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Abstract

This policy proposal presents the homelessness and housing insecurity issues amongst USC students to Dr. Wanda Austin, President of the University of Southern California. This policy memorandum is heavily based on government reports and USC reports. This proposal includes a multifaceted analysis of the proposed policy which suggests a way to decrease the level of homelessness and housing insecurity among USC students in Los Angeles by 5% by 2031. This policy proposal concludes with the need for implementing the proposed policy that matches international high school students with USC college students, who are US citizens, to resolve the housing issues of USC students.
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To: Dr. Wanda Austin, President of the University of Southern California  
From: Eun Gyo Jung, USC Alum, Class of 2016  
Date: December 18, 2018  
Re: Policy Proposal on College Student Housing Insecurities and Homelessness

**ACTION FORCING EVENT**

In April 2018, Wisconsin HOPE Lab at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, released a survey-based study, showing that 46% of the “43,000 students at 66 institutions in 20 states and the District of Columbia” were affected by housing insecurity, while 12 percent of university students were homeless.¹ These findings build on data released the prior year, using the Community College Success Measure (CCSM), that was derived from a “subsample of 3,647 students from California campuses,” which reported that 32.8% of students experienced housing insecurity.²

**STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

Over “56,000 college students,” as indicated on the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) application in 2013, attend college while homeless.³ For this policy proposal, the term “homeless” refers to individuals who “lack a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence” and includes those who: (1) “shar[e] the housing of other persons due to loss of housing, economic hardship, or a similar reason; are living in motels, hotels, trailer parks, or camping grounds due to the lack of alternative adequate accommodations; are living in emergency or transitional shelters; or are abandoned in hospitals; (2) “have a primary nighttime residence that is a public or private place not designed for or ordinarily used as a regular sleeping accommodation for human beings;”

---

(3) are “living in cars, parks, public spaces, abandoned buildings, substandard housing, bus or train stations, or similar settings;” and (4) are “migratory children… living” in at least one of the above conditions.4

According to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, homelessness among adults increased in 2017 compared to the previous year. It found that “homelessness increased by seven percent … among those ages 18 to 24 and by two percent … among those ages 24 and older.”5 This figure, in particular, includes 40,799 “unaccompanied youth—that is, people under the age of 25 experiencing homelessness on their own” in 2017.6 It should be noted that 88% of these unaccompanied youth were “between the ages of 18 and 24.”7 These unaccompanied youth were 55% more likely to be unsheltered than the combined total of “all people experiencing homelessness (35%) and all people experiencing homelessness as individuals (48%).”8 This can be interpreted as being college students who claim to be homeless. Students generally are within the age range of the unaccompanied youth and are more likely to be unsheltered as they are faced with housing instability. Unfortunately, for the vast majority of college students who are “enduring homelessness,” “higher education is often one of the few pathways to long-term future stability”.9

It should be noted, that “[a]s enrollment has increased, today’s college students are more diverse,” particularly in the context of age range, and have new and/or rather

---

6 Ibid.
7 Ibid.
8 Ibid.
unconventional needs. For instance, over “one-half of students at public two-year schools are age 24 or older” and only “one-half of undergraduates enroll exclusively full time.” These figures may imply that some college students require housing not just for themselves, but also for their dependents.

Among these college students, those who do not identify themselves as homeless are either experiencing or concerned about housing insecurities as they “struggle to find adequate, affordable housing options near their campus.” Considering the fact that “[r]esearch has long suggested that students who live on campus are more likely to graduate, and particularly when the on-campus experience is purposefully structured toward student learning and engagement,” the students who struggle to find affordable housing options are probably less likely to complete their college education.

It is reported that while “[f]our-year colleges are much more likely to offer on-campus housing than are two-year institutions,” when compared to surging enrollment rates, “on-campus housing construction” did not reach an adequate level to be “matched increased enrollment.” Although new construction is “financed through public-private partnerships,” in an effort to match the housing needs of enrolled students, it often is less affordable than existing housing options. Since “housing accounts for 50% of costs at four-year institutions and over 65% of costs at community colleges,” continuously increasing housing costs do not allow these students a way to get out of their housing

---

12 Ibid.
14 Ibid.
15 Ibid.
instability issues.\textsuperscript{16} It is reported that these students, even after they “find on-campus housing, may struggle to find a place to live during breaks from school.”\textsuperscript{17} This risk is "particularly acute for students emerging from foster care.”\textsuperscript{18}

