



Shining a Brighter Light on Textbook Affordability

Increasing Transparency about the Costs of
Attending College Beyond Tuition and Fees



Archie P. Cubarrubia, Ed.D.
June 2019



**Partners for
College Affordability**
AND PUBLIC TRUST



About Partners for College Affordability and Public Trust

Partners for College Affordability and Public Trust is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization dedicated to making high-quality, affordable college education a reality for all Americans. We are committed to accelerating the widespread adoption of public policies and institutional practices that improve quality and lower costs at America's public colleges and universities. We translate good ideas into action by bridging the gaps between research, policy, and practice. And we ensure that policymakers and college leaders are held accountable by an informed and engaged public.

Visit www.pcapt.org for more information.

About This Paper

Partners produces occasional papers that highlight issues related to college affordability, transparency, and quality. Papers may be cited or reproduced for noncommercial purposes with proper attribution.



Introduction

In the past decade, tuition and fees have increased by more than 35 percent at public universities and by more than 34 percent at community colleges in inflation-adjusted dollars.¹ But tuition and fees make up less than half of full-time student budgets at public colleges and universities.² Other related expenses such as room and board have also increased,³ making it more likely that students will have to take on more educational debt to attend. For example, among those who take out student loans, three out of four borrowed more than they paid in tuition and fees.⁴

Students and families having to contend with near-annual increases in tuition and fees is challenging enough. We want to know what can be done about the other costs of attending college.

Every year, colleges and universities that participate in federal student financial aid programs report the estimated expenses for full-time, beginning undergraduate students to the U.S. Department of Education's Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). These estimated expenses are part of the federal cost of attendance formula, which is defined by law⁵ and includes tuition and fees; an allowance for books, supplies, transportation, and miscellaneous personal expenses; an allowance (as determined by institutions) for room and board costs; and other expenses.





The cost of attendance is the total amount that it costs a student to attend an institution for an academic year, or for some institutions with programs that last a different period of time, how much it costs to attend for the entire program. The cost of attendance is typically used as the “sticker price.” More important, the cost of attendance is used to calculate the amount of federal student aid for which students are eligible. That’s why it’s critical that the cost of attendance is accurate.

Institutions have the latitude to determine the “appropriate and reasonable amounts” to include for each expense,⁶ and guidance from the U.S. Department of Education regarding how to calculate and report cost of attendance estimates is limited. Not surprisingly, the estimates that colleges and universities report have been found to be inconsistent and incomparable.⁷

In this paper, we take a closer look at one of the components of the cost of attendance reported by colleges and universities to IPEDS: the allowance for books and supplies.⁸ The allowance for books and supplies makes up around five percent of the total cost of attendance for in-state, on-campus students at public 4-year institutions and around eight percent for in-district, commuter students at public 2-year institutions.⁹ We highlight a few observations from our analysis of the data by state, sector, and institution. We also provide recommendations for institutions to improve reporting under the existing IPEDS data collection system and for federal policymakers to improve IPEDS for future data collections. Our recommendations may also be useful to state policymakers in crafting state policies related to college affordability and transparency.





A Focus on Textbook Affordability

There is ongoing nationwide interest in improving the affordability of textbooks and course materials.^{10,11,12}

In 2008, Congress introduced disclosure requirements related to textbook information in the *Higher Education Opportunity Act* with the following language:

“The purpose of this section is to ensure that students have access to affordable course materials by decreasing costs to students and enhancing transparency and disclosure with respect to the selection, purchase, sale, and use of course materials. It is the intent of this section to encourage all of the involved parties, including faculty, students, administrators, institutions of higher education, bookstores, distributors, and publishers, to work together to identify ways to decrease the cost of college textbooks and supplemental materials for students while supporting the academic freedom of faculty members to select high quality course materials for students.”¹³

States and institutions are also seeking to improve textbook affordability through increased use of Open Educational Resources (OERs),¹⁴ textbook rentals, bundling and unbundling, and other cost reduction strategies.

