

Cynthia Kendall
Salem, OR
503.581.6485

Tuesday - March 19, 2013

HB 2787 Testimony

The simple fact that there are no limits set on the number of students that can access the instate tuition benefit, that there is no sunset or end date, that there is no clear definition of "statement of intent" or "affidavit" and that there is no plan of follow up or any consequences for not following through on those "promises" to become a citizen is troublesome to me... a citizen and a taxpayer.

Clearly, **this bill has holes one could drive a truck through**. But, if this misguided Legislation must pass, please take the time to strengthen the bill with a few simple amendments.

First, require these students to **attend a community college and obtain an Associates degree first**. Community college credits are now much easier to transfer to universities saving thousands of dollars. Is it unreasonable to expect that these students could pay for their first 2 years of higher education at a community college, and, if they're successful, they could then continue on to a university?

Second, **add a sunset clause** , that would allow the impact of the bill to be reviewed, renewed or abandoned.

A **student participant limit and/or a dollar cost maximum** should be included in any bill. Even a lay person can understand that. The number of anticipated students varies wildly, depending on the source of the estimate...let's simply set a limit of some kind. It's just common sense.

Another way to accomplish these limits would be to grant **any student now currently enrolled** in an Oregon school **at the time the bill goes into affect, and** if they continue through high school here in Oregon, then they will be eligible for instate tuition benefits. The end!

This bill promises instate tuition benefits to folks not even illegally in the state yet. That's just dumb and leaves Oregon vulnerable to abuses that other states are experiencing!

These simple suggestions are straightforward and necessary to make HB 2787 a stronger bill. The real question is, **why are they not in the bill?** Do any of these suggestions seem unreasonable?

Remember...only 13 states give instate tuition benefits to students illegally in the country.
Thirty seven states don't!