College students who are facing either homelessness or housing insecurity issues, since they tend to have a low income, “often induce them to enroll part time, live off campus, and work long hours at jobs.”\textsuperscript{19} In 2011, over “two-thirds of undergraduates worked while attending college, and one-fifth worked full time.”\textsuperscript{20} Besides the physical fatigue that these students experience due to their long hours at their jobs, they are also faced with a “biological impact on the brain that impedes academic success, and it also presents students with difficult logistical hurdles” as they struggle to complete their education while living in poverty.\textsuperscript{21} It is reported that first-generation students, in particular, “are much less likely to benefit from living on campus” and “are 20 percent less likely to plan to live on campus (53.9 percent) during their first year of college than non-first-generation students (73.4 percent).”\textsuperscript{22}


HISTORY/BACKGROUND

Historically speaking, the “federal government began building subsidized housing during the New Deal” and has evolved to address the housing insecurities of low-income renters in the decades since.\textsuperscript{23} Federal housing programs today fall into the following three categories: “(1) programs that provide deep, gap-filling rent subsidies, earmarked either for particular buildings or for individual households; (2) tax credits that help developers build new housing for moderate (below-market) rent levels; and (3) block grants that provide flexible support for local affordable housing initiatives.”\textsuperscript{24}

There were two phases in production of above-mentioned programs. The first phase, between the 1930s and the 1970s, “the federal government contracted with local public housing agencies (PHAs) to build and manage properties, providing funds to cover both capital and operating costs” which required PHAs, in effect, to “maintain the affordability of public housing units in perpetuity.”\textsuperscript{25} Then, the second phase, between the 1960s and the early 1980s, the federal government entered into contracts “directly with for-profit and nonprofit housing developers” instead of with PHAs, thereby guaranteeing subsidies and imposing “affordability restrictions for up to 30-year terms.”\textsuperscript{26} However, putting the affordability issue aside, the supply of federal housing itself “falls so short of the demand, waiting lists are long and are often closed for years at a time.”\textsuperscript{27} This naturally puts young adults, particularly those currently enrolled as students in college/higher education, at a greater risk for homelessness and/or housing...

\textsuperscript{24} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{25} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{26} Ibid.
insecurity. These young adults, especially college students, are usually left with no option, except to rent. Their lack of a consistent and adequate income source prevents them from becoming homeowners. As a result, renting, and the housing insecurities that frequently accompany it, is “a common choice for young adults since they face frequent moves as family, work, school, and living arrangements change.”  

As renters, college students often face additional and different types of challenges than average adults may experience in the real estate market. Since they lack a financial history of paying rent, this often leads them to encounter “skeptical landlords.” These landlords are understandably skeptical of renting to students who have no proven history of meeting monthly payments. At the same time, college students face greater difficulties in buying a house since they usually do not have enough “savings for a security deposit or lacking someone able to act as a guarantor.” This often leads college students to share apartment rooms through subleases that are often illegal and violate tenant laws and safety codes.

College students’ housing instability issues began to steadily emerge at the same time that many K-12 students faced housing instability challenges. Experimental interventions included an effort to decrease “family relocation rates,” such as “the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act amendments of 2002.” These amendments stated that “homeless children have a right to equal access to the same free, appropriate and non-segregated public education provided to other children” and imposed “a duty upon state and local agencies to remove barriers to enrollment, attendance, and success in

30 Ibid.
schools.” 31 This represented great progress for the housing needs of K-12 students. However, the college-level housing shortage, when compared to that of K-12 students, has, until recent years, lacked systematic national efforts to assess and evaluate “the extent of housing instability among undergraduates or to consider the impacts of instability on rates of college completion.” 32

As housing security assessment efforts were mobilized, data became available which proved that college students are faced with a distinctive difficulty. College students are faced with a unique financial burden that is a result of their occupation as students: that is, tuition and also room-and-board costs. Examining the 1987–88 school year through the 2017–18 school year, as shown in Table 1, the “published tuition and fees rose at about the same rates from 2007-08 to 2012-13 and from 2012-13 to 2017-18 — 12% and 13% over five years after adjusting for inflation” at private nonprofit four-year institutions. 33 It should be noted, that although there was a more steady increase” — 6% and 8% — between 2012-13 and 2017-18,” the “average prices at public two-year and four-year institutions rose at about twice that rate over the first five years of the decade.” 34