The allowance for books and supplies that institutions report to IPEDS is one of the few institution-level data points on textbooks collected by the federal government. Because the allowance for books and supplies is part of the federal cost of attendance formula, there is a need to ensure that the data institutions report are accurate and consistent. Inaccurate, inconsistent, and incomparable data can hinder students' and families' college selection and financial planning. Finally, data quality issues can limit the ability of institutions to determine the impacts and effectiveness of interventions to lower the cost of books and supplies.

There's a lot that should be done to ensure the consistency of information that colleges and universities report to IPEDS so it can be more useful to students and families, institutional leaders, and policymakers. While this paper will not directly lower the cost of books and supplies, we hope that calling for improved data can help shine a brighter light on textbook affordability.



Methodology

We reviewed the allowance for books and supplies reported by public 2-year and public 4-year institutions in the Institutional Characteristics component of IPEDS for the 2012–13, 2013–14, 2014–15, 2015–16, 2016–17, and 2017–18 academic years. We excluded institutions that did not have data for the 2017–18 academic year. Figures were not adjusted for inflation.

Findings

We found that the allowances for books and supplies reported by institutions vary by state and by sector (see Table 1 in the Appendix). For example, in Massachusetts, the median allowance for public 2-year institutions (\$1,245) is 21% higher than the median allowance for public 4-year institutions (\$1,025). In Tennessee, it's the opposite: the median allowance for public 4-year institutions (\$1,540) is 15% higher than the median allowance for public 2-year institutions (\$1,344). California has the largest median allowance for books and supplies for public 4-year institutions (\$1,854), and Wisconsin has the smallest median allowance for public 4-year institutions (\$650).

And when we look at changes over time, we see that the median allowances for books and supplies in some states stay constant while the median allowances in other states vary from year to year. In Vermont, for example, the median allowance for public 2-year and 4-year institutions remained at \$1,000 over the past five years. During the same period, the median allowance for public 4-year institutions in New Jersey decreased by around 10.7%—from \$1,550 in 2012–13 down to \$1,384 in 2017–18.

When we look at figures reported by each individual institution, we see that some institutions within the same state or system report the same figures in any given year, suggesting that the state or system provides guidance regarding the figures that institutions report. And when we look at institution-level data over time, we see that figures for some institutions change from year to year, while others remain the same (for example, see Table 2 for annual figures reported by public 4-year institutions in Texas since 2012–13).

These observations raise questions.



For example, an assumption is that institutions use a consistent formula or methodology from year to year to estimate how much students typically spend on books and supplies. The National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators recommends the use of student surveys and expenditure diaries.¹⁵ Unfortunately, information about how institutions calculate allowances for books and supplies is not collected in IPEDS, so we don't know whether institutions are indeed using student surveys or other methods to calculate the figures they report.

A 2014 article in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* about cost of living estimates provided by institutions includes a quote from an institutional leader that gives us pause:

“Sooner or later, reality kicks in, and students are going to come back to you and say, ‘This isn’t working. You said I only would spend \$1,000 on books, but I’m actually spending three times that.’”¹⁶

In addition, we don't know why these figures change from year to year or in some cases not change at all. For example, we don't know if the impacts of efforts such as increased use of OERs or other cost reduction strategies are observable through these data.

(That seems to be the case for the University of Maryland University College, which advertises “Major savings on textbooks: At UMUC, we’ve replaced nearly every textbook with no-cost electronic course materials that are tailored to each course.”¹⁷ Its allowance for textbooks and supplies decreased from \$600 in 2014–15 to \$0 in 2015–16. It continues to report \$0 for books and supplies in IPEDS.)

Finally, we suspect that institutions don't use the same formula or methodology for calculating these allowances. We would need to collect additional information to confirm this suspicion, but we're not confident that the data are comparable across institutions. This means that students and families who use the data on books and supplies in the U.S. Department of Education's College Navigator website¹⁸ may not be comparing apples to apples. In addition, because data on books and supplies are collected at the institution level and not the program level, students and families would not be able to compare estimated textbook expenses for an English major versus a Math major. This also means that institutions may not be able to use the data to benchmark against other institutions, and policymakers may not be able to tell which institutions are doing a better job of reducing textbook costs.



