)	14%	6	20%	2	0%	0	13%	8
Substantial proportion (31–60%)	2%	1	0%	0	38%	3	7%	4
Majority (more than 60%)	0%	0	10%	1	13%	1	3%	2
Not sure	35%	15	40%	4	38%	3	36%	22
	<b>Answered</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>61</b>
	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>15</b>
	Community Colleges		CSUs		UCs		Combined	
<b>Q8. Approximately what proportion of students at your campus had to turn down financial aid, including but not limited to funds provided by your campus support program, due to not being able to successfully access the COA adjustment process in a typical academic year?</b>								
Answer Choices	Responses		Responses		Responses		Responses	
None (0%)	24%	10	20%	2	0%	0	20%	12
Small proportion (1–10%)	31%	13	10%	1	43%	3	29%	17
Moderate proportion (11–30%)	12%	5	20%	2	14%	1	14%	8
Substantial proportion (31–60%)	0%	0	10%	1	14%	1	3%	2
Majority (more than 60%)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Not sure	33%	14	40%	4	29%	2	34%	20
	<b>Answered</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>59</b>
	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>17</b>

APPENDIX

	Community Colleges		CSUs		UCs		Combined	
<b>Q9. Based on your professional experience, how accessible is your campus’s process for adjusting a student’s Cost of Attendance?</b>								
Answer Choices	Responses		Responses		Responses		Responses	
Not at all accessible	10%	4	20%	2	0%	0	10%	6
Slightly accessible	26%	11	20%	2	29%	2	25%	15
Moderately accessible	21%	9	30%	3	43%	3	25%	15
Very accessible	17%	7	10%	1	29%	2	17%	10
Extremely accessible	5%	2	10%	1	0%	0	5%	3
Unsure	21%	9	10%	1	0%	0	17%	10
	Answered	42	Answered	10	Answered	7	Answered	59
	Skipped	11	Skipped	2	Skipped	4	Skipped	17

	Community Colleges		CSUs		UCs		Combined	
--	--------------------	--	------	--	-----	--	----------	--

**Q10. What challenges, if any, have you observed in your campus’s Cost of Attendance (COA) adjustment process? Check all that apply.**

Answer Choices	Responses		Responses		Responses		Responses	
Limited or unclear information about the process on the campus website	63%	25	40%	4	71%	5	60%	34
Lack of clarity on documentation required	45%	18	40%	4	57%	4	46%	26
Lengthy or unpredictable processing timelines	43%	17	30%	3	71%	5	44%	25
Restrictive or limited categories eligible for adjustment	28%	11	40%	4	100%	7	39%	22
No clear or accessible appeal process	23%	9	40%	4	43%	3	28%	16
I have not observed any challenges	18%	7	20%	2	0%	0	16%	9
Not sure	18%	7	10%	1	0%	0	14%	8
Other (please specify)	5%	2	30%	3	0%	0	9%	5
	Answered	40	Answered	10	Answered	7	Answered	57
	Skipped	13	Skipped	2	Skipped	4	Skipped	19

APPENDIX

	Community Colleges		CSUs		UCs		Combined	
<b>Q11. Based on your professional experience, how have these challenges affected students? Check all that apply.</b>								
Answer Choices	Responses		Responses		Responses		Responses	
Experienced housing instability	64%	21	60%	6	57%	4	62%	31
Experienced food insecurity	61%	20	40%	4	57%	4	56%	28
Reduced course load or shifted to part-time enrollment	52%	17	30%	3	43%	3	46%	23
Dropped out of school	48%	16	20%	2	57%	4	44%	22
Reduced work study hours	21%	7	30%	3	43%	3	26%	13
Increased stress or anxiety	76%	25	70%	7	71%	5	74%	37
Other (please specify)	21%	7	20%	2	29%	2	22%	11
	<b>Answered</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>50</b>
	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>26</b>
	Community Colleges		CSUs		UCs		Combined	
<b>Q12. In your professional judgment, does the official Cost of Attendance at your institution adequately reflect the actual expenses for current and former foster youth?</b>								
Answer Choices	Responses		Responses		Responses		Responses	
Yes	21%	8	10%	1	0%	0	16%	9
No	33%	13	60%	6	71%	5	43%	24
Unsure	46%	18	30%	3	29%	2	41%	23
	<b>Answered</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>56</b>
	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>20</b>

APPENDIX

	Community Colleges		CSUs		UCs		Combined	
<b>Q13. In your professional judgment, how important is it to ensure that the Cost of Attendance adjustment process is accessible to your students?</b>								
Answer Choices	Responses		Responses		Responses		Responses	
Extremely important	61%	23	60%	6	86%	6	64%	35
Very important	21%	8	40%	4	14%	1	24%	13
Somewhat important	11%	4	0%	0	0%	0	7%	4
Not so important	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Not at all important	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Not sure	8%	3	0%	0	0%	0	5%	3
	<b>Answered</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>55</b>
	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>21</b>



John Burton Advocates for Youth improves the quality of life for youth in California who have been in foster care or homeless by advocating for better laws, training communities to strengthen local practices and conducting research to inform policy solutions.



235 Montgomery Street, Suite 1142, San Francisco, CA 94104

[www.jbay.org](http://www.jbay.org)