32 Ibid.
34 Ibid.
Table 1. Average Tuition and Fees and Room and Board in 2017 Dollars, 1987-1988 to 2017-2018, Selected Years.35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tuition and Fees in 2017 Dollars</th>
<th>Room and Board in 2017 Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Nonprofit Four-Year</td>
<td>Ten-Year Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>$11,180</td>
<td>$3,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>$21,020</td>
<td>$5,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>$37,520</td>
<td>$7,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>$44,740</td>
<td>$7,220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>One-Year % Change</th>
<th>Public Four-Year</th>
<th>One-Year % Change</th>
<th>Public Two-Year</th>
<th>One-Year % Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>$7,250</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
<td>$310</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
<td>$970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>$27,620</td>
<td>$2,850</td>
<td>$1,990</td>
<td>$2,850</td>
<td>$190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>$29,260</td>
<td>$3,900</td>
<td>$2,920</td>
<td>$3,900</td>
<td>$103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>$30,050</td>
<td>$4,570</td>
<td>$3,080</td>
<td>$4,570</td>
<td>$550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>$30,210</td>
<td>$4,720</td>
<td>$3,220</td>
<td>$4,720</td>
<td>$450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>$30,970</td>
<td>$5,240</td>
<td>$3,570</td>
<td>$5,240</td>
<td>$470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>$31,570</td>
<td>$5,930</td>
<td>$3,900</td>
<td>$5,930</td>
<td>$900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>$32,140</td>
<td>$6,400</td>
<td>$4,340</td>
<td>$6,400</td>
<td>$990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>$33,180</td>
<td>$6,770</td>
<td>$4,850</td>
<td>$6,770</td>
<td>$110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>$34,100</td>
<td>$7,840</td>
<td>$5,530</td>
<td>$7,840</td>
<td>$111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>$34,740</td>
<td>$8,970</td>
<td>$6,370</td>
<td>$8,970</td>
<td>$111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Average tuition and fee prices reflect in-district charges for public two-year institutions and in-state charges for public four-year institutions.

Prior to 2006, reporting of financial aid or parental income was not a requirement in order to apply for federal housing assistance. This granted eligibility for some college students to apply for the Housing Voucher program, commonly referred to as Section 8, which is “administered at the federal level by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD),” that provides vouchers to subsidize rent.36 However, due to some reported cases of relatively wealthy “college students obtaining federal housing assistance without their educational financial assistance counting as income for purposes of income eligibility for federal housing assistance,” a new rule was “enacted as part of HUD's Fiscal Year (FY) 2006 appropriations, that restricts individuals enrolled in an

institutions of higher education and who meet certain other requirements from receiving assistance under section 8.”

There are two types of situations in which one can be eligible for housing assistance: being a dependent student and being an independent student. The new eligibility restrictions defined the “dependent” category as “a dependent child of an enrolled student who meets the criteria of 24 CFR 5.612.” This includes people who meet the definition “in HUD's income eligibility regulations at 24 CFR 5.603 is a member of the family (except foster children and foster adults) other than the family head or spouse, who is under 18 years of age, or a person with a disability, or is a full-time student.”

This implies that college students who are enrolled as part-time students cannot get housing assistance, even if they are working in order to pay off their tuition.

Meanwhile, the “independent” category is granted to a college student who meets one of the following criteria: “[b]e at least 24 years old by December 31 of the award year for which aid is sought; … [b]e an orphan or a ward of the court through the age of 18; … [b]e a veteran of the U.S. Armed Forces; d. Have legal dependents other than a spouse (for example, dependent children or an elderly dependent parent) … [b]e a graduate or professional student; or, … [b]e married.”

In addition, for those who meet only the first criteria, they must further prove their eligibility as “independent” students to “PHAs, Owners, and Managers of Section 8 assistance.” It is only after the potential landlords can “verify a student's independence from his or her parents to determine that


39 Ibid.

40 Ibid.
the student's parents' income is not relevant for determining the student's eligibility for assistance by taking into consideration” that the students can receive housing assistance.41

However, even if the housing affordability issue was resolved through housing assistance programs, and although “[f]our-year colleges are much more likely to offer on-campus housing than are two-year institutions,” the continued surge in college enrollment, when compared to “on-campus housing construction” means that there probably will continue to be a housing problem for college students.42 The effort to finance necessary construction “through public-private partnerships” often reinforces the affordability issue since the new on-campus housing units, with their frequent emphasis on unnecessary amenities, which often have been added to attract new students, tend to be “less affordable than existing housing options.”43 So even though there has been an increase in the on-campus student housing supply on many college campuses, the actual cost of housing for individual students has continued to increase, rather than to decrease. As a result, despite an increase in on-campus student housing in recent years, many college students still are facing housing issues, such as housing insecurity and homelessness.

POLICY PROPOSAL

The policy goal is to lower the level of homelessness and housing insecurity among USC students in Los Angeles by 5% by 2031. The policy implementation tool would be a voucher. The authorization tool of this policy proposal would be policy

43 Ibid.
legislation by the USC Board of Trustees as part of the student housing aid policy. This proposal will create housing security for USC students with either U.S. permanent legal residency and/or U.S. citizenship. This would create mutually beneficial cultural exchange ties with other countries through reciprocating guardianships and cultural and language exchange opportunities for the international students who participate in the program. Establishing this policy will require voting by the Board of Trustees at USC.