Recommendations

Additional research is necessary to get to the bottom of why the data on allowances for books and supplies are the reported the way they are in IPEDS.

But we think institutions can adopt certain practices *now* under the current IPEDS data collection system to improve the quality of data on books and supplies they report. Similarly, the U.S. Department of Education can provide additional technical assistance under existing policy using the current IPEDS data collection system. We also recommend changes to statute and regulation to ensure that best practices in reporting data on books and supplies are codified.

Recommendations for Institutions

- Institutions should voluntarily disclose or report the methodology they use to calculate and report allowances for textbooks and supplies in the context notes provided in the IPEDS Data Collection System and on their websites.
- Institutions should voluntarily disclose the total cost of required textbooks for an entire academic program to help students and families budget more accurately.
- Institutions, through the Association for Institutional Research and the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, should develop and adopt a common methodology for calculating and reporting allowances for textbooks and supplies in IPEDS.
- Institutions, in partnership with textbook service providers and publishers, should develop better ways to collect data on textbook costs to better reflect the impacts of textbook affordability initiatives.

Recommendations for Policymakers

- The U.S. Department of Education should improve guidance (through IPEDS survey component instructions and FAQs) and technical assistance to institutions (through its partnership with the Association for Institutional Research) regarding the calculation and reporting of allowances for books and supplies under existing statute and regulations.
- Congress should make changes to the cost of attendance formula to improve information regarding books and supplies in the next reauthorization of the *Higher Education Act*.
- State policymakers should consider adopting a common methodology for calculating allowances for books and supplies for public institutions to ensure consistency and comparability.

Appendix

Table 1. Average and Median Estimated Academic Year Expenses for Books and Supplies for Full-time Beginning Undergraduate Students, by State and Sector: 2012–13 and 2017–18

		Average			Median		
		2012–13	2017–18	5-year % Change	2012–13	2017–18	5-year % Change
Alabama	Public, 2-year	\$1,446	\$1,580	9.3%	\$1,400	\$1,575	12.5%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,291	\$1,348	4.5%	\$1,200	\$1,216	1.3%
Alaska	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,187	\$1,452	22.3%	\$1,275	\$1,504	18.0%
Arizona	Public, 2-year	\$1,234	\$1,401	13.6%	\$1,240	\$1,390	12.1%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,056	\$1,103	4.5%	\$1,020	\$1,125	10.3%
Arkansas	Public, 2-year	\$1,291	\$1,283	-0.7%	\$1,200	\$1,300	8.3%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,260	\$1,330	5.6%	\$1,200	\$1,308	9.0%
California	Public, 2-year	\$1,679	\$1,815	8.1%	\$1,665	\$1,854	11.4%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,617	\$1,681	4.0%	\$1,665	\$1,854	11.4%
Colorado	Public, 2-year	\$1,680	\$1,673	-0.4%	\$1,749	\$1,800	2.9%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,532	\$1,573	2.6%	\$1,607	\$1,680	4.5%
Connecticut	Public, 2-year	\$1,304	\$1,226	-6.0%	\$1,200	\$1,200	0.0%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,038	\$1,050	1.2%	\$925	\$850	-8.1%
Delaware	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,267	\$1,433	13.2%	\$1,500	\$1,600	6.7%
District of Columbia	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,400	\$1,280	-8.6%	\$1,400	\$1,280	-8.6%
Florida	Public, 2-year	\$1,133	\$1,180	4.1%	\$1,133	\$1,180	4.1%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,263	\$1,293	2.4%	\$1,220	\$1,209	-0.9%
Georgia	Public, 2-year	\$1,259	\$1,367	8.6%	\$1,168	\$1,300	11.3%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,269	\$1,366	7.7%	\$1,200	\$1,350	12.5%
Hawaii	Public, 2-year	\$948	\$1,012	6.8%	\$948	\$1,012	6.8%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,146	\$1,012	-11.7%	\$1,212	\$1,012	-16.5%
Idaho	Public, 2-year	\$1,054	\$1,554	47.4%	\$1,041	\$1,119	7.5%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,337	\$1,286	-3.8%	\$1,358	\$1,246	-8.2%
Illinois	Public, 2-year	\$1,304	\$1,387	6.3%	\$1,223	\$1,391	13.7%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,168	\$1,213	3.8%	\$1,200	\$1,200	0.0%
Indiana	Public, 2-year	\$1,070	\$1,390	29.9%	\$1,070	\$1,390	29.9%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,096	\$1,207	10.1%	\$1,100	\$1,176	6.9%
Iowa	Public, 2-year	\$1,175	\$1,381	17.6%	\$1,100	\$1,340	21.8%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,062	\$948	-10.8%	\$1,054	\$950	-9.9%
Kansas	Public, 2-year	\$1,167	\$1,243	6.5%	\$1,170	\$1,200	2.6%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,037	\$1,066	2.8%	\$988	\$1,000	1.3%
Kentucky	Public, 2-year	\$1,000	\$1,000	0.0%	\$1,000	\$1,000	0.0%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,048	\$1,151	9.8%	\$1,000	\$1,200	20.0%
Louisiana	Public, 2-year	\$1,230	\$1,270	3.2%	\$1,200	\$1,220	1.7%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,300	\$1,307	0.5%	\$1,200	\$1,300	8.3%