The Office of International Students (OIS) of local high schools in Los Angeles and the USC Financial Aid Department will work together to successfully implement this policy. The OIS of local high schools in Los Angeles will work with the schools that are already linked to USC through USC’s Teach International Relations Program (TIRP) and The Joint Educational Project” (JEP). These will be ideal schools for the USC Financial Aid Department to reach out to in order to request qualified international students who will then be paired with qualified U.S. college students who have been identified by the Financial Aid Department as being in need of financial support due to their housing insecurities and/or homelessness.

The two parties, meaning the local high schools and USC, will administer the pilot phase of this proposal in Los Angeles County. The reason for region-specific outlining is primarily due to consideration for close proximity to schools for the students of the two schools. In addition, since approximately 19% of “the L.A. community college students surveyed reported” that “they were recently homeless, 8% reported being thrown out of their homes, 4% said they had been evicted, and 6% had stayed in an abandoned building, car or other location not meant for housing,” the greater Los Angeles area is one
of the main targeted regions for this voucher program.\textsuperscript{44} The estimated budget for this policy should consider the proposal’s administration fee would be approximately $44,940, based on the fact that the “Program Coordinator salaries at the University of Southern California can range from $12 - $30 [per hour].”\textsuperscript{45}

In order to be qualified to receive this service, one must be a U.S. citizen, attending USC, who is struggling with housing security, regardless of age, is legally certified according to the pre-existing legal structure as being homeless and/or are having housing insecurities issues, and has at least a 3.2 GPA. The GPA requirement is to ensure that only students who are academically motivated get opportunities to participate in this program, thus promoting academic commitment to graduate in four-year time window. Also, because of the minimum GPA requirement, the program will be less able to be criticized as potentially providing aid to non-serious students and thus being a waste of money. The housing-insecure college students can be paired with academically outstanding international students, between 8\textsuperscript{th} grade to 12\textsuperscript{th} grade, who are interested in studying in the United States.

The international students in the desired academic years tend to be under the age of 18, so they will require guardianship during their legal stay within the United States. Thus, these international students will be required to find host families. It is reported that “a private Chinese educational group” charges international students $57,000 a year for providing homestay services so that they can attend local high schools in the United


States. Meanwhile, the U.S. college students will be expected to share their rooms during their college years. As “American family size goes down and the number of household bedrooms up, many millennials” who “never have shared a bedroom before” will be expected to share rooms and/or living spaces during their college years. Although the “risks that go with braving the wilds of multi-family housing markets in college towns and cities are serious,” college students with housing security issues continue to share overcrowded apartments where “doubles are all forced triples,” in “the same size room as a double.”

Based on these facts, this policy proposal is intended to make arrangements between the housing-challenged USC students and the international students to help meet each other’s needs. Diligent USC students who are academically motivated, but who have financial needs for their housing during their studies, will be able to offer guardianship to selected international students, along with an opportunity for the international students to learn their language and culture. Meanwhile, the international students can offer the financial support that these USC students need. Both parties will be able to use some level of screening process when finding their roommates. Ideal USC student candidates would be those pursuing a career in teaching since they could offer English lessons and essay editing services to the international students at a similar rate that other international students pay for such services. In this regard, the USC students can gain a living stipend

---

in return for providing these teaching services. While providing these services, the U.S. college students can earn a higher hourly wage than most other part-time jobs.

The intended timeframe of the pilot phase of this policy will be from August 2021, until December 2033. Given that the average student has four years of undergraduate study and four years in high school, the efficacy of this proposal shall be addressed at the end of the third student group's graduating year.

**POLICY ANALYSIS**

The likelihood of the policy achieving its goal of lowering the level of homelessness and housing insecurity among college students in Los Angeles by 5% by 2031 is expected to be very high due to the consistent demand of international students to find housing to study abroad in the United States, particularly in the Los Angeles region. Local high schools are available to serve this need since within the city of Los Angeles, particularly, within 5 miles of zip code 90007, which is USC’s zip code, there are 27 private high schools which international students can attend.49

However, since this policy relies on an influx of international students, one of the factors that could potentially lower the likelihood of this proposal achieving its goal would be any new policies that would discourage immigration or higher education, or discourage international students from studying in America. As shown in Table 2, while there were “a total of 393,573 F-1 visas issued for the fiscal year ending 30 September 2017,” that was “a 17% decline from the 471,000 F-1s issued in 2016, and a nearly 39% drop in F-1 visa issuance from the recent-year high in 2015.”50

---


Table 2. Nonimmigrant Visas Issued by Classification Fiscal Years 2013-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F-1 (academic study)</td>
<td>534,320</td>
<td>595,569</td>
<td>644,233</td>
<td>471,728</td>
<td>393,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-1 (vocational study)</td>
<td>11,320</td>
<td>11,706</td>
<td>11,058</td>
<td>10,305</td>
<td>9,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-1 (exchange visitor)</td>
<td>312,522</td>
<td>331,068</td>
<td>332,540</td>
<td>339,712</td>
<td>343,811</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, there are also other factors that could decrease the number of international students which will decrease the likelihood of the policy reaching its goal. For instance, despite consistent “years of rapid growth, enrollment of first-time international students in U.S. … dipped [in 2017 due to] concerns about political uncertainty, tuition increases, visa delays and reductions in scholarship money.”

In terms of the efficacy of this policy, a cost/benefit analysis should be conducted. One of the major benefits of this policy would be the fact that this could offer opportunities for the participating schools to provide services to meet the needs of the students at USC. This policy is significant in its commitment and determination for a “change in leadership” compared to that of former USC President C. L. Max Nikias. Both the student body and the professors, both part-time and tenured, had demanded that the former President step down from the office due to his neglect in providing student welfare and necessary care, as proven by “a series of scandals at the university.” The school mishandled a situation in which “the longtime gynecologist at the campus health

center had” sexually “mistreated students for decades” while making “offensive remarks to patients.” The previous school administration “officials settled the matter quietly and did not report it to the state medical board.”54 This scandal was the second one from the previous year’s reports in which the “former Dean of the medical school had used drugs on campus and partied with prostitutes.” This other scandal was even more highly criticized and USC ultimately “required the man who replaced him was forced to step down after the university admitted that it had settled a sexual harassment case with one of his former researchers”.55

In the context of student welfare and students’ need for assistance, an additional benefit of this policy is the potential positive spillover effect in the school’s military veterans’ housing program. The veterans’ housing program is a relatively new housing policy that was introduced in early 2018. This new proposed policy, although starting out with pairing-up low income college students, if proven successful, could also be incorporated into the USC veterans housing program. In that case, this policy could help solidify “USC’s commitment to providing military veterans access to higher education.”56

Another benefit of this policy would be to maintain the school’s reputation as an international student-friendly school. The pairing of high school students, who are international students, promotes USC’s image of being a school that is friendly to international students. This image is crucial to the school since the co-called “Trojan Family” spirit is one of the school’s main marketing talking points for prospective students.

55 Ibid.
students. The school’s international connections serve to unite and connect throughout the “University of Southern California … membership.” Since this policy deals with students’ housing, it literally converts the international family spirit into meaningful action. This new policy is expected to enhance the school’s reputation in its commitment to what it promises to prospective students.

This policy could be considered to be a long-term investment for the school, since these international high school students often choose to apply to attend colleges in the U.S. There is quite reasonable potential that these high school students will apply to USC, since it is reported that “[f]oreign students are concentrated in U.S. metropolitan areas” that from “2008 to 2012, 85 percent of foreign students pursuing a bachelor’s degree or above attended colleges and universities in 118 metro areas that collectively accounted for 73 percent of U.S. higher education student,” while contributing “approximately $21.8 billion in tuition and $12.8 billion in other spending—representing a major services export—to those metropolitan economies over the five-year period.” Another noteworthy fact is that California is considered to be “the nation’s most popular destination for foreign students, with 157,000 coming to the state in 2016-17.” This implies that out of all international students, 16%, more than 1 million, decided to study abroad in California, the state in which USC is located.

In addition, since USC “is among the top schools for” international students and that it is “ranked 2nd out of 1,240 in our Overall Best U.S. Colleges & Universities for

59 Ibid.
International Students,” this is a potential source of revenue that the school can invest in.61 It should be noted that 23.9% of all USC students” in Fall 201862 are international students, representing “at least 50 countries.”63 Perhaps more importantly, “USC must consider the financial implications of its increasing enrollment rate of international students, as shown below in Figure 1.

Figure 1. International Student Enrollment 2007-201764

Note: Enrollment data excludes OPT and International Academy students*
Source: Enrollment Services (October 2017)

Once these international students choose to enroll as freshmen, with the intent of graduating from USC within the average pace of four years, the estimated annual revenue

that the school will be gaining from each individual international student, based on academic year 2018-2019 cycle, is $74,825, as shown in Table 3.\textsuperscript{65}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
Tuition (12-18 units for two semesters) & $55,320 \\
Fees & $905 \\
Room and board* & $15,395 \\
Books and supplies & $1,200 \\
Personal and miscellaneous & $1,452 \\
Transportation & $553 \\
Total** & $74,825 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{2018-2019 Undergraduate Estimate of Costs\textsuperscript{66}}
\end{table}

\begin{itemize}
\item *Includes average rent and the standard meal plan for students living in on-campus freshman housing.
\item **Add $450 New Student Fee for your first semester.
\end{itemize}

Even if the international high school students, upon their graduation from high schools in the United States, choose to return to their homeland, from a long-term planning perspective, these students could eventually become potential transfer and/or “visitor” students during their undergraduate, graduate, and doctoral academic years as shown in the Table 4.
Table 4. 2016/2017 Enrollment Comparison by Degree Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrolled International Undergraduate Students</th>
<th>Fall 2017</th>
<th>Fall 2016</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>2.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>9.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Visitor</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>18.49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrolled International Graduate Students</th>
<th>Fall 2017</th>
<th>Fall 2016</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>6124</td>
<td>5651</td>
<td>8.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral/Professional</td>
<td>1805</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>1.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Visitor</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>16.57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Re-created from Table B. 2017/2016 Enrollment Comparison by Degree Level

As shown in Tables 5 and 6, since graduate-level or above units are more expensive, the potential long-term revenue, based on this policy, is greater.

Table 5. 2018-2019 Estimate of Costs for Master’s Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Flat Rate: Taking 15 to 18 units per semester</th>
<th>Full-Time: Taking 8 to 14 units * per semester</th>
<th>Half-Time: Taking 4 to 7 units ** per semester</th>
<th>Dissertation: Taking 2 units per semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>$55,320</td>
<td>$37,260</td>
<td>$22,356</td>
<td>$7,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Fees</td>
<td>$2,269</td>
<td>$2,269</td>
<td>$2,269</td>
<td>$1,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room &amp; Board***</td>
<td>$17,800</td>
<td>$17,800</td>
<td>$17,800</td>
<td>$17,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal and Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$2,231</td>
<td>$2,231</td>
<td>$2,231</td>
<td>$2,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>$2,451</td>
<td>$2,451</td>
<td>$2,451</td>
<td>$2,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$81,271</td>
<td>$62,911</td>
<td>$47,707</td>
<td>$31,036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. 2018-2019 Estimate of Costs for Doctoral Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Flat Rate: Taking 15 to 18 units per semester</th>
<th>Full-Time: Taking 10 to 14 units* per semester</th>
<th>Full-Time: Taking 6 to 9 units** per semester</th>
<th>Half-Time: Taking 3 to 5 units*** per semester</th>
<th>Dissertation: Taking 2 units per semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>$55,320</td>
<td>$44,712</td>
<td>$29,808</td>
<td>$14,904</td>
<td>$7,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Fees</td>
<td>$2,165</td>
<td>$2,165</td>
<td>$2,165</td>
<td>1,498</td>
<td>$1,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room &amp; Board****</td>
<td>$17,800</td>
<td>$17,800</td>
<td>$17,800</td>
<td>$17,800</td>
<td>$17,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal and Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$2,231</td>
<td>$2,231</td>
<td>$2,231</td>
<td>$2,231</td>
<td>$2,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>$2,451</td>
<td>$2,451</td>
<td>$2,451</td>
<td>$2,451</td>
<td>$2,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$81,167</td>
<td>$70,259</td>
<td>$55,355</td>
<td>$39,484</td>
<td>$31,732</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final major benefit would be that this policy’s mission of mutual benefits aligns with a variety of other community outreach programs which equip the school to promote local community welfare, thus potentially producing synergistic effects. For instance, consider the USC School of IR’s Teach International Relations Program (TIRP). USC’s students were engaged locally in an effort to provide free quality education to local high schools in the college campus neighborhood as a means to combat local poverty issues. TIRP creates mutual benefits in education as local high school teachers gain free USC outreach education support for “topics including security,

development, trade, human rights.”  

For “USC students, TIRP” provides “a service learning opportunity to team-teach complex and controversial issues in local high schools” by teaching “a series of four class sessions over four weeks.”  

The School of IR could further incorporate this policy into their program and allow the paired international high school students to be a part of the learning experience, thus solidifying its mission and commitment for free education.

The Joint Educational Project (JEP) is another example of USC supporting the idea of mutual learning through community support. Founded in 1972, JEP is committed to “partnerships and collaborations with local K-12 schools, non-profit organizations, and health care centers that are dedicated to serving the communities surrounding USC.”  

Partnering “with USC faculty and staff” and its mission to “offer meaningful service opportunities for students that directly contribute to and benefit [its] community partners,” JEP is “committed to developing community-based learning activities and curricula that promote student development, encourage personal reflection and require academic rigor” by enabling USC students to serve “as teaching assistants, tutors and advocates for children and adult learners.”  

Since volunteer hours are necessary for most international students, as a part of their college admissions requirements, this policy will not only align with USC JEP’s mission, it also potentially creates a pool of necessary volunteer hours for JEP’s operations through the potential involvement of international students.

---
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However, the policy’s financial cost should be noted as well. It is reported, as mentioned briefly in the Policy Proposal section above, that the “Program Coordinator salaries at University of Southern California can range from $12 - $30 [per hour],” an estimate “based upon 5 University of Southern California Program Coordinator salary reports provided by employees or estimated based upon statistical methods”. Once “bonuses and additional compensation” are factored in, the expected annual expenses for a policy coordinator would be $44,940. However, this is a cost that could be offset once one student is enrolled at the university. So the new policy is worth the temporary financial investment.

Thus, based on a cost/benefit analysis, USC can potentially gain more from this policy than what it will cost. The potential revenue, volunteer labor for other USC school programs, and good PR that improves its reputation offsets the initial financial cost that is required for the operation of the program, which is mainly for salaries for the program’s administrative staff.

POLITICAL ANALYSIS

In order to conduct a political analysis, two aspects must be considered. One is the political cost and benefit comparisons and the other is the likelihood of the policy being passed by the school board. “California is home to more than one-fifth of the nation’s homeless people, and the numbers are” continuously increasing. Since this policy’s goal is to lower the level of homelessness and housing insecurity among college students in

---
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Los Angeles by 5% by 2031, this project will gain statewide political support since it is targeting a societal issue that many wish to combat and essentially eradicate.\footnote{Schneider, Benjamin. "California's Housing Crisis, Explained." CityLab. June 25, 2018. Accessed November 24, 2018. \url{https://www.citylab.com/equity/2018/03/in-california-momentum-builds-for-radical-action-on-housing/554768/}}

Politically, given that USC is a private public-benefit nonprofit corporation, a business-minded approach can gain student political support for the current administration of the school. For a majority of the students who are full-time students, their official occupation is “student.” This means that, for the students, the university to which they belong is considered as the business that they are a part of, in addition to the academic nature of the institution in which they are enrolled. In this regard, it is important to note that “[amongst the 343 U.S. millennials who were surveyed, they want to make a positive difference in the world (68%) and said that a successful business needs to have a genuine purpose (81%) and that the values of their employer should match their own (78%).]”\footnote{Field, Anne. "Millennials Want Companies Mixing Mission And Money," Forbes. December 11, 2017. Accessed November 25, 2018. \url{https://www.forbes.com/sites/annefield/2017/12/11/millennials-want-companies-mixing-mission-and-money/#4ae9f5edab0c}} USC has a high international student recruitment rate. Students from other countries such as France, United Kingdom and Germany, as shown in Figure 2, have stated that it is important that the values of the business that they work for will match their own values.
As shown above, on average, 75% of millennials, across different nations, share a similar view of wanting to be a part of a company that shares their own values. Accordingly, this policy, should appeal to Millennials’ value and thus should gain their political support for the current administration.

In terms of regional political reaction, this policy will gain political support for the school from the citizens of Los Angeles since “Los Angeles County saw its homeless population increase by 13,000 people” in 2017. In response to this homelessness phenomenon, 69% of survey respondents were supportive of a proposal that would build supportive housing for the homeless in their neighborhood, as shown in Figure 3.
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In fact, in 2016, “a ballot measure approving $1.2 billion to pay for affordable housing construction passed with more than 75 percent of the vote.” Although the proposed policy is not in regard to the construction of new student housing, it shows that the core concept of combating local housing issues should gain political support for the current administration from Los Angelenos.

In this context, it should be noted that this policy runs some potential political risks. In terms of its logistics, the pairing up of U.S. college students with high school international students for housing, this policy could either gain support or be criticized by the advocates for the Affordable Housing Act and Prop 10. The Affordable Housing Act is a statewide joint ballot initiative filed on “October 23rd, 2017, by Michael Weinstein, President of the AIDS Healthcare Foundation (AHF), Christina Livingston, State Director
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of Alliance of Californians for Community Empowerment Action (ACCE Action), and Elena Popp, Founder and Executive Director of Eviction Defense Network” to “repeal the Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act.”

The Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act was supported “by the corporate landlord lobby and signed by Governor Pete Wilson in 1995, the Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act (AB 1164; codified in California Civil Code Sections 1954.50) places significant restrictions on the ability of cities and counties in California to implement rent control — or limits on skyrocketing rents.

If the placement of the paired students supports corporate buildings and Airbnb housings, then this policy will face resistance from supporters of the Affordable Housing Act Prop 10. The involvement of international students, along with a policy that guarantees housing for immigrants, could be viewed as a component that might face resistance from local voters. On the contrary, if the students are placed in rent-controlled housing to support the Act, it will be likely to get support from local mortgage owner voters. The latter option, perhaps, is more fundamentally a mission targeting gesture to resolve housing insecurities of the college students.

Meanwhile, it is important to understand that gaining the support of local residents implies that there is a potential political loss in support from corporate landlords,” which could have a long-term, financially negative impact on the school’s donation/charity revenue. However, this impact can arguably be interpreted as having a lower impact than gaining a good reputation from local residents and voters since allocation of endowment spending, contributions, contracts and grants combined are not

---
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greater than the revenues from net student tuition and fees as shown in the Figure 4 below:

**Figure 4. USC Operating Revenue**

Since local residents’ resistance could damage the school’s reputation, which is directly related to the revenues from student tuition, it could be a politically greater gain, in the long term, to side with the local residents. Thus cautious PR efforts regarding the policy with a lens that is focused on the purpose of the education promotion, rather than separating the international students as an external immigrants population, could avoid and/or lower the resistance from the core local residents in the school’s neighborhood.

The latter aspect, in terms of the likelihood of this policy’s approval, the organizational structure should be examined. USC, as an organization, is controlled by a Board of Trustees composed of 60 voting trustees, and the business-minded approach

---

should gain political support amongst the trustees with voting power.\textsuperscript{85} In this regard, this policy runs the potential risk of facing resistance from a few of the trustees with voting power who are involved in either the local or state-level real estate industry. Trustee Jeanie M. Buss, a real estate investor who later became the “Co-owner, CEO, and Governor of the Los Angeles Lakers,”\textsuperscript{86} would potentially be one of these members. Other trustees with voting power, such as Alan I. Casden, the “Chairman and CEO of Casden Property Company LP” and Jaime L. Lee, the CEO of “Jamison Realty, Inc.,” will be likely to have a similar view.\textsuperscript{87} These figures are likely to be against the policy when it is deemed as anti-corporate landlord policies, thus lowering the likelihood of the policy actually passing.

Despite the potential resistance from a few of the trustees, one could argue that the project still is likely to be approved because the school recently underwent a series of scandals, as mentioned earlier in the policy analysis section of this piece. As a result, supporting this student welfare project should be encouraged as a way to recover some of the damage that school has endured. The recent transition of the new current president also implies that office politics will want to ride this political tide.

**RECOMMENDATION**

In summary, the proposed policy that involves USC making housing arrangements between its college students, who have either permanent residency or U.S. citizenship, and with high school-level international students in order to lower the level of homelessness and housing insecurity amongst its college students in Los Angeles by 5%

\textsuperscript{85} “University of Southern California.” University Bylaws. Accessed November 25, 2018. \url{https://policy.usc.edu/university-bylaws/}.  
\textsuperscript{86} “University of Southern California.” Trustees | Board of Trustees | USC. Accessed November 24, 2018. \url{https://boardoftrustees.usc.edu/trustees/}.  
\textsuperscript{87} Ibid.
by 2031, is recommended. The reason for this conclusion is based on several factors, including its viability, and on a careful policy and political analysis.

This policy’s viability lies mainly in the fact that the implementation of this policy does not require a new structure and/or a new system. Instead it is an approach that simply requires a matching process of their enrolled students. In this regard, the cost of possibly failing to achieve the intended end goals of this policy will be just the administrative cost that was spent on the Program Coordinator, which is relatively easy to cover by student tuition or fees. So, in essence there is very little, or no, downside financial risk to this program. That means that the Risk/Reward or Cost/Benefit ratio is very favorable to trying this program. USC has almost nothing to lose and very much to gain.

Based on a Cost/Benefit analysis, the benefits created from this policy, the probable good PR gain and a potentially substantial increase in international student recruitment, far outweigh the potential financial cost. This policy also is recommended because of the probable political implications. Indeed, there are risks that this policy could face potential opposition from corporate landlords and the real-estate based industry that are involved with USC Board of Trustee members who have voting power. However, the current political atmosphere of USC, due to its recent scandals, has resulted in many alumni and other interested parties calling for a reorganizing of the university’s officials. USC needs some good PR. Meanwhile, the business potential of this policy could appeal to the more entrepreneurial voting members of the Board of Trustees. For these reasons, this policy could be considered as worthy of further analysis and consideration. Perhaps most importantly, the university’s unofficial, yet most powerful
political influencers, the students and faculty, along with local residents, are likely to support this proposal. These are powerful reasons why this policy should be considered as worthy to be pursued.

Lastly, the fundamental reason that this policy is recommended is based on its potential to help solve a long-standing nation-wide issue. This proposed policy, when it has been proven its success, can be followed by other U.S. higher education institutions, which then have the potential of helping to solve one of the chronic housing issues for young workers. Thus, this policy potentially sets the table for important action on this issue. For all of these reasons, personally coming from a USC alum’s point of view, this policy is recommended for your consideration.
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