Maine	Public, 2-year	\$1,378	\$1,400	1.6%	\$1,500	\$1,400	-6.7%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,011	\$1,000	-1.1%	\$1,000	\$1,000	0.0%
Maryland	Public, 2-year	\$1,485	\$1,559	5.0%	\$1,400	\$1,481	5.8%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,359	\$1,369	0.7%	\$1,200	\$1,275	6.3%
Massachusetts	Public, 2-year	\$1,300	\$1,429	9.9%	\$1,200	\$1,245	3.8%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,065	\$1,137	6.7%	\$1,000	\$1,025	2.5%
Michigan	Public, 2-year	\$1,269	\$1,334	5.1%	\$1,200	\$1,265	5.4%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,160	\$1,165	0.5%	\$1,100	\$1,084	-1.5%
Minnesota	Public, 2-year	\$1,162	\$1,211	4.2%	\$1,150	\$1,200	4.3%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,072	\$1,068	-0.4%	\$1,000	\$1,011	1.1%
Mississippi	Public, 2-year	\$1,119	\$1,227	9.6%	\$1,200	\$1,300	8.3%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,448	\$1,371	-5.3%	\$1,300	\$1,400	7.7%
Missouri	Public, 2-year	\$1,104	\$1,270	15.0%	\$1,005	\$1,178	17.2%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$850	\$910	7.1%	\$952	\$1,000	5.0%
Montana	Public, 2-year	\$1,040	\$1,075	3.4%	\$1,000	\$1,100	10.0%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,056	\$1,210	14.5%	\$1,000	\$1,200	20.0%
Nebraska	Public, 2-year	\$1,199	\$1,456	21.4%	\$1,250	\$1,500	20.0%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,091	\$1,200	9.9%	\$1,075	\$1,170	8.8%
Nevada	Public, 2-year	\$1,500	\$1,200	-20.0%	\$1,500	\$1,200	-20.0%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,233	\$1,338	8.5%	\$1,250	\$1,300	4.0%
New Hampshire	Public, 2-year	\$1,257	\$1,429	13.6%	\$1,200	\$1,400	16.7%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,050	\$1,110	5.7%	\$1,000	\$1,200	20.0%
New Jersey	Public, 2-year	\$1,431	\$1,672	16.8%	\$1,400	\$1,500	7.1%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,545	\$1,523	-1.4%	\$1,550	\$1,384	-10.7%
New Mexico	Public, 2-year	\$1,153	\$1,208	4.8%	\$1,038	\$1,250	20.4%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,358	\$1,339	-1.4%	\$1,038	\$1,144	10.2%
New York	Public, 2-year	\$1,229	\$1,346	9.5%	\$1,248	\$1,364	9.3%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,248	\$1,374	10.1%	\$1,200	\$1,364	13.7%
North Carolina	Public, 2-year	\$1,402	\$1,536	9.6%	\$1,312	\$1,495	13.9%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,145	\$1,218	6.4%	\$1,165	\$1,238	6.2%
North Dakota	Public, 2-year	\$980	\$1,010	3.1%	\$1,000	\$1,000	0.0%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,111	\$1,078	-3.0%	\$1,100	\$1,100	0.0%
Ohio	Public, 2-year	\$1,395	\$1,402	0.5%	\$1,300	\$1,320	1.5%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,257	\$1,170	-6.9%	\$1,330	\$1,200	-9.8%
Oklahoma	Public, 2-year	\$1,330	\$1,497	12.6%	\$1,250	\$1,600	28.0%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,272	\$1,289	1.4%	\$1,200	\$1,260	5.0%
Oregon	Public, 2-year	\$1,568	\$1,515	-3.4%	\$1,500	\$1,500	0.0%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,427	\$1,220	-14.5%	\$1,350	\$1,225	-9.3%
Pennsylvania	Public, 2-year	\$1,391	\$1,569	12.8%	\$1,350	\$1,650	22.2%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,399	\$1,560	11.5%	\$1,568	\$1,840	17.3%
Rhode Island	Public, 2-year	\$1,000	\$1,200	20.0%	\$1,000	\$1,200	20.0%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,100	\$1,200	9.1%	\$1,100	\$1,200	9.1%
South Carolina	Public, 2-year	\$1,363	\$1,470	7.8%	\$1,395	\$1,530	9.7%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,666	\$1,874	12.5%	\$1,170	\$1,212	3.6%

South Dakota	Public, 2-year	\$1,378	\$1,390	0.9%	\$1,150	\$1,400	21.7%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,203	\$1,360	13.1%	\$1,140	\$1,200	5.3%
Tennessee	Public, 2-year	\$1,231	\$1,355	10.1%	\$1,200	\$1,344	12.0%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,555	\$1,627	4.6%	\$1,492	\$1,540	3.2%
Texas	Public, 2-year	\$1,495	\$1,555	4.0%	\$1,489	\$1,577	5.9%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,199	\$1,214	1.2%	\$1,174	\$1,200	2.2%
Utah	Public, 2-year	\$1,680	\$1,300	-22.6%	\$1,680	\$1,300	-22.6%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,304	\$1,255	-3.8%	\$1,220	\$1,200	-1.6%
Vermont	Public, 2-year	\$1,000	\$1,000	0.0%	\$1,000	\$1,000	0.0%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,040	\$1,080	3.8%	\$1,000	\$1,000	0.0%
Virginia	Public, 2-year	\$1,285	\$1,425	10.9%	\$1,200	\$1,390	15.8%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,236	\$1,445	16.9%	\$1,100	\$1,300	18.2%
Washington	Public, 2-year	\$1,029	\$945	-8.2%	\$1,001	\$962	-3.9%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,028	\$897	-12.7%	\$1,002	\$840	-16.2%
West Virginia	Public, 2-year	\$1,183	\$1,349	14.0%	\$1,200	\$1,372	14.3%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,196	\$1,216	1.7%	\$1,100	\$1,050	-4.5%
Wisconsin	Public, 2-year	\$1,404	\$1,820	29.6%	\$1,472	\$1,939	31.7%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$735	\$709	-3.6%	\$786	\$650	-17.3%
Wyoming	Public, 2-year	\$1,206	\$1,329	10.2%	\$1,200	\$1,320	10.0%
	Public, 4-year or above	\$1,200	\$1,200	0.0%	\$1,200	\$1,200	0.0%

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, Institutional Characteristics Component



Table 2. Average Estimated Academic Year Expenses for Books and Supplies for Full-time Beginning Undergraduate Students at Texas Public 4-Year Institutions: 2012–13 to 2017–18

Institution	2012–13	2013–14	2014–15	2015–16	2016–17	2017–18	5-year % Change
Tyler Junior College	\$1,170	\$1,188	\$1,800	\$1,500	\$1,800	\$1,800	53.8%
The University of Texas at San Antonio	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,500	50.0%
The University of Texas at El Paso	\$1,160	\$1,186	\$1,188	\$1,216	\$1,216	\$1,632	40.7%
Midland College	\$1,168	\$1,226	\$1,349	\$1,416	\$1,486	\$1,561	33.6%
Prairie View A & M University	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,300	\$1,300	\$1,300	\$1,302	30.2%
The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley	\$1,000	\$1,150	\$1,150	\$1,194	\$1,210	\$1,210	21.0%
Sul Ross State University	\$1,208	\$1,340	\$1,366	\$1,366	\$1,366	\$1,366	13.1%
University of Houston–Downtown	\$1,100	\$1,100	\$1,167	\$1,190	\$1,210	\$1,210	10.0%
The University of Texas of the Permian Basin	\$915	\$915	\$915	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	9.3%
University of Houston	\$1,200	\$1,200	\$1,200	\$1,300	\$1,300	\$1,300	8.3%
Texas Southern University	\$1,450	\$1,450	\$1,450	\$1,450	\$1,524	\$1,569	8.2%
Stephen F Austin State University	\$1,146	\$1,164	\$1,192	\$1,192	\$1,192	\$1,202	4.9%
The University of Texas at Arlington	\$1,160	\$1,160	\$1,206	\$1,206	\$1,206	\$1,206	4.0%
Texas A & M University–Kingsville	\$1,300	\$1,300	\$1,300	\$1,344	\$1,344	\$1,344	3.4%
Tarleton State University	\$1,174	\$1,174	\$1,200	\$1,200	\$1,200	\$1,200	2.2%
Brazosport College	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500	0.0%
South Texas College	\$1,200	\$1,200	\$1,200	\$1,200	\$1,200	\$1,200	0.0%
Texas A & M University–Commerce	\$1,400	\$1,400	\$1,400	\$1,400	\$1,400	\$1,400	0.0%
Texas A&M University–Texarkana	\$1,400	\$700	\$1,000	\$1,400	\$1,400	\$1,400	0.0%
Texas Tech University	\$1,200	\$1,200	\$1,200	\$1,200	\$1,200	\$1,200	0.0%
Texas Woman’s University	\$1,050	\$1,050	\$1,050	\$1,050	\$1,050	\$1,050	0.0%
The University of Texas at Dallas	\$1,200	\$1,200	\$1,200	\$1,200	\$1,200	\$1,200	0.0%
University of Houston–Victoria	\$1,200	\$1,200	\$1,200	\$1,200	\$1,200	\$1,200	0.0%
University of North Texas	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	0.0%
West Texas A & M University	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	0.0%
Sam Houston State University	\$1,108	\$1,124	\$1,124	\$1,124	\$1,000	\$1,096	-1.1%
The University of Texas at Tyler	\$1,324	\$1,540	\$1,580	\$1,252	\$1,292	\$1,292	-2.4%
Midwestern State University	\$1,200	\$1,200	\$1,200	\$1,350	\$1,350	\$1,050	-12.5%
Texas A & M University–Corpus Christi	\$992	\$1,008	\$868	\$868	\$1,008	\$868	-12.5%
Texas A & M University–College Station	\$1,272	\$1,246	\$1,000	\$1,194	\$1,054	\$1,054	-17.1%
Angelo State University	\$1,500	\$1,200	\$1,200	\$1,200	\$1,200	\$1,200	-20.0%
The University of Texas at Austin	\$904	\$750	\$750	\$750	\$662	\$662	-26.8%
Texas State University	\$1,090	\$800	\$810	\$820	\$820	\$770	-29.4%
Lamar University	\$1,520	\$1,544	\$1,200	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,012	-33.4%
Texas A & M International University	\$1,750	\$1,750	\$1,780	\$1,820	\$1,456	\$960	-45.1%
Texas A&M University–San Antonio					\$1,328	\$1,342	1.1%*
University of Houston–Clear Lake			\$1,050	\$1,050	\$1,064	\$1,064	1.3%*
University of North Texas at Dallas		\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,200	\$1,200	\$1,200	20.0%*

*Calculated for years with available data
Note: Includes institutions classified as public, 4-year or above in IPEDS

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, Institutional Characteristics Component



- 1 Jennifer Ma, Sandy Baum, Matea Pender, and CJ Libassi, *Trends in College Pricing 2018* (New York: The College Board, 2018), <https://trends.collegeboard.org/college-pricing/figures-tables/tuition-fees-room-board-over-time>
- 2 Ma, Baum, Pender, and Libassi, *Trends in College Pricing 2018*, <https://trends.collegeboard.org/college-pricing/figures-tables/average-estimated-undergraduate-budgets-2018-19>
- 3 Ma, Baum, Pender, and Libassi, *Trends in College Pricing 2018*, <https://trends.collegeboard.org/college-pricing/figures-tables/tuition-fees-room-and-board-over-time>
- 4 Kim Dancy and Ben Barrett, *Living on Credit? An Overview of Student Borrowing for Non-Tuition Expenses* (Washington, DC: New America, 2018), https://s3.amazonaws.com/newamericadotorg/documents/Living_on_Credit_KfCmy9t.pdf
- 5 <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/20/1087II>
- 6 Federal Student Aid, *2018-19 Federal Student Aid Handbook: Volume 3 – Calculating Awards and Packaging* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, 2018), <https://ifap.ed.gov/fsahandbook/attachments/1819V3C2FinalDec.pdf>
- 7 See Sara Goldrick-Rab and Nancy Kendall, *The Real Price of College* (New York: The Century Foundation, 2016), <https://tcf.org/content/report/the-real-price-of-college/> and Robert Kelchen, Sara Goldrick-Rab, and Braden Hosch, "The Costs of College Attendance: Examining Variation and Consistency in Institutional Living Cost Allowances." *The Journal of Higher Education* 88:6, 947-971, DOI: 10.1080/00221546.2016.1272092.
- 8 The IPEDS glossary (<https://surveys.nces.ed.gov/ipeds/VisGlossaryAll.aspx>) defines the allowance for books and supplies as such: "The average cost of books and supplies for a typical student for an entire academic year (or program). Does not include unusual costs for special groups of students (e.g., engineering or art majors), unless they constitute the majority of students at an institution."
- 9 Ma, Baum, Pender, and Libassi, *Trends in College Pricing 2018*, <https://trends.collegeboard.org/college-pricing/figures-tables/average-estimated-undergraduate-budgets-2018-19>
- 10 Allie Grasgreen, "Options don't stem textbook woes," *Inside Higher Ed*, January 28, 2014, <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2014/01/28/textbook-prices-still-crippling-students-report-says>
- 11 Carl Straumsheim, "Triaging textbook costs," *Inside Higher Ed*, August 4, 2015, <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/08/04/era-400-college-textbook-affordability-initiatives-take-utilitarian-approach>
- 12 Emma Whitford, "Textbook trade-offs," *Inside Higher Ed*, July 26, 2018, <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2018/07/26/students-sacrifice-meals-and-trips-home-pay-textbooks>
- 13 Higher Education Opportunity Act, P.L. 110-315 (2008), <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/PLAW-110publ315/pdf/PLAW-110publ315.pdf>
- 14 "OER State Policy Tracker," SPARC, accessed June 19, 2019, <https://sparcopen.org/our-work/state-policy-tracking>
- 15 National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, *Monograph 24: Developing the Cost of Attendance* (Washington, DC: National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, 2014), <https://www.nasfaa.org/EntrancePDF.aspx?id=438>
- 16 Jonah Newman, "Tuition and fees rise, but cost of living—by colleges' estimate—falls," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, July 10, 2014, <https://www.chronicle.com/blogs/data/2014/07/10/tuition-and-fees-rise-but-cost-of-living-by-colleges-estimate-falls/>
- 17 "Costs & Financial Aid," University of Maryland University College, accessed June 19, 2019, <https://www.umuc.edu/costs-and-financial-aid/index.cfm>
- 18 College Navigator (<https://nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator>) is the U.S. Department of Education's primary consumer tool for accessing data from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS)