

A loan forgiveness provision for Head Start personnel would match that for other critically needed teachers. It is the right place to begin.

I regret that not all of my colleagues will have the opportunity to consider this proposal because the amendment to do so was not ruled in order.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adopting House Resolution 309 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on adopting House Resolution 310.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 192, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 337]

YEAS—230

Abercrombie	Davis, Tom	Isakson
Aderholt	Deal (GA)	Issa
Akin	DeLay	Istook
Alexander	DeMint	Jenkins
Bachus	Diaz-Balart, L.	Johnson (CT)
Baker	Diaz-Balart, M.	Johnson (IL)
Ballenger	Doolittle	Johnson, Sam
Barrett (SC)	Dreier	Jones (NC)
Bartlett (MD)	Duncan	Keller
Barton (TX)	Dunn	Kelly
Bass	Ehlers	Kennedy (MN)
Beauprez	Emerson	King (IA)
Bereuter	English	King (NY)
Biggart	Everett	Kingston
Bilirakis	Feeney	Kirk
Bishop (UT)	Ferguson	Kline
Blackburn	Flake	Knollenberg
Blunt	Fletcher	Kolbe
Boehlert	Foley	LaHood
Boehner	Forbes	Latham
Bonilla	Fossella	LaTourette
Bonner	Franks (AZ)	Leach
Bono	Frelinghuysen	Lewis (CA)
Boozman	Gallegly	Lewis (KY)
Bradley (NH)	Garrett (NJ)	Linder
Brady (TX)	Gerlach	LoBiondo
Brown (SC)	Gilchrest	Lucas (OK)
Brown-Waite,	Gillmor	Manzullo
Ginny	Gingrey	Marshall
Burgess	Goode	McCotter
Burns	Goodlatte	McCrary
Burr	Granger	McHugh
Burton (IN)	Graves	McInnis
Buyer	Green (TX)	McKeon
Calvert	Green (WI)	Mica
Camp	Greenwood	Miller (FL)
Cannon	Gutknecht	Miller (MI)
Cantor	Harris	Miller, Gary
Capito	Hart	Moran (KS)
Carter	Hastings (WA)	Murphy
Castle	Hayes	Musgrave
Chabot	Hayworth	Myrick
Chocola	Hefley	Nethercutt
Coble	Hensarling	Neugebauer
Cole	Herger	Ney
Collins	Hobson	Northup
Crane	Hoekstra	Norwood
Crenshaw	Hostettler	Nunes
Cubin	Houghton	Nussle
Culberson	Hulshof	Osborne
Cunningham	Hunter	Ose
Davis, Jo Ann	Hyde	Otter

Oxley	Rohrabacher	Tancredo
Paul	Ros-Lehtinen	Tauzin
Pearce	Royce	Taylor (NC)
Pence	Ryan (WI)	Terry
Peterson (PA)	Ryun (KS)	Thomas
Petri	Saxton	Thornberry
Pickering	Schrock	Tiahrt
Pitts	Scott (GA)	Tiberi
Platts	Sensenbrenner	Toomey
Pombo	Sessions	Turner (OH)
Pomeroy	Shadegg	Upton
Porter	Shaw	Vitter
Portman	Shays	Walden (OR)
Pryce (OH)	Sherwood	Walsh
Putnam	Shimkus	Wamp
Quinn	Shuster	Weldon (FL)
Radanovich	Simmons	Weldon (PA)
Ramstad	Simpson	Weller
Regula	Smith (MI)	Whitfield
Rehberg	Smith (NJ)	Wicker
Renzi	Smith (TX)	Wilson (NM)
Reynolds	Souder	Wilson (SC)
Rogers (AL)	Stearns	Wolf
Rogers (KY)	Sullivan	Young (AK)
Rogers (MI)	Sweeney	Young (FL)

NAYS—192

Ackerman	Hall	Neal (MA)
Allen	Hill	Oberstar
Andrews	Hinchey	Obeys
Baca	Hinojosa	Olver
Baird	Hoeffel	Ortiz
Baldwin	Holden	Pallone
Ballance	Holt	Pascrell
Becerra	Honda	Pastor
Bell	Hooley (OR)	Payne
Berkley	Hoyer	Pelosi
Berman	Inslee	Peterson (MN)
Berry	Israel	Price (NC)
Bishop (GA)	Jackson (IL)	Rahall
Bishop (NY)	Jackson-Lee	Rangel
Blumenauer	(TX)	Reyes
Boswell	Jefferson	Rodriguez
Boucher	John	Ross
Boyd	Johnson, E. B.	Rothman
Brady (PA)	Jones (OH)	Roybal-Allard
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski	Ruppersberger
Brown, Corrine	Kaptur	Rush
Capps	Kennedy (RI)	Sabo
Capuano	Kildee	Sanchez, Linda
Cardin	Kilpatrick	T.
Cardoza	Kind	Sanchez, Loretta
Carson (IN)	Klecza	Sanders
Carson (OK)	Kucinich	Sandlin
Case	Lampson	Schakowsky
Clay	Langevin	Schiff
Clyburn	Lantos	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Costello	Lee	Skelton
Crowley	Levin	Slaughter
Cummings	Lewis (GA)	Snyder
Davis (AL)	Lipinski	Solis
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Spratt
Davis (FL)	Lowe	Stark
Davis (IL)	Lucas (KY)	Stenholm
Davis (TN)	Lynch	Strickland
DeFazio	Majette	Stupak
DeGette	Maloney	Tanner
DeLahunt	Markey	Tauscher
DeLauro	Matheson	Taylor (MS)
Deutsch	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Dicks	McCarthy (MO)	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Tierney
Doggett	McCollum	Towns
Dooley (CA)	McDermott	Turner (TX)
Doyle	McGovern	Udall (CO)
Emanuel	McIntyre	Udall (NM)
Engel	McNulty	Van Hollen
Eshoo	Meehan	Velazquez
Etheridge	Meek (FL)	Visclosky
Evans	Meeks (NY)	Waters
Farr	Menendez	Watson
Fattah	Michaud	Watt
Filner	Miller (NC)	Waxman
Ford	Miller, George	Weiner
Frank (MA)	Mollohan	Wexler
Frost	Moore	Woolsey
Gonzalez	Moran (VA)	Wu
Gordon	Murtha	Wynn
Grijalva	Nadler	
Gutierrez	Napolitano	

NOT VOTING—12

Cox	Goss	Millender-
Cramer	Harman	McDonald
Edwards	Hastings (FL)	Owens
Gephardt	Janklow	Smith (WA)
Gibbons		

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1205

Messrs. GEORGE MILLER of California, LANGEVIN, HINOJOSA, MATSUI, PRICE of North Carolina, SPRATT, and HONDA changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. POMEROY changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2211, READY TO TEACH ACT OF 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question of agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 310, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 252, nays 170, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 338]

YEAS—252

Abercrombie	Clay	Green (TX)
Aderholt	Coble	Green (WI)
Akin	Cole	Greenwood
Alexander	Collins	Gutknecht
Bachus	Cox	Harris
Baker	Crane	Hart
Ballenger	Crenshaw	Hastings (WA)
Barrett (SC)	Cubin	Hayes
Bartlett (MD)	Culberson	Hayworth
Barton (TX)	Cunningham	Hefley
Bass	Davis (TN)	Hensarling
Beauprez	Davis, Jo Ann	Herger
Bell	Davis, Tom	Hobson
Bereuter	Deal (GA)	Hoekstra
Berry	DeLay	Holden
Biggart	DeMint	Honda
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hostettler
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Houghton
Blackburn	Dicks	Hulshof
Blunt	Doolittle	Hunter
Boehlert	Duncan	Hyde
Boehner	Dunn	Isakson
Bonilla	Ehlers	Issa
Bonner	Emerson	Istook
Bono	English	Jefferson
Boozman	Eshoo	Jenkins
Boucher	Everett	Johnson (CT)
Boyd	Feeney	Johnson (IL)
Bradley (NH)	Ferguson	Johnson, Sam
Brady (TX)	Flake	Jones (NC)
Brown (SC)	Fletcher	Jones (OH)
Brown-Waite,	Foley	Keller
Ginny	Forbes	Kelly
Burgess	Fossella	Kennedy (MN)
Burns	Franks (AZ)	King (IA)
Burr	Frelinghuysen	King (NY)
Burton (IN)	Gallegly	Kingston
Buyer	Garrett (NJ)	Kirk
Calvert	Gerlach	Kline
Camp	Gilchrest	Knollenberg
Cannon	Gillmor	Kolbe
Cantor	Gingrey	LaHood
Capito	Goode	Latham
Carter	Goodlatte	LaTourette
Castle	Gordon	Leach
Chabot	Granger	Lewis (CA)
Chocola	Graves	Lewis (KY)

Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lucas (OK)  
Manzullo  
Marshall  
Matheson  
McCollum  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McKeon  
Meeks (NY)  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Moran (KS)  
Murphy  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Nethercutt  
Neugebauer  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nunes  
Nussle  
Osborne  
Ose  
Otter  
Oxley  
Paul  
Pearce  
Pence  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)

## NAYS—170

Ackerman  
Allen  
Andrews  
Baca  
Baird  
Baldwin  
Ballance  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Boswell  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (OH)  
Brown, Corrine  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardin  
Cardoza  
Carson (IN)  
Carson (OK)  
Case  
Clyburn  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costello  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Deutsch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dooley (CA)  
Doyle  
Emanuel  
Engel  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Ford  
Frank (MA)  
Frost  
Gonzalez  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hall  
Hill

Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Renzi  
Reynolds  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Royce  
Rush  
Ryan (WI)  
Ryun (KS)  
Saxton  
Schrock  
Scott (GA)  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shuster

Simmons  
Simpson  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Souder  
Spratt  
Stearns  
Sullivan  
Sweeney  
Tancredo  
Tanner  
Tauzin  
Taylor (NC)  
Terry  
Thomas  
Thompson (CA)  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Toomey  
Turner (OH)  
Upton  
Vitter  
Walsh  
Walden (OR)  
Wamp  
Weldon (FL)  
Weller  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

Olver  
Ortiz  
Pallone  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reyes  
Rodriguez  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (OH)  
Sabo  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Sherman  
Lee  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Stark  
Stenholm  
Strickland  
Stupak  
Tauscher  
Taylor (MS)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Towns  
Turner (TX)  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Van Hollen  
Velazquez  
Wesclosky  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Weldon (PA)  
Wexler  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn

## NOT VOTING—12

Cramer  
Dreier  
Edwards  
Gephardt  
Gibbons  
Goss  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Janklow  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Owens  
Pascrell

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes to vote.

□ 1211

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 310 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2211.

□ 1212

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2211) to reauthorize title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965, with Mr. SIMPSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 30 minutes.

□ 1215

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 2211, the Ready to Teach Act of 2003, which was reported by the Committee on Education and the Workforce on June 10 by a bipartisan voice vote, complements the No Child Left Behind Act and will help improve the quality and accountability of our Nation's teacher preparation programs.

No Child Left Behind set a lofty, but achievable, goal of placing a highly qualified teacher in every public school classroom by the 2005-2006 school year. We can all agree that a highly qualified teacher plays a pivotal role in the successful education of our Nation's children, and those children deserve nothing less. Congress has kept our word to increase funding to help ensure teachers can become highly qualified. In fact, we increased funding for teacher quality grants by 35 percent in the first year of No Child Left Behind alone, and the increases are continuing. We are providing the resources, and this bill will build on that effort by supporting our teachers with real reforms.

There is a serious problem when the programs charged with training the teachers of tomorrow are not meeting that goal, and that is exactly what we are facing today. Everyone here will agree that highly qualified teachers

prepared to meet the challenges of the classroom and fulfill the needs of our students are essential if we are going to succeed with education reform in America. Yet the Nation's teacher-training programs suffer from serious lack of accountability, and this time it is the teachers who are being left behind.

The bill before us today takes important steps to ensure that teacher-training programs are in fact giving perspective teachers the skills and knowledge they need to meet the highly qualified standard in No Child Left Behind. Let us be clear on this point: this bill is about supporting our teachers. We are expecting a lot from them, and they deserve to have access to high quality training programs that ensure that when they step into the classroom they are truly ready to teach.

This legislation makes several improvements to title II of the Higher Education Act to ensure that teacher-training programs are providing perspective teachers with the skills they need to be highly qualified and ready to teach when they enter the classroom. This bill is about helping teachers, pure and simple, giving them the tools and training they need to meet the needs of our Nation's students.

H.R. 2211 authorizes competitively awarded grants under the Higher Education Act to increase the quality of our teaching force by improving the preparation of perspective teachers and enhancing teacher professional development activities. We want to hold teacher-preparation programs accountable for preparing highly qualified teachers and recruit highly qualified individuals, including minorities and individuals from other occupations, into the teaching force.

The Ready to Teach Act ensures that program effectiveness can accurately be measured and places a renewed emphasis on the skills needed to meet the "highly qualified" standard found in No Child Left Behind, such as the use of advanced technology in the classroom, vigorous academic content knowledge, scientifically based research and challenging State student academic standards.

Under this legislation, funds can also be used to recruit individuals, and specifically minorities, into the teaching profession. The committee adopted a bipartisan amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BURNS), the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) to authorize grants for the creation of Centers of Excellence at high quality, minority-serving institutions.

In general, those Centers of Excellence will help increase teacher recruitment and make institutional improvements to teacher-preparation programs at minority-serving institutions. Grants under this program will be competitively awarded to high quality teacher preparation programs at eligible institutions, which include historically black colleges and universities,

Hispanic-serving institutions, tribally controlled colleges or universities, Alaska native-serving institutions, or native Hawaiian-serving institutions.

Mr. Chairman, as we work to place highly qualified teachers in classrooms across the Nation, I am particularly pleased that the Ready to Teach Act allows for innovative programs that provide alternative options to traditional teacher-training programs. Proposals outlined in this bill, such as charter colleges of education, provide a much-needed alternative route to training highly qualified and effective teachers.

H.R. 2211 authorizes States to use funds to set up charter colleges of education that function in a manner similar to elementary and secondary charter schools, except that they would prepare highly qualified teachers in a higher-education setting. Charter colleges of education would exchange flexibility in meeting State requirements for institutional commitments to produce results-based outcomes for teacher-education graduates, measured based on increased student academic achievement.

This bill takes the important step of recognizing that individuals seeking to enter the teaching profession often have varied backgrounds; and by creating a more flexible approach that steps outside the box, these individuals can become highly qualified teachers through training programs as unique as their own individual experiences.

H.R. 2211 will also hold teacher-preparation programs accountable for preparing highly qualified teachers. While current higher-education law contains annual reporting requirements, these reporting measures have often proven ineffective in measuring the true quality of teacher-preparation programs. In fact, the current requirements have often been manipulated, leaving data skewed and often irrelevant. The Ready to Teach Act includes accountability provisions that will strengthen the reporting measures and hold teacher-preparation programs accountable for providing accurate and useful information.

I would like to thank a new member of our committee, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY), the author of this bill, for his work on the Ready to Teach Act. I would also like to commend my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the ranking member; the gentleman from California (Chairman McKeon) of the subcommittee; and his ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), for their bipartisan effort on this bill. They have put together a bipartisan bill that makes common-sense changes to title II of the Higher Education Act to help improve the quality of our Nation's teachers.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the underlying bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) ask unanimous consent to control the time of

the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER)?

Mr. KILDEE. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2211, the Ready to Teach Act of 2003, with the hope that certain amendments that were made in order will be adopted.

I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY), the author of this bill, and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), the chairman of the subcommittee. He and I have worked together for a number of years now on higher-education matters. It was a very enjoyable task in this. I would also like to thank the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman BOEHNER), for his work in the committee.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation reauthorizes title II's teacher-quality programs and makes much-needed improvements to its accountability system. Teacher quality is a critical element to ensure our children succeed academically. This bill makes great strides to improve teacher-preparation programs that create our supply of highly qualified teachers.

Chief of these improvements is a bipartisan amendment accepted at the subcommittee markup creating the Minority Centers of Excellence program. This new program will allow high-quality Historically Black Colleges, Hispanic-serving institutions and Tribal colleges to improve teacher preparation and to work with disadvantaged school districts. This program will tap the vast knowledge and skill housed in these institutions to improve teacher preparation, especially for minority teachers.

In addition, the bill's provisions to expand teacher retention and preparation of early childhood teachers are very critical improvements. With added resources for retention, school districts will be more able to keep highly qualified teachers in their districts. With new resources to ensure that we have early childhood teachers, our Nation's youngest children will receive the head start they really need to succeed.

While this legislation represents a good first step, we are missing an opportunity to address some of the most pressing issues facing education. Whether it is the No Child Left Behind Act, IDEA or Pell Grants, the Bush administration and Republican leadership have failed to meet their education funding commitments.

President Bush and the House and Senate appropriations committees have proposed funding, for example, title I at \$12.35 billion. That is over \$6 billion short of the \$18.5 billion which the President signed into law for this year when he signed No Child Left Behind.

The Republican budget resolution promised \$2.2 billion in new IDEA funding. The House and Senate appropriations committees have proposed less than half that amount.

In addition, the Pell Grants have been frozen by the House and Senate appropriation committees, despite increasing college costs.

While I really want to reiterate that I will support this legislation, the administration and the Republican Congress are missing an opportunity to meet our education funding commitments.

Basically, and Members have heard me say this before, this is an authorization bill; and it is a good authorization bill. We worked hard on it. But I have always said an authorization bill is like a get-well card, Mr. Chairman. If I have a friend who is ill, I will send my friend a get-well card, which expresses my attitude, how I value my friend, and that is very important. But what my friend really needs is a Blue Cross card to pay the bills.

I think we have to work closer together to make sure there is not such a wide disparity between the levels that are in the authorization bills, the get-well card, and what is in the appropriations bill, the Blue Cross card.

But having said that, I want to say that the authorizing committee did work well together; and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the chairman, was very, very fair to us, and we adopted Democratic amendments in that committee. I think the authorizers have done a good job.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me again congratulate my friend from Michigan. This is a bipartisan bill that has been worked on with Members on both sides of the aisle to try to address the serious needs that we have in our teacher preparation programs as outlined in title II of the Higher Education Act. But as a side note, I need to respond to my colleague from Michigan when it comes to the issue of funding the Federal Government's role in education.

We can look at this as a glass half empty, or we can look at it as a glass half full. Federal education spending over the last 3 fiscal years has gone from \$28 billion for elementary and secondary programs to \$35.7 billion for these same programs, including almost \$400 million to pay for the development and implementation of the testing requirements under No Child Left Behind.

We can look at title I. It has been increased almost 200 percent over the last 6 years. We can look at the last 6 years of special education funding having risen 300 percent.

So when Members come to the floor of the House and suggest that we are not meeting our commitments, I have no choice but to stand up and say, let us be honest. We are doing our share.

Could we do more? Of course, we could do more.

But as I told my colleagues one day, I was elected to come to Congress and make decisions; I was not elected to be Santa Claus, and today is not Christmas. As we get through the appropriations process, we are going to continue to work at the appropriate funding levels for these education programs. But, today, we have a bipartisan bill that will help improve the quality of our Nation's teachers and those who seek to be teachers, and we have to continue to work together to meet this important goal.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY), the author of this bill, who spent an awful lot of time as a school board member, a State legislator, and now as a Member of Congress, developing teacher-training programs to help meet the needs of our Nation's teachers.

□ 1230

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), for yielding me this time. I would like to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE). We have worked very closely, very good together, as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) pointed out, in a very bipartisan fashion. And, as the chairman just mentioned, it is not all about funding; it is certainly also about accountability. That is what we are trying to do in the reauthorization of the Title II part of the Higher Education Act: We want to bring additional accountability so that we make sure that no child is left behind by assuring that a qualified teacher is, indeed, in every classroom.

H.R. 2211, the Ready to Teach Act of 2003, is a bill that I introduced to help ensure that teacher training programs are producing well-prepared teachers to meet the needs of American students. H.R. 2211 updates the teacher provisions of the Higher Education Act. Specifically, this legislation amends Part A, Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants for States and Partnerships, and also Part B, Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology of Title II of the Higher Education Act. In addition, H.R. 2211 authorizes teacher preparation Centers of Excellence for minority-serving institutions.

The purposes of the Ready to Teach Act are to increase student academic achievement, elevate the quality of the current and future teaching force by improving the preparation of prospective teachers and enhancing professional development activities; hold teacher preparation programs accountable for preparing highly qualified

teachers; and to recruit highly qualified individuals, including minorities and individuals from other occupations, into the teaching force.

As in current law, H.R. 2211 authorizes three types of competitive grant programs: State grants, partnership grants, and teacher recruitment grants.

State grant funds must be used to reform teacher preparation requirements, coordinate with activities under Title II of No Child Left Behind Act, and ensure that current and future teachers are highly qualified. Programs administered through State grants will focus on effective teacher preparation, placing a renewed emphasis on the skills needed to meet the "highly qualified" standard.

The partnership grants allow effective partners to join together, combining their strengths and resources to train highly qualified teachers and achieve success in the classroom. The eligible partnerships must include four partners: a high-quality teacher preparation program at an institution of higher education; a college of arts and sciences, presumably at that same institution; a high-need, local educational agency; and a public or private educational organization. It can include additional partners, but it must include those four. These partnerships will require the faculty of the teacher preparation programs to serve with a highly qualified teacher in the classroom, allowing effective in-class experience to ensure that teachers are truly prepared to teach. Among other things, partnership activities will help to ensure that teachers are able to use advanced technology effectively in the classroom, address the needs of students with different learning styles, including students with disabilities, and receive training in methods of improving student behavior in the classroom.

As America holds teacher preparation programs accountable for preparing teachers who will ensure that no child is left behind, the need to recruit individuals into the teaching profession will only expand. Teacher recruitment grants will help bring high-quality individuals into teacher programs and ultimately put more highly qualified teachers into the classrooms. H.R. 2211 recognizes the need to ensure that high-need, local educational agencies are able to effectively recruit highly qualified teachers, and will help answer that need by increasing the number of teachers being trained.

H.R. 2211 also includes a new program which is based on provisions submitted to the committee by the United Negro College Fund and the Hispanic Education Coalition to authorize teacher preparation Centers of Excellence at minority-serving institutions. In general, the purpose of this program and this amendment brought to us by my colleague and good friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BURNS), are to increase teacher recruitment and to make institutional improvements to

teacher preparation programs at minority-serving institutions.

While current higher education law contains annual reporting and accountability requirements for institutions of higher education, these measures, as the chairman indicated, have proven ineffective in determining the true quality of teacher preparation programs. H.R. 2211 in this reauthorization adds accountability provisions to the Higher Education Act that will strengthen these current law provisions and hold teacher preparation programs accountable for providing accurate and useful information about the quality of their programs.

Mr. Chairman, in summary, H.R. 2211 is specifically designed to align teacher preparation programs with the high standards of accountability and results provided for in No Child Left Behind Act. This Ready to Teach Act will help to ensure that program effectiveness can accurately be measured and places a strong focus on the quality of teacher preparation and a renewed emphasis on the skills needed to meet the "highly qualified" standard found in the No Child Left Behind Act.

In conclusion, I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their assistance in moving this bill through the process. It is a bipartisan product, Mr. Chairman, of which we can all be proud. I urge each and every one of my colleagues to support H.R. 2211, the Ready to Teach Act of 2003.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 2211, the Ready to Teach Act, and to highlight the new provisions for recruiting and training teachers that it contains.

Our Nation faces the unprecedented challenge of recruiting and retaining an additional 2.5 million teachers over the next 10 years. This is necessary to keep pace with anticipated retirements and a growing student population. It is also a critical aspect of education reform. The No Child Left Behind Act requires that every teacher be "highly qualified" by the 2005-06 school year. In fact, there is hardly an aspect of educational reform that does not depend on a well-trained and highly motivated teaching force.

That is why I introduced the Teaching Fellows Act, H.R. 1805, modeled on a program established in 1986 by the North Carolina General Assembly that has brought some 4,000 young people into our State's teaching force and that offers, I believe, a model for national emulation. I am grateful to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER), a cosponsor of H.R. 1805, and to the gentleman from California (Chairman MCKEON), and to the ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and to many

other subcommittee and full committee members for their cooperation in writing major elements of the Teaching Fellows Act into the bill that is before us today.

Much as we envisioned in the Teaching Fellows Act, H.R. 2211, as amended in committee, would establish State scholarship programs for prospective teachers and give them the preparation and support they need to make a long-term commitment to the field. Scholarships could be offered to high school students embarking on a 4-year program or to students farther along in college when they might be better prepared to make a career choice.

The bill also contains a second recruitment initiative: Through partnerships between community colleges and 4-year schools, H.R. 2211 would offer fellowships to 2-year students, particularly those in training as teaching assistants, to go on for their bachelor's degree and full teaching certification. This community college component of the program is especially promising for rural and small town areas. Too often our beginning teachers are lured away by schools in the big cities and the affluent suburbs, leaving rural and inner-city schools behind. But community colleges typically contain people more deeply rooted in these underserved areas, and enabling them to complete a 4-year degree would be a promising strategy for identifying and training a cadre of "home-grown" teachers.

The program we envision would not merely throw money at individual students, but would seek, through rich, extracurricular programs, to promote *esprit de corps* and collaborative learning, to strengthen professional identity, and to provide a support system as students first enter the classroom as teachers. Students would participate in various community and school-based internships and experiences that go well beyond normal teacher preparation. In North Carolina, these enrichment programs have featured orientations to school systems, communities, and educational issues, as well as experiences like Outward Bound and international travel.

In exchange, scholarship recipients would be required to teach in a public school for a minimum of 1 year plus a period of time equivalent to the length of their scholarships. In this the program would resemble the National Health Service Corps, which helps finance students' medical and dental education in exchange for service in underserved areas, and early National Service proposals, which envisioned young people being given scholarships as compensation for community service. The ideas of reciprocal obligation and community service would thus be enlisted in the service of teaching, which is surely one of the best ways one can imagine of giving back to the community and to the next generation.

Finally, the legislation assumes that the route to success is not through regimented, top-down administration, but through a decentralized structure

that engages and empowers local leaders and participants. States would be given the option of running their programs through nonprofit organizations separate from their department of education, an arrangement that has fostered innovation and flexibility in North Carolina.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2211 does not include all of the elements of the Teaching Fellows Act, and it leaves future funding levels indeterminate. It will require us to work with the Department of Education to get an energetic program up and running, and to push in this body for adequate annual appropriations. But I am enthused at the opportunity this bill affords to initiate and expand State scholarship programs for prospective teachers. I want to commend and thank those colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have contributed to this effort.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to control the time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman BOEHNER) and my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY), a new member of the committee who has shown great leadership in bringing forth this bill. I want to thank him for his work on this important piece of legislation.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 2211, the Ready to Teach Act of 2003, a bipartisan bill that seeks to meet the call of the No Child Left Behind Act to place a highly qualified teacher in every classroom. It makes improvements to Title II of the Higher Education Act to help ensure teacher training programs are producing well-prepared teachers to meet the needs of America's students.

There is widespread awareness that the subject matter, knowledge, and teaching skills of teachers play a central role in the success of elementary and secondary education reform. More than half of the 2.2 million teachers that America's schools will need to hire over the next 10 years will be first-time teachers, and they will need to be well prepared for the challenges of today's classrooms. For these reasons, the Nation's attention has increasingly focused on the role that institutions of higher education and States play in ensuring that new teachers have the content knowledge and teaching skills they need to ensure that all students are held to higher standards.

Accordingly, building on current law, the Ready to Teach Act authorizes three types of teacher training grants, and each play a unique, yet crucial, role in the education of tomorrow's teachers. State grant funds must be

used to reform teacher preparation requirements and ensure that current and future teachers are highly qualified. Partnership grants allow effective partners to join together, combining strengths and resources to train highly qualified teachers and achieve success where it matters most: in the classroom. Teacher recruitment grants help bring high-quality individuals into teacher programs, and ultimately put more highly qualified teachers into classrooms.

H.R. 2211 includes a new program to authorize grants for the creation of teacher preparation programs at minority-serving institutions around the country. These institutions provide equal opportunity and strong academic programs for minority and disadvantaged students to help achieve greater financial stability for the institutions that serve these students.

In general, the Ready to Teach Act focuses on three key objectives, accountability, flexibility, and effectiveness, to improve the quality of teacher preparation.

While current higher education law contains some annual reporting requirements, these reporting measures have proven ineffective in measuring the true quality of teacher preparation programs. In fact, the current requirements have often been manipulated, leaving data skewed and often irrelevant. H.R. 2211 includes accountability provisions that will strengthen reporting requirements and hold teacher preparation programs accountable for providing accurate and useful information.

This legislation recognizes that flexibility should exist in methods used for training highly qualified teachers and, for that reason, would allow funds to be used for innovative methods in teacher preparation programs such as chartered colleges of education, which can provide an adequate gateway for teachers to become highly qualified. Pioneering programs such as charter colleges of education would also implement systems to gauge a true measure of teacher effectiveness: the academic achievement of students.

In addition to increasing accountability measures, the Ready to Teach Act increases the effectiveness and quality in teacher training by including provisions to focus training on the skills and knowledge needed to prepare highly qualified teachers.

□ 1245

The bill places a renewed emphasis on a broad range of skills required for effective teaching, such as the use of advanced technology in the classroom, rigorous academic content knowledge, scientifically based research and challenging State student academic content standards.

Teacher-preparation programs have a great deal of responsibility contributing to the preparation of our Nation's teachers, and this bill will make sure they are meeting their responsibilities. Once again, I want to commend the gentleman from Georgia (Mr.

GINGREY) for introducing the Ready to Teach Act, and I appreciate the bipartisan efforts of the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) on this bill.

I believe the Ready to Teach Act will help to ensure that the best and brightest teachers are teaching our children. I urge our colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by commending the committee leadership on both sides of the aisle for their efforts on this bipartisan bill, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER); the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER); the subcommittee leadership, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON); and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE); and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) for all his work on this piece of legislation.

It is critical that we improve teacher training in this country to make sure that the children in our classrooms get the best possible results. I want to thank the committee for adopting an amendment that I submitted along with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) to make it clear that these teacher-training funds could be used to train the teachers who train our youngest children because we all understand the importance of early, early education.

I must say, however, I am very concerned about the growing gap between what we say we want to do as an authorizing committee and what we are willing to pay for as a Congress. We can talk all day long about the good things we are going to do; but at the end of the day, if we are not going to pay for them, all we have is talk. And I think this gap, this credibility gap, cannot be made more clear between what we are going to do here today and what we will do tomorrow when we take up the education appropriations bill.

Today we will pass an authorizing bill, Ready to Teach, calling for a \$300 million authorization to do the things we are talking about on this floor. Tomorrow we will have a Republican appropriations bill that has less than one-third of that money, \$90 million appropriated. Today we are talking about how important it is to teach teachers, but tomorrow we will take up an education appropriations bill that underfunds No Child Left Behind by \$8 billion. It is great to have trained teachers; but we if we do not provide the schools with the money to hire them, our kids will not get the benefit of those teachers, and that is \$8 billion short.

Today we are talking about training special education teachers so they can

provide a good education to the children in this country who have disabilities. But tomorrow we will take up an education appropriations bill that provides less than 50 percent of what this committee, the Committee on Education and the Workforce, said we should be providing.

Now, the chairman said we can look at that as a cup half full or half empty. The fact of the matter is we promised a full cup; and we, as a Congress, are not delivering. I think the chairman of the committee is absolutely right, we came here to make decisions to establish priorities. Let us do it. The reason we are falling short tomorrow in the appropriations bill and not meeting the commitments that we are making today in this authorizing bill is because the priority of the majority party here was to provide huge tax cuts that disproportionately benefit the very wealthiest Americans. Let us get our priorities straight and truly pass not only an authorizing bill but an appropriations bill that leaves no child behind.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE), a member of the committee and a good friend of mine.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman and also the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman BOEHNER), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for their work on this bill.

I would like to remind the gentleman who just spoke that frequently what is authorized and what is appropriated is not the same. I certainly share many of his sentiments, but I do believe that H.R. 2211 is an important bill because I spent 5 years teaching in a teachers college, 3 years when I was a young man in my twenties, and 2 years more recently at an unspecified age. And I was often struck by the disconnect between the theory of teaching presented in the teachers college and the practical aspects of teaching in the classroom. As a result, because of this disconnect, we find a lot of young teachers going into the classroom unprepared and they leave early, and this is very expensive to the whole system.

So H.R. 2211 requires teachers colleges to work together with school districts so education theory and actual classroom teaching experience are aligned. I think this is critical because so often what happens is the teachers college kind of drifts off into a never-never-land of theory and they are really not rooted in actual experience. So I think this is a critical change. And I think this will encourage higher retention rates.

In addition, as has been pointed out previously, H.R. 2211 ensures that teacher preparation is thorough and that teachers have sufficient knowledge and skills to truly meet the highly qualified standards set forth in No Child Left Behind. Again, my experi-

ence has been that too often teachers have not adequately been assessed in terms of their knowledge, their skill; and mediocrity has often been the norm, and that is tragic in a profession as important as this. So H.R. 2211 raises the bar for teacher preparation. I think it is a good bill, and I urge its support; and I thank those who have worked so hard to bring it to fruition.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

(Mr. KIND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I too want to commend the leadership of the committee for putting together this bipartisan piece of legislation.

This is an important piece of the overall higher-education bill that we have to reauthorize during the rest of this session. It recognizes the importance of teacher quality in the classroom. It recognizes the fact that because of attrition and the aging population, retirement, we will have to replace 2.2 million teachers over the next decade. It also recognizes that the quality of a teacher is the second most important determinant of how well students perform in the classroom, right behind the active involvement of loving and caring parents in their own child's education. But it also recognizes the new mandates that are being placed on schools and school districts throughout the entire country under No Child Left Behind that mandates that every classroom have a qualified, certified teacher by 2005 and 2006 under the No Child Left Behind legislation. And in part, this bill is meant to address these growing challenges as a Nation.

But like my friend from Maryland indicated, there is a growing gap between the rhetoric for support for education in this country and what is actually being appropriated and the resources and funds that are going to achieve the success that we are demanding of our school districts.

I am particularly pleased that under this legislation it is reauthorizing the Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology program. This is a program that has been highly successful in preparing prospective teachers to use technology to help students reach their highest potential. Unfortunately, in the education appropriations bill that will start later today and tomorrow, the Republican majority has zeroed out funding for that technology program, even though we have this powerful new learning tool and yet there exists a gap between the integration of that technology in classroom curriculum. We need more resources and more training for teachers on how to use this technology rather than zeroing it out.

I am also disappointed that under the labor-HHS and education appropriations bill that we are \$8 billion short in

fully funding the No Child Left Behind legislation. We are setting up these school districts for failure unless we provide them the tools and resources they need to meet the new Federal mandates that are passed under this legislation. The President ran as an education President. He got passed the No Child Left Behind, which establishes these new Federal mandates. And I think it is outrageous that he is not funding this now, as the promise was just a short year and a half ago that he would.

Let me say in conclusion that I am very proud and I think every Member in this House is very proud of the military force that we have protecting our country. We have a lot of well-motivated, well-trained individuals that comprise our Armed Forces; but it does not just happen by accident. We invest a lot of money in our military to make sure they have the proper training and the proper equipment so they can be an effective military force around the globe as they carry out our orders as policymakers. But we have another national security threat that I am afraid is going neglected, and that is the investment in the future of our Nation, in our children, and in these education programs which will also make our country strong. We need to do a better job of backing up the rhetoric around here with the resources. This bill is a start if the funding follows, and I would encourage bipartisan support for it.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER), a senior member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me time. First, I would like to begin by thanking the chairman and the ranking member for working with me and my colleague from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) to include aspects of the gentleman's Teaching Fellows Act in today's bill.

The Ready to Teach Act authorizes competitive grants to encourage development of teacher-training programs and to create highly qualified teachers. I believe that one of the most important additions that we made to this legislation is that it allows a partnership grant to be used to coordinate with community colleges to strengthen teacher-training programs.

It is estimated that North Carolina will need 80,000 new teachers over the next decade. To address this problem in my area, Appalachian State Teachers' College, it used to be, it is now Appalachian State University, which is a branch of the university and recognized as one of the best teaching colleges in the United States, Caldwell Community College and the local public schools initiated a proposal to leverage technology and integrate their resources to develop a model teacher-training program. Area residents who typically would not have had access to

the teacher prep program would have the opportunity to become highly qualified teachers through the use of distance technology. It is this kind of innovative thinking that the Ready to Teach Act aims to encourage, and I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

"Unfunded mandate" is a term and a phrase that we often hear in education. Time and time again we attempt to solve problems by demanding change while refusing to provide funds necessary for schools to make that desirable change. Loan forgiveness attracts college graduates into the field of education and encourages current teachers to continue their education. However, this does not fully address the problems of teacher quality and higher education affordability; especially we need to help title I schools.

However, the labor-HHS-education appropriations bill falls \$334 million short of the promised \$1 billion in title I funds under the No Child Left Behind Act.

Mr. Chairman, over one-fifth of our secondary school students have taken at least one class from a teacher who neither majored nor minored in that subject in college. Today our schools lack many greatly needed and highly qualified teachers; therefore, we must improve teacher training and education. H.R. 2211 attempts to promote teacher training and development by making up for some of the funding shortfalls in education. In the labor-HHS-education appropriations bill, we were promised \$3.2 billion for States to improve teacher quality; and yet, like the promise to fund title I schools, the appropriations bill falls \$244 million short. As a result, 54,000 fewer teachers will receive federally supported professional development.

H.R. 2211 attempts to make up for some of the unfunded mandates under the No Child Left Behind Act. Indeed, there are some encouraging aspects to this bill which I am in great support of. However, it still lacks greater funding, which is needed for true improvement in education that will maximize the potential of teachers and the potential of students so that, indeed, no child is left behind.

Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation, but I sure hope that before it is over we will have the money that is needed to fund the thoughts and ideas.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BURNS), a former college professor.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), and the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), and the author, my good friend, the gentleman

from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY), for their leadership in bringing this bill to the floor today.

Paine College and Savannah State University are two Historically Black Colleges and Universities in the 12th district of Georgia. Both of these institutions do a wonderful job of preparing young professionals for lives in the working world. With these two institutions and the many minority-serving institutions across this country, it is imperative that we increase opportunities for Americans of all educational, ethnic, and geographic backgrounds to become highly qualified teachers.

□ 1300

I was proud to sponsor an amendment that will allow grants to be competitively awarded to highly qualified teacher-training programs for eligible institutions. These institutions can include Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic-serving institutions, Tribally controlled colleges and universities, Alaska Native-serving institutions and Native Hawaiian-serving institutions.

I would like to especially thank my good colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) for their cosponsorship of this amendment in committee and then ultimately its successful adoption and strong bipartisan support we have received. I would also like to thank the United Negro College Fund and the Hispanic Education Coalition for the help they provided and the inspiration for this amendment that strengthened this bill.

The purposes of this provision are to increase our teacher recruitment at minority-serving institutions and to make institutional improvements to teacher-preparation programs at minority-serving institutions. Specifically, we are looking for funds here that will allow these universities and colleges to be awarded grants to produce highly qualified minority teachers. We need more strong, high-quality teachers from all backgrounds, both current and future.

I urge my colleagues to support the Ready to Teach Act. H.R. 2211 will result in more highly qualified teachers, and this will increase the academic achievement of America's students.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I commend him and the chairman and the other senior members of this subcommittee for this bipartisan legislation, which will not only help recruit and retain highly qualified teachers but also provide professional development. I certainly hope, as others have said, that the majority and the appropriators will see fit to fund this program fully, unlike the labor and education bill which, as it now stands, underfunds the No Child Left Behind by \$8 billion.



I am pleased that the committee has accepted two of my amendments in this bill. The first amendment would ensure that teacher-recruitment programs could assist people who want to make the transition into teaching from a career outside of the field of education.

The second amendment will allow school districts to form partnerships with universities and businesses. This will allow opportunities for teachers to get clinical experience and training in areas related to science, mathematics and technology, including opportunities in laboratories and businesses. I think teachers with real-world experience are more able to show applications of science to the student, which is a more inspiring way to teach.

Investing in improved math and science education in this country is directly linked to the strength of our national security. I believe if we, as a Nation, fail to make a new national commitment to science and math education, we are facilitating the gradual erosion of America's physical and economic security, and do not just take my word for it.

The United States Commission on National Security in the 21st Century headed by former Senators Gary Hart and Warren Rudman said, "The inadequacies of our systems of research and education pose a greater threat to the U.S. national security over the next quarter century than any potential conventional war that we might imagine. If we do not invest heavily and wisely in rebuilding these two core strengths, America will be incapable of maintaining its global position long into the 21st century."

Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for working with me on these amendments, and I ask my colleagues to support this bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The Chair would inform the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) that he has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Select Education.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I thank my chairman for yielding me the time and congratulate him and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) on the success in passing an education agenda beginning more than a year ago and passing the President's agenda for No Child Left Behind, at least beginning that process, and now filling in the many different pieces that are necessary to make sure that every one of our children has the opportunity to leave school well qualified and well prepared to go for higher education for a professional career.

The part of the bill that I think is most interesting here was what my colleague from Georgia just talked about.

This authorizing grants for the creation of centers of excellence at highly qualified, minority-serving institutions, such as Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Hispanic-serving institutions.

Over the last number of years, this Congress has taken an increasing interest in making sure that Historically Black Colleges and Hispanic-serving institutions get the resources they need so that they can more effectively serve those populations that have a tremendous amount of potential and that they have done such a good job at. We are reaching out to Historically Black Colleges and Universities and to Hispanic-serving institutions specifically in this bill to provide the resources, additional resources and grants, for them to build more effective teaching programs because we recognize that if we are going to address the vision that we have in mind of making sure that we leave no child left behind, that we have to develop more effective training-teacher programs specifically to reach into inner city schools; and that is what we are looking at here.

We have talked with Historically Black Colleges and Universities to try to partner with them to develop programs to reach into the inner city, to use their unique resources. This fulfills the promise. This, along with the next bill, really gets us moving in the right direction.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Michigan for yielding me the time, and also the chairman of the committee.

Both the Ready to Teach Act and the Teacher Recruitment and Retention Act try to improve teacher training and quality and retention. I congratulate the Committee on Education and the Workforce on these two bills, but both these bills fall short in one important area. They fail to correct the problem of the government pension offset, or what is called the GPO. The Committee on Education and the Workforce cannot address this major reason people are leaving the teaching profession because they do not have the jurisdiction.

In my home State of Texas, teachers are leaving the profession in droves because of the unfair GPO. This provision reduces spousal benefits by two-thirds and, in some cases, eliminates benefits altogether.

The GPO is a problem for many public servants, but especially bad for women. Eighty percent of the Texas school teachers and retirees are women. Sixty percent of that group are married. Almost all of them are eligible for Medicare through their husbands, and none of them are eligible for their spousal Social Security benefit because of the government pension offset.

After a lifetime of being underpaid as teachers, they depend on their Social

Security widow's benefit to make up for it in their retirement; but the GPO, the government pension offset, takes away that widow's benefit.

The only way some teachers can escape this unfair mentality is by working their last day in a job covered by Social Security and their retirement system. This last-day exemption is the only way teachers can get a fair retirement benefit; but this House is trying to take that away, and we debated this issue a few months back when the House voted narrowly on H.R. 743, the so-called Social Security Protection Act.

That language would eliminate the last-day exemption and cause many of my Texas teachers to lose their widow's benefits. Teachers in Texas are retiring by the busload so that they can get their benefits before the Senate acts to take them away.

This is a serious problem in Texas and other States that do not have Social Security as part of their teacher retirement system, and it is causing a serious retention problem. Debating these bills today is good, but we really need to look at why teachers are leaving the profession instead of getting into it.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Michigan for yielding me the time.

Students in this era take laptops and hand-held computers to class, but they are very often being taught by teachers who started teaching when cable television was an innovation or even when color television was an innovation.

This is a very promising bill that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) has written, that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), and the others have brought to the floor. I am happy to support it and commend all those responsible for it.

My concern is that the promise of this bill may well turn out to be another unfulfilled promise when it comes to helping teachers catch up to the new realities of the world in which they are teaching. School districts across this country already understand that reality. When they look at the requirements under the No Child Left Behind Act, they understand that by the 2005-2006 school year, every classroom must have a highly qualified teacher in that classroom. The gap between getting to that point and where we are now is a very expensive one; and if we look at the education funding bill that the House will be considering tomorrow, there is an \$8 billion difference between what is needed by school districts around our country and what is



provided by the majority in its bill to meet that need.

It does not make sense to raise standards and raise expectations and then fail to provide the funding and the money and the resources to meet those expectations. It is obvious that many of the teachers that are presently teaching around our country today are going to need sabbaticals, are going to need extra education, are going to need extra training in order to meet the new standards of being a highly qualified teacher.

I support raising those standards, but I do not support falsely raising expectations about what we are going to do for public education and then failing to meet those expectations. How are we in this predicament?

The budget forecast a few years ago said that this year for every \$100 we are going to spend to run our government, we would have \$125 worth of revenue coming in. Did not happen. Certainly the terrorist attack of 9/11 had a role in this. The recession has had a major role in this, but the two huge tax cuts enacted by the majority have also had a role in this. So, today, instead of having \$125 of revenue for every \$100 that we need to spend, we have about \$80 of revenue for every \$100 that we need to spend.

What gets cut? Environmental protection, health care, education. This is one more example of a choice the majority has made between the long-term fiscal health of the country by improving education and the short-term political gratification of enacting tax cuts.

This is the right bill. It makes a great promise, but the majority will fail to fulfill that promise because it continues to worship at the altar of irresponsible fiscal practices.

I urge support of the bill.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2211 is a good bill. As its name suggests, the Ready to Teach Act works to ensure that our children, our future, are taught by well-prepared and qualified teachers. It also supports our schools so that they are able to recruit and retain the teachers who give so much of themselves for the children of others.

We will pass this bill today; and in doing so, we all agree that the country needs the Federal Government to spend \$300 million on teacher preparation and retention; but in fact, we will not spend that much on teacher preparation and retention. The President has asked that we spend only \$90 million or 30 percent of what we today all agree is necessary. Why?

Yesterday we passed the defense spending bill that spends \$8.9 billion on a missile system which does not work; and today we will pass an education bill that, if fully funded, would work, but we will not fully fund it.

There is money for education. We could reallocate the \$8.9 billion for

missile defense and put it into education. We would have money to hire and train thousands more qualified teachers. We would have money to buy 9 million more computers for our children and schools. We would have money to fully fund and expand the Head Start program, IDEA, and the No Child Left Behind Act.

Instead, we are spending too much, \$8.9 billion, for a missile program that will not work, and we are underfunding the education account.

Mr. Chairman, as we walk in each day to vote, we walk under the canopy of the House, and there is a pediment that is supported by the pillars, and the pediment is called the "Apotheosis of Democracy," and in the middle of it right at the apex there is a woman whose arm is outextended, and her arm is protecting a child who is sitting blissfully atop a pile of books. That sculpture, which is right at the center of our experience as we come in to vote every day, is entitled "Peace Protecting Genius."

□ 1315

And the child genius is protected not with nuclear arms, but with the arms of eternal love and sitting atop a pile of books which represents knowledge.

We have to realize that our protection in this country and our security depends on education, and that it is peace which protects genius, and that it is peace which will lead us on a path towards sparing the tremendous amount of monies that are to be wasted by the Pentagon, and freeing it up so that we can put that money back into education to truly protect the future of this Nation and to enable the children of this Nation to be able to have lives that are rich, that are endowed with great education, and that lead to a world of peace.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is a bipartisan bill, and we do our best especially in the field of education when we work in a bipartisan way, and we did that in committee. There was not only civility in committee, but a great deal of enjoyment in writing this bill. This is a good start for the authorization of the remaining titles of the Higher Education Act.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), and Members on both sides of the aisle for their work. I especially want to thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY), a new member of our committee and new Member of Congress, for his authorship of the underlying bill.

We all know that one of the real keys to ensuring every child in America gets a chance at a good education is to ensure that every child has a highly qualified teacher in their classroom.

There has been much effort around the country at improving the quality of teacher preparation programs. What we try to do in the bill we have before us today is to strengthen those programs and to bring greater accountability for those programs that need a little more oversight than they are getting today.

The goal here is to take young people and others outside of the profession and put them through rigorous programs that will benefit them and their students when they are in the classroom. There are just too many programs today around the country that are doing not as well as they could in terms of preparing teachers for tomorrow.

There has been a lot of discussion here about funding, because later on today the House is expected to take up the Labor-HHS appropriation bill, which includes the funding for education. As I said earlier, 2 to 3 years ago we were spending \$28 billion a year on elementary and secondary education programs. Today we are spending \$35.7 billion per year. Most of the money to fund primary and secondary education comes from State governments, local governments, and property taxes. The Federal Government's role is focused on helping needier students have a better chance at the same kind of education than our children received.

We are doing our share. Could we be doing more? Absolutely, we could be doing more. But we are here, as I said before, to make decisions, and I do think that we are meeting our commitments under No Child Left Behind. I do again suggest to all of our Members that this is a good underlying bipartisan bill, so let us support it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, and other distinguished members, I rise today in order to speak about House Resolution 2211, a bill that shall reauthorize Title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

For our country to progress, we as representatives of the people, must adhere to the provisions of the Higher Education Act, especially in regards to the activities addressed in Title II of that document. Activities such as the disbursement of teacher quality enhancement grants for our States and grants preparing the teachers of tomorrow with the newest technology of today benefit society as a whole.

Besides maintaining the grant-given ability so crucial to the future of the United States, House Resolution 2211 would also create a new grant program for higher educational institutions that have historically served minority populations. Schools that largely cater to Native-American, African-American, and Hispanic-American student bodies will receive the funding needed to compete with our Nation's premiere universities by developing teachers that will improve the high academic standards of the United States.

In fact, I attempted to submit an amendment that would require the Secretary of Education to collect all grant repayments and redirect the funds to low-income and historically low-achieving school districts. I offered this amendment for the purpose of balancing the benefits conferred to low-income and needy

schools when exceptional students who complete teacher education programs opt to repay the amount of the scholarship awarded to assist them in completing education programs.

Additionally, teacher preparation programs will flourish under House Resolution 2211. Current law neglects to provide funding for the enhancement of institutionally based teacher preparation programs; this bill allows State and partnership grantees to use funds to strengthen and improve teacher preparation programs and will reauthorize institutions to strengthen technology instruction for teacher candidates.

We believe that the future of our youth is the future of our country; an investment in our children is an investment for America. Teachers are responsible for the development of the United States through their impact in our classrooms. It is greatly appreciated when teachers begin the process of intellectual development for our children, but there is an even greater appreciation when teachers continue working with those children throughout the years. Teachers are quite often the role models of the children who eventually go on to serve the United States through avenues of public service. House Resolution 2211 requires teachers who are part of the grant program to stay a minimum of two years, thus having a longer and more influential role in our country's future.

How will we know and how will we be able to gauge the improvement of our children, so that "not child is truly left behind?" House Resolution 2211 addresses such a topic. Under the bill, a State will require the grantees to report information regarding the extent to which substantial progress is made with the allocated funds and will also track the number of highly qualified teachers produced due to the grant program. With a statistical system able to verify the definite success, all Americans will see just how important this bill is for us.

House Resolution 2211, if passed, will last until fiscal year 2008. I am certain that the United States will see an improvement in the quality of our teachers, but more importantly, an increase in the quality of our Nation's future, the children, during that time.

This bill is a key component in a series of bills to reauthorize the Higher Education Act as we seek to meet the call of the No Child Left Behind Act, an act striving to place a highly-qualified teacher in every classroom in the United States.

Mr. Chairman and members, the United States is a great country. To continue on a path that America has been on for over two hundred years, the passage of House Resolution 2211 must be passed. When no child is left behind, as a country we can say that Congress has done its part in the development of each individual child. This is what the parents of America are asking for, and I believe we should comply with their demands.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 2211.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Ready to Teach Act. This bill takes important steps toward one of the most important goals for our Nation—filling our schools with committed, talented teachers.

The shortage of qualified teachers in our country has reached critical levels, and it has a direct impact on the quality of education, especially in underserved areas. In urban dis-

tricts, close to 50 percent of newcomers leave the profession during their first five years of teaching. This bill recognizes the importance of not only filling our schools with teachers, but providing these teachers with the resources and training that allow them to be successful and to make their students successful as well.

I want to call your attention to a school in my district, The Chicago Academy, as an example of the type of positive change that can be brought about by quality teacher preparation programs. The Chicago Academy is a joint program of Chicago Public Schools and a nonprofit organization. Academy for Urban School Leadership, which is taking groundbreaking steps to address the teacher shortage in underserved Chicago schools. The President of the Carnegie corporation called this institution "a model for our Nation."

The Chicago Academy creates a "farm team" of teachers for Chicago's underserved public schools, through a teacher residency program which involves an entire year of in classroom training, instead of the typical twelve-week student teacher segment of graduate programs in education. Each classroom of 24 students is shared by one experienced mentor teacher and two resident teachers, providing an unmatched student-teacher ratio for public schools.

In-classroom training is coupled with graduate work with faculty from National-Louis University. Residents are provided with a stipend for their participation in the program, and receive a Masters of Arts in Teaching at the completion of the year. In return, they commit to five years of service in underperforming Chicago schools.

In the Academy's first year of operation, 82 percent of students performed at or above national norms in reading—better than any other school in the neighborhood. This school is proof of the way that a quality school changes a community. Families are moving out of the suburbs and into Chicago in order to send their children to the Academy. And this effect can extend to the underserved schools that will be supplied with these committed teachers.

The first class of 30 resident teachers graduated last month. Next year, a second Academy will open, and the current school will expand to include the eighth grade. As these new teachers transition into underserved Chicago schools, the number of students served by this program increases exponentially.

The values embodied by the Chicago Academy are those reflected in this important legislation. I commend Mr. GINGREY, Chairman BOEHNER, and Ranking Member MILLER for their bipartisan work to bring this reauthorization to the floor.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2211, the Ready to Teach Act, which will strengthen teacher training programs to ensure teachers are highly-qualified and ready to teach when they enter the classroom.

Eighteen months ago the President signed the No Child Left Behind Act into law and ever since, States and school districts across the country have been answering the call. The Ready to Teach Act follows the momentum of No Child Left Behind and meets its requirement to place a highly qualified teacher in every classroom—a requirement of great import, as the value of a qualified teacher on a student's ability to learn has been proven,

over and over again. H.R. 2211 achieves this by making improvements to the Higher Education Act to help ensure teacher training programs are producing highly qualified teachers to meet the needs of America's students.

All States and nearly all teacher education programs in the country are affected by general accountability provisions in this legislation. Schools receiving Federal funds must report annually on the quality of teacher preparation, including information on the pass rates of their graduates on initial certification assessments. Higher educational institutions enrolling federally-aided students in their teacher preparation programs must report annually, detailing, among other things, the certification pass rates of graduates.

Unfortunately, this data has proven ineffective in measuring the true quality of teacher preparation programs. Current requirements have often been manipulated, leaving data skewed and often irrelevant. For example, if a student fails to pass the State certification exam, upon completion of the institution's program, the school will award them a degree in another field rather than in education. A school will only award students an education degree if that student has passed the state exam. That way, the school will always have a 100 percent pass rate. H.R. 2211 sets forth more useful information. This includes requiring a school to report on all students who have completed 50 percent of the program and requiring an average score of students rather than the pass rates.

As in current law, H.R. 2211 will continue to award State, partnership and teacher recruitment grants. In doing so, H.R. 2211 has evolved with the teaching profession and places updated requirements on these grants.

State grants will be used to increase the advancement technology in the classroom and increase the focus on rigorous academic content knowledge and scientifically based research. States will be given flexibility in identifying innovative methods for teacher preparation programs, such as charter colleges of education to provide an alternative gateway for teachers to become highly qualified.

Partnership grants allow effective partners to join together, combining strengths and resources to train highly qualified teachers and achieve success in the classroom. Among other things, partnership activities will help to ensure that teachers are able to address the needs of students with different learning styles, and receive training in methods of improving student behavior in the classroom.

Finally, teacher recruitment grants will help bring high quality individuals into teacher programs, and ultimately put more highly qualified teachers into classrooms. The Ready to Teach Act places a priority on applicants that will emphasize measures to recruit minorities into the teaching profession, providing a teaching workforce that is both highly qualified and diverse.

We are fortunate in the State of Delaware to have the University of Delaware's Elementary Teacher Education program. In many ways the University of Delaware has already begun to address the need to have a highly qualified teacher in our classrooms. They have been innovative and forward thinking always recognizing the importance of providing their students with a strong academic base as well as a practical experience.

In their freshman year at the University of Delaware, students participate in field experiences in the school setting. Freshmen have the opportunity to observe, tutor, and offer general assistance in the classroom. As sophomores and juniors, the experiences include planning, implementing, and assessing limited instructional units with small groups or an entire class. As seniors, students become engaged in an extended student teaching experience.

Technology is integrated throughout the curriculum and all students will graduate with the skills necessary to utilize technology in their instructional planning. The Elementary Teacher Education program's goal is to prepare teachers who are reflective practitioners serving a diverse community of learners as scholars, problem solvers and partners.

I am committed to ensuring No Child Left Behind is a success for America's children. The Committee and this Congress have been working since passage to ensure other laws in the education arena are aligned with No Child Left Behind. We have accomplished this with IDEA, Head Start and hopefully today with the Ready to Teach Act. I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 2211.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chairman, I believe that H.R. 2211 is a step in the right direction. It builds on the improvements made to teacher preparation programs in the 1998 amendments to the Higher Education Act and provides a much needed focus on preparing a diverse teacher corps so that America's teachers reflect the students in America's classrooms.

To improve student achievement, schools of education must graduate teacher candidates that are prepared to teach our Nation's increasingly diverse K-12 student population. About 42 percent of all public schools in the United States have no minority teachers even though minority students make up more than a third of enrollment in U.S. public schools.

Minority teachers make up just 13.5 percent of all teachers. By the early 21st century, the percentage of minority teachers is expected to shrink to an all-time low or 5 percent. While 41 percent of American students will be minorities. Furthermore, some 2.4 million teachers will be needed in the next 11 years because of teacher attrition and retirement as well as increased student enrollment.

Improving minority teacher recruitment will help our Nation meet the challenge of addressing this severe nationwide teacher shortage.

Minority-serving institutions are uniquely equipped to help us address these shortages.

The Centers of Excellence established in this legislation could provide much needed assistance so that these institutions can increase the number of highly qualified teachers they produce. However, this can only happen if the resources are made available.

Unfortunately the majority and the Administration have elected to allocate our resources elsewhere—mainly to tax breaks for the elite—the wealthiest individuals in our nation. It is my sincere hope that we will provide the funding for all of these programs that we say are critical to the education of our children.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and to make a stand for the necessary investment in education.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule, and shall be considered read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 2211

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

# **SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

*This Act may be cited as the "Ready to Teach Act of 2003".*

## **SEC. 2. TEACHER QUALITY ENHANCEMENT GRANTS.**

*Part A of title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1021 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:*

### **"PART A—TEACHER QUALITY ENHANCEMENT GRANTS FOR STATES AND PARTNERSHIPS"**

#### **"SEC. 201. PURPOSES; DEFINITIONS.**

*"(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this part are to—*

- "(1) improve student academic achievement;*
- "(2) improve the quality of the current and future teaching force by improving the preparation of prospective teachers and enhancing professional development activities;*
- "(3) hold institutions of higher education accountable for preparing highly qualified teachers; and*
- "(4) recruit qualified individuals, including minorities and individuals from other occupations, into the teaching force.*

*"(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this part:*

- "(1) ARTS AND SCIENCES.—The term 'arts and sciences' means—*
- "(A) when referring to an organizational unit of an institution of higher education, any academic unit that offers 1 or more academic majors in disciplines or content areas corresponding to the academic subject matter areas in which teachers provide instruction; and*
- "(B) when referring to a specific academic subject matter area, the disciplines or content areas in which academic majors are offered by the arts and science organizational unit.*

*"(2) EXEMPLARY TEACHER.—The term 'exemplary teacher' has the meaning given such term in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).*

*"(3) HIGHLY QUALIFIED.—The term 'highly qualified' has the meaning given such term in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).*

*"(4) HIGH-NEED LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—The term 'high-need local educational agency' means a local educational agency—*

- "(A)(i)(I) that serves not fewer than 10,000 children from families with incomes below the poverty line; or*
- "(II) with which not less than 25 percent of the children served by the agency are from families with incomes below the poverty line;*
- "(ii) that is among those serving the highest number or percentage of children from families with incomes below the poverty line in the State, but this clause applies only in a State that has no local educational agency meeting the requirements of clause (i); or*
- "(iii) with a total of less than 600 students in average daily attendance at the schools that are served by the agency and all of whose schools are designated with a school locale code of 7, as determined by the Secretary; and*
- "(B)(i) for which there is a high percentage of teachers not teaching in the academic subjects or grade levels that the teachers were trained to teach; or*
- "(ii) for which there is a high percentage of teachers with emergency, provisional, or temporary certification or licensing.*

*"(5) POVERTY LINE.—The term 'poverty line' means the poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget, and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2))) applicable to a family of the size involved.*

*"(6) PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT.—The term 'professional development' has the meaning given such term in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).*

*"(7) SCIENTIFICALLY BASED READING RESEARCH.—The term 'scientifically based reading research' has the meaning given such term in section 1208 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6368).*

*"(8) SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH.—The term 'scientifically based research' has the meaning given such term in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).*

*"(9) TEACHING SKILLS.—The term 'teaching skills' means skills that—*

*"(A) are based on scientifically based research;*

*"(B) enable teachers to effectively convey and explain subject matter content;*

*"(C) lead to increased student academic achievement; and*

*"(D) use strategies that—*

*"(i) are specific to subject matter;*

*"(ii) include ongoing assessment of student learning;*

*"(iii) focus on identification and tailoring of academic instruction to students's specific learning needs; and*

*"(iv) focus on classroom management.*

#### **"SEC. 202. STATE GRANTS.**

*"(a) IN GENERAL.—From amounts made available under section 210(1) for a fiscal year, the Secretary is authorized to award grants under this section, on a competitive basis, to eligible States to enable the eligible States to carry out the activities described in subsection (d).*

*"(b) ELIGIBLE STATE.—*

*"(1) DEFINITION.—In this part, the term 'eligible State' means—*

*"(A) the Governor of a State; or*

*"(B) in the case of a State for which the constitution or law of such State designates another individual, entity, or agency in the State to be responsible for teacher certification and preparation activity, such individual, entity, or agency.*

*"(2) CONSULTATION.—The Governor or the individual, entity, or agency designated under paragraph (1) shall consult with the Governor, State board of education, State educational agency, or State agency for higher education, as appropriate, with respect to the activities assisted under this section.*

*"(3) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to negate or supersede the legal authority under State law of any State agency, State entity, or State public official over programs that are under the jurisdiction of the agency, entity, or official.*

*"(c) APPLICATION.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an eligible State shall, at the time of the initial grant application, submit an application to the Secretary that—*

*"(1) meets the requirement of this section;*

*"(2) demonstrates that the State is in full compliance with sections 207 and 208;*

*"(3) includes a description of how the eligible State intends to use funds provided under this section;*

*"(4) includes measurable objectives for the use of the funds provided under the grant;*

*"(5) demonstrates the State has submitted and is actively implementing a plan that meets the requirements of sections 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) and 1119 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(h)(1)(C)(viii) and 6319); and*

*"(6) contains such other information and assurances as the Secretary may require.*

“(d) **USES OF FUNDS.**—An eligible State that receives a grant under this section shall use the grant funds to reform teacher preparation requirements, to coordinate with State activities under section 2113(c) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6613(c)), and to ensure that current and future teachers are highly qualified, by carrying out one or more of the following activities:

“(1) **REFORMS.**—Ensuring that all teacher preparation programs in the State are preparing teachers who are highly qualified, and are able to use advanced technology effectively in the classroom, including use for instructional techniques to improve student academic achievement, by assisting such programs—

“(A) to retrain faculty; and

“(B) to design (or redesign) teacher preparation programs so they—

“(i) are based on rigorous academic content, scientifically based research (including scientifically based reading research), and challenging State student academic content standards; and

“(ii) promote strong teaching skills.

“(2) **CERTIFICATION OR LICENSURE REQUIREMENTS.**—Reforming teacher certification (including recertification) or licensing requirements to ensure that—

“(A) teachers have the subject matter knowledge and teaching skills in the academic subjects that the teachers teach necessary to help students meet challenging State student academic achievement standards; and

“(B) such requirements are aligned with challenging State academic content standards.

“(3) **ALTERNATIVES TO TRADITIONAL TEACHER PREPARATION AND STATE CERTIFICATION.**—Providing prospective teachers with alternative routes to State certification and traditional preparation to become highly qualified teachers through—

“(A) innovative approaches that reduce unnecessary barriers to State certification while producing highly qualified teachers;

“(B) programs that provide support to teachers during their initial years in the profession; and

“(C) alternative routes to State certification of teachers for qualified individuals, including mid-career professionals from other occupations, former military personnel, and recent college graduates with records of academic distinction.

“(4) **INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS.**—Planning and implementing innovative and experimental programs to enhance the ability of institutions of higher education to prepare highly qualified teachers, such as charter colleges of education or university and local educational agency partnership schools, that—

“(A) permit flexibility in meeting State requirements as long as graduates, during their initial years in the profession, increase student academic achievement;

“(B) provide long-term data gathered from teachers' performance over multiple years in the classroom on the ability to increase student academic achievement;

“(C) ensure high-quality preparation of teachers from underrepresented groups; and

“(D) create performance measures that can be used to document the effectiveness of innovative methods for preparing highly qualified teachers.

“(5) **MERIT PAY.**—Developing, or assisting local educational agencies in developing—

“(A) merit-based performance systems that reward teachers who increase student academic achievement; and

“(B) strategies that provide differential and bonus pay in high-need local educational agencies to retain—

“(i) principals;

“(ii) highly qualified teachers who teach in high-need academic subjects, such as reading, mathematics, and science;

“(iii) highly qualified teachers who teach in schools identified for school improvement under section 1116(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6316(b));

“(iv) special education teachers;

“(v) teachers specializing in teaching limited English proficient children; and

“(vi) highly qualified teachers in urban and rural schools or districts.

“(6) **TEACHER ADVANCEMENT.**—Developing, or assisting local educational agencies in developing, teacher advancement and retention initiatives that promote professional growth and emphasize multiple career paths (such as paths to becoming a highly qualified mentor teacher or exemplary teacher) and pay differentiation.

“(7) **TEACHER REMOVAL.**—Developing and implementing effective mechanisms to ensure that local educational agencies and schools are able to remove expeditiously incompetent or unqualified teachers consistent with procedures to ensure due process for the teachers.

“(8) **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.**—Providing technical assistance to low-performing teacher preparation programs within institutions of higher education identified under section 208(a).

“(9) **TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS.**—Developing—

“(A) systems to measure the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs and professional development programs; and

“(B) strategies to document gains in student academic achievement or increases in teacher mastery of the academic subjects the teachers teach as a result of such programs.

“(10) **TEACHER RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION.**—Undertaking activities that—

“(A) develop and implement effective mechanisms to ensure that local educational agencies and schools are able effectively to recruit and retain highly qualified teachers; or

“(B) are described in section 204(d).

“(11) **PRESCHOOL TEACHERS.**—Developing strategies—

“(A) to improve the qualifications of preschool teachers, which may include State certification for such teachers; and

“(B) to improve and expand preschool teacher preparation programs.

“(e) **EVALUATION.**—

“(1) **EVALUATION SYSTEM.**—An eligible State that receives a grant under this section shall develop and utilize a system to evaluate annually the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs and professional development activities within the State in producing gains in—

“(A) the teacher's annual contribution to improving student academic achievement, as measured by State academic assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(3)); and

“(B) teacher mastery of the academic subjects they teach, as measured by pre- and post-participation tests of teacher knowledge, as appropriate.

“(2) **USE OF EVALUATION SYSTEM.**—Such evaluation system shall be used by the State to evaluate—

“(A) activities carried out using funds provided under this section; and

“(B) the quality of its teacher education programs.

“(3) **PUBLIC REPORTING.**—The State shall make the information described in paragraph (1) widely available through public means, such as posting on the Internet, distribution to the media, and distribution through public agencies.

**SEC. 203. PARTNERSHIP GRANTS.**

“(a) **GRANTS.**—From amounts made available under section 210(2) for a fiscal year, the Secretary is authorized to award grants under this section, on a competitive basis, to eligible partnerships to enable the eligible partnerships to carry out the activities described in subsections (d) and (e).

“(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—

“(1) **ELIGIBLE PARTNERSHIPS.**—In this part, the term ‘eligible partnership’ means an entity that—

“(A) shall include—

“(i) a partner institution;

“(ii) a school of arts and sciences;

“(iii) a high-need local educational agency; and

“(iv) a public or private educational organization; and

“(B) may include a Governor, State educational agency, the State board of education, the State agency for higher education, an institution of higher education not described in subparagraph (A), a public charter school, a public or private elementary school or secondary school, a public or private educational organization, a business, a science-, mathematics-, or technology-oriented entity, a faith-based or community organization, a prekindergarten program, a teacher organization, an education service agency, a consortia of local educational agencies, or a nonprofit telecommunications entity.

“(2) **PARTNER INSTITUTION.**—In this section, the term ‘partner institution’ means an institution of higher education, the teacher training program of which demonstrates that—

“(A) graduates from the teacher training program exhibit strong performance on State-determined qualifying assessments for new teachers through—

“(i) demonstrating that the graduates of the program who intend to enter the field of teaching have passed all of the applicable State qualification assessments for new teachers, which shall include an assessment of each prospective teacher's subject matter knowledge in the content area or areas in which the teacher intends to teach; or

“(ii) being ranked among the highest-performing teacher preparation programs in the State as determined by the State—

“(I) using criteria consistent with the requirements for the State report card under section 207(a); and

“(II) using the State report card on teacher preparation required under section 207(a); or

“(B) the teacher training program requires all the students of the program to participate in intensive clinical experience, to meet high academic standards, and—

“(i) in the case of secondary school candidates, to successfully complete an academic major in the subject area in which the candidate intends to teach or to demonstrate competence through a high level of performance in relevant content areas; and

“(ii) in the case of elementary school candidates, to successfully complete an academic major in the arts and sciences or to demonstrate competence through a high level of performance in core academic subject areas.

“(c) **APPLICATION.**—Each eligible partnership desiring a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may require. Each such application shall—

“(1) contain a needs assessment of all the partners with respect to teaching and learning and a description of how the partnership will coordinate with other teacher training or professional development programs, and how the activities of the partnership will be consistent with State, local, and other education reform activities that promote student academic achievement;

“(2) contain a resource assessment that describes the resources available to the partnership, the intended use of the grant funds, including a description of how the grant funds will be fairly distributed in accordance with subsection (f), and the commitment of the resources of the partnership to the activities assisted under this part, including financial support, faculty participation, time commitments, and continuation of the activities when the grant ends; and

“(3) contain a description of—

“(A) how the partnership will meet the purposes of this part;

“(B) how the partnership will carry out the activities required under subsection (d) and any permissible activities under subsection (e);

“(C) the partnership’s evaluation plan pursuant to section 206(b);

“(D) how faculty of the teacher preparation program at the partner institution will serve, over the term of the grant, with highly qualified teachers in the classrooms of the high-need local educational agency included in the partnership; and

“(E) how the partnership will ensure that teachers in private elementary and secondary schools located in the geographic areas served by an eligible partnership under this section will participate equitably in accordance with section 9501 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7881).

“(d) REQUIRED USES OF FUNDS.—An eligible partnership that receives a grant under this section shall use the grant funds to reform teacher preparation requirements, to coordinate with State activities under section 2113(c) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6613(c)), and to ensure that current and future teachers are highly qualified, by carrying out one or more of the following activities:

“(1) REFORMS.—Implementing reforms within teacher preparation programs to ensure that such programs are preparing teachers who are highly qualified, and are able to use advanced technology effectively in the classroom, including use for instructional techniques to improve student academic achievement, by—

“(A) retraining faculty; and

“(B) designing (or redesigning) teacher preparation programs so they—

“(i) are based on rigorous academic content, scientifically based research (including scientifically based reading research), and challenging State student academic content standards; and

“(ii) promote strong teaching skills.

“(2) CLINICAL EXPERIENCE AND INTERACTION.—Providing sustained and high-quality preservice and in-service clinical experience, including the mentoring of prospective teachers by exemplary teachers, substantially increasing interaction between faculty at institutions of higher education and new and experienced teachers, principals, and other administrators at elementary schools or secondary schools, and providing support for teachers, including preparation time and release time, for such interaction.

“(3) PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT.—Creating opportunities for enhanced and ongoing professional development that improves the academic content knowledge of teachers in the subject areas in which the teachers are certified to teach or in which the teachers are working toward certification to teach, and that promotes strong teaching skills.

“(4) TEACHER PREPARATION.—Developing, or assisting local educational agencies in developing, professional development activities that—

“(A) provide training in how to teach and address the needs of students with different learning styles, particularly students with disabilities, limited English proficient students, and students with special learning needs; and

“(B) provide training in methods of—

“(i) improving student behavior in the classroom; and

“(ii) identifying early and appropriate interventions to help students described in subparagraph (A) learn.

“(e) ALLOWABLE USES OF FUNDS.—An eligible partnership that receives a grant under this section may use such funds to carry out the following activities:

“(1) ALTERNATIVES TO TRADITIONAL TEACHER PREPARATION AND STATE CERTIFICATION.—Providing prospective teachers with alternative routes to State certification and traditional preparation to become highly qualified teachers through—

“(A) innovative approaches that reduce unnecessary barriers to teacher preparation while producing highly qualified teachers;

“(B) programs that provide support during a teacher’s initial years in the profession; and

“(C) alternative routes to State certification of teachers for qualified individuals, including

mid-career professionals from other occupations, former military personnel, and recent college graduates with records of academic distinction.

“(2) DISSEMINATION AND COORDINATION.—Broadly disseminating information on effective practices used by the partnership, and coordinating with the activities of the Governor, State board of education, State higher education agency, and State educational agency, as appropriate.

“(3) MANAGERIAL AND LEADERSHIP SKILLS.—Developing and implementing professional development programs for principals and superintendents that enable them to be effective school leaders and prepare all students to meet challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards.

“(4) TEACHER RECRUITMENT.—Activities—

“(A) to encourage students to become highly qualified teachers, such as extracurricular enrichment activities; and

“(B) activities described in section 204(d).

“(5) CLINICAL EXPERIENCE IN SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND TECHNOLOGY.—Creating opportunities for clinical experience and training, by participation in the business, research, and work environments with professionals, in areas relating to science, mathematics, and technology for teachers and prospective teachers, including opportunities for use of laboratory equipment, in order for the teacher to return to the classroom for at least 2 years and provide instruction that will raise student academic achievement.

“(6) COORDINATION WITH COMMUNITY COLLEGES.—Coordinating with community colleges to implement teacher preparation programs, including through distance learning, for the purposes of allowing prospective teachers—

“(A) to attain a bachelor’s degree and State certification or licensure; and

“(B) to become highly qualified teachers.

“(f) SPECIAL RULE.—At least 50 percent of the funds made available to an eligible partnership under this section shall be used directly to benefit the high-need local educational agency included in the partnership. Any entity described in subsection (b)(1)(A) may be the fiscal agent under this section.

“(g) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit an eligible partnership from using grant funds to coordinate with the activities of more than one Governor, State board of education, State educational agency, local educational agency, or State agency for higher education.

#### “SEC. 204. TEACHER RECRUITMENT GRANTS.

“(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—From amounts made available under section 210(3) for a fiscal year, the Secretary is authorized to award grants, on a competitive basis, to eligible applicants to enable the eligible applicants to carry out activities described in subsection (d).

“(b) ELIGIBLE APPLICANT DEFINED.—In this part, the term ‘eligible applicant’ means—

“(1) an eligible State described in section 202(b); or

“(2) an eligible partnership described in section 203(b).

“(c) APPLICATION.—Any eligible applicant desiring to receive a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such form, and containing such information as the Secretary may require, including—

“(1) a description of the assessment that the eligible applicant, and the other entities with whom the eligible applicant will carry out the grant activities, have undertaken to determine the most critical needs of the participating high-need local educational agencies;

“(2) a description of the activities the eligible applicant will carry out with the grant, including the extent to which the applicant will use funds to recruit minority students to become highly qualified teachers; and

“(3) a description of the eligible applicant’s plan for continuing the activities carried out with the grant, once Federal funding ceases.

“(d) USES OF FUNDS.—Each eligible applicant receiving a grant under this section shall use the grant funds—

“(1)(A) to award scholarships to help students, such as individuals who have been accepted for their first year, or who are enrolled in their first or second year, of a program of undergraduate education at an institution of higher education, pay the costs of tuition, room, board, and other expenses of completing a teacher preparation program;

“(B) to provide support services, if needed to enable scholarship recipients—

“(i) to complete postsecondary education programs; or

“(ii) to transition from a career outside of the field of education into a teaching career; and

“(C) for followup services provided to former scholarship recipients during the recipients first 3 years of teaching; or

“(2) to develop and implement effective mechanisms to ensure that high-need local educational agencies and schools are able effectively to recruit highly qualified teachers.

“(e) ADDITIONAL DISCRETIONARY USES OF FUNDS.—In addition to the uses described in subsection (d), each eligible applicant receiving a grant under this section may use the grant funds to develop and implement effective mechanisms to recruit into the teaching profession employees from—

“(1) high-demand industries, including technology industries; and

“(2) the fields of science, mathematics, and engineering.

“(f) SERVICE REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish such requirements as the Secretary determines necessary to ensure that recipients of scholarships under this section who complete teacher education programs—

“(A) subsequently teach in a high-need local educational agency for a period of time equivalent to—

“(i) one year; increased by

“(ii) the period for which the recipient received scholarship assistance; or

“(B) repay the amount of the scholarship.

“(2) USE OF REPAYMENTS.—The Secretary shall use any such repayments to carry out additional activities under this section.

“(g) PRIORITY.—The Secretary shall give priority under this section to eligible applicants who provide an assurance that they will recruit a high percentage of minority students to become highly qualified teachers.

#### “SEC. 205. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

“(a) DURATION; ONE-TIME AWARDS; PAYMENTS.—

“(1) DURATION.—

“(A) ELIGIBLE STATES AND ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS.—Grants awarded to eligible States and eligible applicants under this part shall be awarded for a period not to exceed 3 years.

“(B) ELIGIBLE PARTNERSHIPS.—Grants awarded to eligible partnerships under this part shall be awarded for a period of 5 years.

“(2) ONE-TIME AWARD.—An eligible partnership may receive a grant under each of sections 203 and 204, as amended by the Ready to Teach Act of 2003, only once.

“(3) PAYMENTS.—The Secretary shall make annual payments of grant funds awarded under this part.

“(b) PEER REVIEW.—

“(1) PANEL.—The Secretary shall provide the applications submitted under this part to a peer review panel for evaluation. With respect to each application, the peer review panel shall initially recommend the application for funding or for disapproval.

“(2) PRIORITY.—In recommending applications to the Secretary for funding under this part, the panel shall—

“(A) with respect to grants under section 202, give priority to eligible States serving States that—

“(i) have initiatives to reform State teacher certification requirements that are based on rigorous academic content, scientifically based research, including scientifically based reading research, and challenging State student academic content standards;

“(ii) include innovative reforms to hold institutions of higher education with teacher preparation programs accountable for preparing teachers who are highly qualified and have strong teaching skills; or

“(iii) involve the development of innovative efforts aimed at reducing the shortage of highly qualified teachers in high poverty urban and rural areas; and

“(B) with respect to grants under section 203—

“(i) give priority to applications from broad-based eligible partnerships that involve businesses and community organizations; and

“(ii) take into consideration—

“(I) providing an equitable geographic distribution of the grants throughout the United States; and

“(II) the potential of the proposed activities for creating improvement and positive change.

“(3) SECRETARIAL SELECTION.—The Secretary shall determine, based on the peer review process, which application shall receive funding and the amounts of the grants. In determining grant amounts, the Secretary shall take into account the total amount of funds available for all grants under this part and the types of activities proposed to be carried out.

“(c) MATCHING REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) STATE GRANTS.—Each eligible State receiving a grant under section 202 or 204 shall provide, from non-Federal sources, an amount equal to 50 percent of the amount of the grant (in cash or in kind) to carry out the activities supported by the grant.

“(2) PARTNERSHIP GRANTS.—Each eligible partnership receiving a grant under section 203 or 204 shall provide, from non-Federal sources (in cash or in kind), an amount equal to 25 percent of the grant for the first year of the grant, 35 percent of the grant for the second year of the grant, and 50 percent of the grant for each succeeding year of the grant.

“(d) LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—An eligible State or eligible partnership that receives a grant under this part may not use more than 2 percent of the grant funds for purposes of administering the grant.

#### “SEC. 206. ACCOUNTABILITY AND EVALUATION.

“(a) STATE GRANT ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT.—An eligible State that receives a grant under section 202 shall submit an annual accountability report to the Secretary, the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate, and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives. Such report shall include a description of the degree to which the eligible State, in using funds provided under such section, has made substantial progress in meeting the following goals:

“(1) PERCENTAGE OF HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS.—Increasing the percentage of highly qualified teachers in the State as required by section 1119 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6319).

“(2) STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT.—Increasing student academic achievement for all students as defined by the eligible State.

“(3) RAISING STANDARDS.—Raising the State academic standards required to enter the teaching profession as a highly qualified teacher.

“(4) INITIAL CERTIFICATION OR LICENSURE.—Increasing success in the pass rate for initial State teacher certification or licensure, or increasing the numbers of qualified individuals being certified or licensed as teachers through alternative programs.

“(5) DECREASING TEACHER SHORTAGES.—Decreasing shortages of highly qualified teachers in poor urban and rural areas.

“(6) INCREASING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT.—Increasing opportunities for enhanced and ongoing professional development that—

“(A) improves the academic content knowledge of teachers in the subject areas in which the teachers are certified or licensed to teach or in which the teachers are working toward certification or licensure to teach; and

“(B) promotes strong teaching skills.

“(7) TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION.—Increasing the number of teachers prepared effectively to integrate technology into curricula and instruction and who use technology to collect, manage, and analyze data to improve teaching, learning, and decisionmaking for the purpose of increasing student academic achievement.

“(b) ELIGIBLE PARTNERSHIP EVALUATION.—Each eligible partnership receiving a grant under section 203 shall establish, and include in the application submitted under section 203(c), an evaluation plan that includes strong performance objectives. The plan shall include objectives and measures for—

“(1) increased student achievement for all students as measured by the partnership;

“(2) increased teacher retention in the first 3 years of a teacher's career;

“(3) increased success in the pass rate for initial State certification or licensure of teachers;

“(4) increased percentage of highly qualified teachers; and

“(5) increasing the number of teachers trained effectively to integrate technology into curricula and instruction and who use technology to collect, manage, and analyze data to improve teaching, learning, and decisionmaking for the purpose of improving student academic achievement.

“(c) REVOCATION OF GRANT.—

“(1) REPORT.—Each eligible State or eligible partnership receiving a grant under section 202 or 203 shall report annually on the progress of the eligible State or eligible partnership toward meeting the purposes of this part and the goals, objectives, and measures described in subsections (a) and (b).

“(2) REVOCATION.—

“(A) ELIGIBLE STATES AND ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS.—If the Secretary determines that an eligible State or eligible applicant is not making substantial progress in meeting the purposes, goals, objectives, and measures, as appropriate, by the end of the second year of a grant under this part, then the grant payment shall not be made for the third year of the grant.

“(B) ELIGIBLE PARTNERSHIPS.—If the Secretary determines that an eligible partnership is not making substantial progress in meeting the purposes, goals, objectives, and measures, as appropriate, by the end of the third year of a grant under this part, then the grant payments shall not be made for any succeeding year of the grant.

“(d) EVALUATION AND DISSEMINATION.—The Secretary shall evaluate the activities funded under this part and report annually the Secretary's findings regarding the activities to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives. The Secretary shall broadly disseminate successful practices developed by eligible States and eligible partnerships under this part, and shall broadly disseminate information regarding such practices that were found to be ineffective.

#### “SEC. 207. ACCOUNTABILITY FOR PROGRAMS THAT PREPARE TEACHERS.

“(a) STATE REPORT CARD ON THE QUALITY OF TEACHER PREPARATION.—Each State that receives funds under this Act shall provide to the Secretary annually, in a uniform and comprehensible manner that conforms with the definitions and methods established by the Secretary, a State report card on the quality of teacher preparation in the State, both for traditional certification or licensure programs and

for alternative certification or licensure programs, which shall include at least the following:

“(1) A description of the teacher certification and licensure assessments, and any other certification and licensure requirements, used by the State.

“(2) The standards and criteria that prospective teachers must meet in order to attain initial teacher certification or licensure and to be certified or licensed to teach particular subjects or in particular grades within the State.

“(3) A description of the extent to which the assessments and requirements described in paragraph (1) are aligned with the State's standards and assessments for students.

“(4) The percentage of students who have completed at least 50 percent of the requirements for a teacher preparation program at an institution of higher education or alternative certification program and who have taken and passed each of the assessments used by the State for teacher certification and licensure, and the passing score on each assessment that determines whether a candidate has passed that assessment.

“(5) The percentage of students who have completed at least 50 percent of the requirements for a teacher preparation program at an institution of higher education or alternative certification program and who have taken and passed each of the assessments used by the State for teacher certification and licensure, disaggregated and ranked, by the teacher preparation program in that State from which the teacher candidate received the candidate's most recent degree, which shall be made available widely and publicly.

“(6) A description of each State's alternative routes to teacher certification, if any, and the number and percentage of teachers certified through each alternative certification route who pass State teacher certification or licensure assessments.

“(7) For each State, a description of proposed criteria for assessing the performance of teacher preparation programs in the State, including indicators of teacher candidate skills and academic content knowledge and evidence of gains in student academic achievement.

“(8) For each teacher preparation program in the State, the number of students in the program, the average number of hours of supervised practice teaching required for those in the program, and the number of full-time equivalent faculty and students in supervised practice teaching.

“(b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY ON THE QUALITY OF TEACHER PREPARATION.—

“(1) REPORT CARD.—The Secretary shall provide to Congress, and publish and make widely available, a report card on teacher qualifications and preparation in the United States, including all the information reported in paragraphs (1) through (8) of subsection (a). Such report shall identify States for which eligible States and eligible partnerships received a grant under this part. Such report shall be so provided, published and made available annually.

“(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall report to Congress—

“(A) a comparison of States' efforts to improve teaching quality; and

“(B) regarding the national mean and median scores on any standardized test that is used in more than 1 State for teacher certification or licensure.

“(3) SPECIAL RULE.—In the case of programs with fewer than 10 students who have completed at least 50 percent of the requirements for a teacher preparation program taking any single initial teacher certification or licensure assessment during an academic year, the Secretary shall collect and publish information with respect to an average pass rate on State certification or licensure assessments taken over a 3-year period.



“(c) COORDINATION.—The Secretary, to the extent practicable, shall coordinate the information collected and published under this part among States for individuals who took State teacher certification or licensure assessments in a State other than the State in which the individual received the individual's most recent degree.

“(d) INSTITUTION AND PROGRAM REPORT CARDS ON QUALITY OF TEACHER PREPARATION.—

“(1) REPORT CARD.—Each institution of higher education or alternative certification program that conducts a teacher preparation program that enrolls students receiving Federal assistance under this Act shall report annually to the State and the general public, in a uniform and comprehensible manner that conforms with the definitions and methods established by the Secretary, both for traditional certification or licensure programs and for alternative certification or licensure programs, the following information:

“(A) PASS RATE.—(i) For the most recent year for which the information is available, the pass rate of each student who has completed at least 50 percent of the requirements for the teacher preparation program on the teacher certification or licensure assessments of the State in which the institution is located, but only for those students who took those assessments within 3 years of receiving a degree from the institution or completing the program.

“(ii) A comparison of the institution or program's pass rate for students who have completed at least 50 percent of the requirements for the teacher preparation program with the average pass rate for institutions and programs in the State.

“(iii) A comparison of the institution or program's average raw score for students who have completed at least 50 percent of the requirements for the teacher preparation program with the average raw scores for institutions and programs in the State.

“(iv) In the case of programs with fewer than 10 students who have completed at least 50 percent of the requirements for a teacher preparation program taking any single initial teacher certification or licensure assessment during an academic year, the institution shall collect and publish information with respect to an average pass rate on State certification or licensure assessments taken over a 3-year period.

“(B) PROGRAM INFORMATION.—The number of students in the program, the average number of hours of supervised practice teaching required for those in the program, and the number of full-time equivalent faculty and students in supervised practice teaching.

“(C) STATEMENT.—In States that require approval or accreditation of teacher education programs, a statement of whether the institution's program is so approved or accredited, and by whom.

“(D) DESIGNATION AS LOW-PERFORMING.—Whether the program has been designated as low-performing by the State under section 208(a).

“(2) REQUIREMENT.—The information described in paragraph (1) shall be reported through publications such as school catalogs and promotional materials sent to potential applicants, secondary school guidance counselors, and prospective employers of the institution's program graduates, including materials sent by electronic means.

“(3) FINES.—In addition to the actions authorized in section 487(c), the Secretary may impose a fine not to exceed \$25,000 on an institution of higher education for failure to provide the information described in this subsection in a timely or accurate manner.

“(e) DATA QUALITY.—Either—

“(1) the Governor of the State; or

“(2) in the case of a State for which the constitution or law of such State designates another individual, entity, or agency in the State to be responsible for teacher certification and prepa-

ration activity, such individual, entity, or agency;

shall attest annually, in writing, as to the reliability, validity, integrity, and accuracy of the data submitted pursuant to this section.

#### “SEC. 208. STATE FUNCTIONS.

“(a) STATE ASSESSMENT.—In order to receive funds under this Act, a State shall have in place a procedure to identify and assist, through the provision of technical assistance, low-performing programs of teacher preparation within institutions of higher education. Such State shall provide the Secretary an annual list of such low-performing institutions that includes an identification of those institutions at risk of being placed on such list. Such levels of performance shall be determined solely by the State and may include criteria based upon information collected pursuant to this part. Such assessment shall be described in the report under section 207(a).

“(b) TERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY.—Any institution of higher education that offers a program of teacher preparation in which the State has withdrawn the State's approval or terminated the State's financial support due to the low performance of the institution's teacher preparation program based upon the State assessment described in subsection (a)—

“(1) shall be ineligible for any funding for professional development activities awarded by the Department of Education; and

“(2) shall not be permitted to accept or enroll any student who receives aid under title IV of this Act in the institution's teacher preparation program.

#### “SEC. 209. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

“(a) METHODS.—In complying with sections 207 and 208, the Secretary shall ensure that States and institutions of higher education use fair and equitable methods in reporting and that the reporting methods do not allow identification of individuals.

“(b) SPECIAL RULE.—For each State in which there are no State certification or licensure assessments, or for States that do not set minimum performance levels on those assessments—

“(1) the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, collect data comparable to the data required under this part from States, local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, or other entities that administer such assessments to teachers or prospective teachers; and

“(2) notwithstanding any other provision of this part, the Secretary shall use such data to carry out requirements of this part related to assessments or pass rates.

“(c) LIMITATIONS.—

“(1) FEDERAL CONTROL PROHIBITED.—Nothing in this part shall be construed to permit, allow, encourage, or authorize any Federal control over any aspect of any private, religious, or home school, whether or not a home school is treated as a private school or home school under State law. This section shall not be construed to prohibit private, religious, or home schools from participation in programs or services under this part.

“(2) NO CHANGE IN STATE CONTROL ENCOURAGED OR REQUIRED.—Nothing in this part shall be construed to encourage or require any change in a State's treatment of any private, religious, or home school, whether or not a home school is treated as a private school or home school under State law.

“(3) NATIONAL SYSTEM OF TEACHER CERTIFICATION PROHIBITED.—Nothing in this part shall be construed to permit, allow, encourage, or authorize the Secretary to establish or support any national system of teacher certification.

#### “SEC. 210. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this part \$300,000,000 for fiscal year 2004 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years, of which—

“(1) 45 percent shall be available for each fiscal year to award grants under section 202;

“(2) 45 percent shall be available for each fiscal year to award grants under section 203; and

“(3) 10 percent shall be available for each fiscal year to award grants under section 204.”.

#### SEC. 3. PREPARING TOMORROW'S TEACHERS TO USE TECHNOLOGY.

(a) ELIGIBILITY.—Section 222(a)(3)(D) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1042(a)(3)(D)) is amended by inserting “non-profit telecommunications entity,” after “community-based organization.”.

(b) PERMISSIBLE USES OF FUNDS.—Section 223(b)(1)(E) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1043(b)(1)(E)) is amended to read as follows:

“(E) To use technology to collect, manage, and analyze data to improve teaching, learning, and decisionmaking for the purpose of increasing student academic achievement.”.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 224 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1044) is amended by striking “each of fiscal years 2002 and 2003.” and inserting “fiscal year 2004 and each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years.”.

#### SEC. 4. CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE.

Title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1021 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

##### “PART C—CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE

#### “SEC. 231. PURPOSES; DEFINITIONS.

“(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this part are—

“(1) to help recruit and prepare teachers, including minority teachers, to meet the national demand for a highly qualified teacher in every classroom; and

“(2) to increase opportunities for Americans of all educational, ethnic, class, and geographic backgrounds to become highly qualified teachers.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this part:

“(1) ELIGIBLE INSTITUTION.—The term ‘eligible institution’ means—

“(A) an institution of higher education that has a teacher preparation program that meets the requirements of section 203(b)(2) and that is—

“(i) a part B institution (as defined in section 322);

“(ii) a Hispanic-serving institution (as defined in section 502);

“(iii) a Tribal College or University (as defined in section 316);

“(iv) an Alaska Native-serving institution (as defined in section 317(b)); or

“(v) a Native Hawaiian-serving institution (as defined in section 317(b));

“(B) a consortium of institutions described in subparagraph (A); or

“(C) an institution described in subparagraph (A), or a consortium described in subparagraph (B), in partnership with any other institution of higher education, but only if the center of excellence established under section 232 is located at an institution described in subparagraph (A).

“(2) HIGHLY QUALIFIED.—The term ‘highly qualified’ has the meaning given such term in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

“(3) SCIENTIFICALLY BASED READING RESEARCH.—The term ‘scientifically based reading research’ has the meaning given such term in section 1208 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6368).

“(4) SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH.—The term ‘scientifically based research’ has the meaning given such term in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

#### “SEC. 232. CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE.

“(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—From the amounts appropriated to carry out this part, the Secretary is authorized to award competitive grants to eligible institutions to establish centers of excellence.



“(b) *USE OF FUNDS.*—Grants provided by the Secretary under this part shall be used to ensure that current and future teachers are highly qualified, by carrying out one or more of the following activities:

“(1) Implementing reforms within teacher preparation programs to ensure that such programs are preparing teachers who are highly qualified and are able to use advanced technology effectively in the classroom, including use for instructional techniques to improve student academic achievement, by—

“(A) retraining faculty; and

“(B) designing (or redesigning) teacher preparation programs that—

“(i) prepare teachers to close student achievement gaps, are based on rigorous academic content, scientifically based research (including scientifically based reading research), and challenging State student academic content standards; and

“(ii) promote strong teaching skills.

“(2) Providing sustained and high-quality preservice clinical experience, including the mentoring of prospective teachers by exemplary teachers, substantially increasing interaction between faculty at institutions of higher education and new and experienced teachers, principals, and other administrators at elementary schools or secondary schools, and providing support, including preparation time, for such interaction.

“(3) Developing and implementing initiatives to promote retention of highly qualified teachers and principals, including minority teachers and principals, including programs that provide—

“(A) teacher mentoring from exemplary teachers or principals; or

“(B) induction and support for teachers and principals during their first 3 years of employment as teachers or principals, respectively.

“(4) Awarding scholarships based on financial need to help students pay the costs of tuition, room, board, and other expenses of completing a teacher preparation program.

“(5) Disseminating information on effective practices for teacher preparation and successful teacher certification test preparation strategies.

“(6) Activities authorized under sections 202, 203, and 204.

“(c) *APPLICATION.*—Any eligible institution desiring a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary at such a time, in such a manner, and accompanied by such information the Secretary may require.

“(d) *MINIMUM GRANT AMOUNT.*—The minimum amount of each grant under this part shall be \$500,000.

“(e) *LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.*—An eligible institution that receives a grant under this part may not use more than 2 percent of the grant funds for purposes of administering the grant.

“(f) *REGULATIONS.*—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this part.

**“SEC. 233. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

“There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this part \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2004 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years.”.

#### **SEC. 5. TRANSITION.**

The Secretary of Education shall take such actions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate to provide for the orderly implementation of this Act.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. No amendment to the committee amendment is in order except those printed in House Report 108-190. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent

and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 108-190.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GINGREY

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to the rule, I offer amendment No. 1.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. GINGREY: Page 6, line 25, strike “(1)” and insert “(1)(B)”.

Page 7, beginning on line 11, strike “shall, at the time of the initial grant application, submit” and insert “shall submit”.

Page 8, line 15, after “qualified,” insert “are able to understand scientifically based research and its applicability.”.

Page 9, line 10, after “teach,” insert “that are”.

Page 10, line 7, strike “and experimental”.

Page 18, line 4, strike “fairly distributed” and insert “used”.

Page 18, line 9, strike “and”.

Page 18, line 25, strike “teachers” and insert “teachers, principals, and superintendents”.

Page 19, line 5, strike the period at the end and insert “; and”.

Page 19, after line 5, insert the following:

“(4) contain a certification from the high-need local educational agency included in the partnership that it has reviewed the application and determined that the grant proposed will comply with subsection (f).

Page 19, line 17, after “qualified,” insert “are able to understand scientifically based research and its applicability.”.

Page 24, after line 2, insert the following:

“(h) *SUPPLEMENT, NOT SUPPLANT.*—Funds made available under this section shall be used to supplement, and not supplant, other Federal, State, and local funds that would otherwise be expended to carry out the purposes of this section.

Page 28, beginning on line 19, strike “serving States”.

Page 29, line 3, strike “include” and insert “have”.

Page 29, line 8, strike “involve the development of” and insert “have”.

Page 32, line 22, strike “receiving” and insert “applying for”.

Page 33, beginning on line 3, insert “,” after “students”.

Page 36, strike lines 10 through 20 and insert the following:

“(5) For students who have completed at least 50 percent of the requirements for a teacher preparation program at an institution of higher education or alternative certification program, and who have taken and passed each of the assessments used by the State for teacher certification and licensure, each such institution's and each such program's average raw score, ranked by teacher preparation program, which shall be made available widely and publicly.

Page 48, line 19, strike “qualified” and insert “qualified, are able to understand scientifically based research.”.

Page 49, line 21, after “teacher” insert “or principal”.

Page 50, line 7, strike “test” and insert “and licensure assessment”.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 310, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The manager's amendment to H.R. 2211, the Ready to Teach Act of 2003, makes refinements to the bill as reported by the Committee on Education and the Workforce on June 10, 2003. This has been a bipartisan bill every step of the way, and I believe it will enjoy broad support among my colleagues in the House. I will not take a great deal of time to describe the amendment in detail since it was drafted in consultation with our Democratic Member, and it contains mostly technical and clarifying changes as recommended by the Department of Education.

However, Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a moment to point out a few of the changes of this proposed amendment. As currently drafted, H.R. 2211 authorizes grants to design or redesign teacher preparation programs that are based on rigorous academic content, scientifically based research, and challenging State student academic content standards. This amendment adds language to ensure that teachers in these programs are able to understand the scientifically based research and how to apply that in their classrooms.

Under H.R. 2211, each partnership that applies for a grant must include at least a high-quality teacher preparation program at an institution of higher education; second, a school of arts and sciences; third, a high-need local education agency; and, finally, a public or private educational organization. In addition, this legislation requires that at least 50 percent of partnership grant funds be used to “directly benefit” partner local education agencies. This provision in the amendment is designed to ensure that each partner local education agency has the ability to influence grant activities, and guarantees that partnership activities focus on the needs of teachers and students in the classroom.

My amendment adds a provision to the bill to require that partnership grant applications contain a certification from the partner local educational agencies stating that they will “directly benefit” from the proposed grant activities. This amendment ensures that the partnership grant funds are used only to supplement, not to supplant, other Federal, State, and local funds that would otherwise be used for teacher preparation activities.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, my amendment ensures that teacher preparation program average raw score data that is reported to the State is also included in the State report card on quality of teacher preparation.

This amendment makes common-sense, noncontroversial changes to the legislation, and I ask for my colleagues' support. Support it because it improves the quality of the programs authorized under Title II of the Higher Education Act.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to oppose this amendment. This amendment makes, indeed, important technical and clarifying changes to the bill, and I urge its support.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and, pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) will be postponed.

The text of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 108-190.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD), I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. KILDEE:  
Page 18, strike line 23.  
Page 19, line 5, strike the period at the end and insert a semicolon.

Page 19, after line 5, insert the following:  
“(F) how the partnership will design and implement a clinical program component that includes close supervision of student teachers by faculty of the teacher preparation program at the partner institution and mentor teachers;

“(G) how the partnership will design and implement an induction program to support all new teachers through the first 3 years of teaching that includes mentors who are trained and compensated by the partnership for their work with new teachers; and

“(H) how the partnership will collect, analyze, and use data on the retention of all teachers in schools located in the geographic areas served by the partnership to evaluate the effectiveness of its teacher support system.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 310, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment would expand the bill to allow clinical and mentoring

programs as part of the teacher preparation. I believe this amendment is a good addition to the bill, and I would urge its passage.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, although I do not oppose the amendment, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we have worked with the minority on this amendment, we support it, and I ask that the membership also support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 108-190.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. HONDA

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. HONDA:  
Page 23, insert after line 15 the following:  
“(7) TEACHER MENTORING.—Establishing or implementing a teacher mentoring program that—

“(A) includes minimum qualifications for mentors;

“(B) provides training and stipends for mentors;

“(C) provides mentoring programs for teachers in their first 3 years of teaching;

“(D) provides regular and ongoing opportunities for mentors and mentees to observe each other's teaching methods in classroom settings during the school day;

“(E) establishes an evaluation and accountability plan for activities conducted under this paragraph that includes rigorous objectives to measure the impact of such activities; and

“(F) provides for a report to the Secretary on an annual basis regarding the partnership's progress in meeting the objectives described in subparagraph (E).

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 310, the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by thanking the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), and the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), for their leadership in crafting this legislation and the support for this noncontroversial bipartisan amendment.

I would also like to give a special thanks to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) for working with us on this amendment.

This amendment, based on legislation I introduced earlier this year, the Teacher Mentoring Act, would permit the use of grant funds to be used for teacher mentoring programs and is supported by the American Federation of Teachers.

As a former teacher and principal, I can attest to the critical role teacher mentoring programs play in preparing and retaining teachers for the many challenges they will face. Teacher retention rates remain a critical problem for our Nation's schools.

According to the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, nearly a quarter of new teachers quit by the end of their second year, and almost half leave within 5 years. This revolving-door phenomenon is particularly problematic in high-poverty schools, where the turnover rate is almost one-third higher than the national average. Teachers who leave the profession often point to support programs for beginning teachers as a key to increasing retention rates.

One critical source of support can be found through teacher mentoring programs that will pair new teachers with experienced educators serving as mentors. A large majority of school districts today have enacted teacher mentoring programs that have proven successful in retaining teachers. In fact, teachers without mentoring programs have been shown to leave the profession at a rate almost 70 percent higher than those with mentoring programs.

My amendment, Mr. Chairman, will help provide the necessary resources for these essential programs, and I urge all Members to support this bipartisan amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, although I do not oppose the amendment, I ask unanimous consent at this time to claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, was drafted in consultation with the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and we support it. It does include minimum qualifications for mentors, provides training and stipends for mentors, provides mentoring programs for teachers in their first 3 years of teaching, and provides regular and ongoing opportunities for mentors and mentees to observe each other's teaching methods in classroom settings during the school day.

I served for 9 years on a school board before I came here, and we had a mentoring program there which was very beneficial. I think this is a strong amendment to the bill, improves the

bill, and I would ask the support of our colleagues for this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1330

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 108-190.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA), I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. KILDEE:

Page 23, after line 15, insert the following:

“(7) COMPUTER SOFTWARE FOR MULTILINGUAL EDUCATION.—Training teachers to use computer software for multilingual education to address the needs of limited English proficient students.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 310, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will expand the bill to allow teachers to retrain using computer software for bilingual education. I believe this amendment is a good addition to the bill and urge its passage.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment was also written with the committee, has the support of the committee, and I believe will be very beneficial to those multilingual children who need this special help; and I urge support for the amendment.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment that will help address a growing problem in our Nation today. My amendment asks for more funding for teachers so that they can be trained to address the needs of students who are of limited English, or speak English as a second language.

In our school systems, the faces that fill our classrooms are diverse. No longer are our students simply Anglo, English-speaking, American born children. Rather, they are children from many different races and cultural backgrounds, speaking many different languages.

But sadly, our teachers are not given the proper tools or training they need to address this growing diversity.

Our teachers are left to their own devices to try to communicate with a classroom of children who do not speak the same language as the instructor. Because we do not give teachers the resources to teach students with limited English skills, many students are being left behind all across this nation. Students with limited English skills are more likely to drop out of school.

We need to build their self-esteem and confidence; otherwise they are more likely to get involved with drugs and alcohol. They are more likely to commit crimes. We need trained teachers who are able to reach out to students with limited English skills and stop them from dropping out of school. Every child deserves an education! Every child deserves to be taught! Every child deserves the access to opportunity!

Education opens the door for opportunity, but for many children with limited English, the doors will always remain shut if they do not learn to read, speak, and write in English!

The need for qualified teachers who can teach students with limited English skills exists not only in states with large immigrant populations like California, Florida, and Texas, but it exists all across the United States! That is why funding to train teachers properly is so crucial!

Georgia, North Carolina, Indiana, Oregon, New Hampshire, and Missouri all reported an increase of over 40 percent in students with limited English! This is not merely a problem in California; it is a problem all over this country! And we cannot ignore it any longer!

Hispanics represent over 14 percent of the total population. It isn't fair to the teachers and it isn't fair to the students if we don't train them! That is why, even here in the Capital, many Congressional members are taking Spanish classes to learn the language and the ability to communicate to their new diverse constituents. School districts are suffering due to a lack of teachers properly trained in teaching English as a Second Language!

In North Carolina there are only 900 qualified teachers for 53,000 students with limited English! In Wisconsin, schools districts that may have had only 8 students with limited English now have as many as 65 today. In Idaho, almost 18,000 limited English students are enrolled in their public school system but research indicates that nearly 40 percent will drop out by the 10th grade!

The fact is that immigrants exist, they are increasingly settling in rural communities not accustomed to immigrants, and are sending their kids to schools that do not know how to educate these children. Our country is a nation of new faces who need and deserve an education.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and help the countless school districts throughout our nation who need our help.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 108-190.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. MEEKS OF NEW YORK

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. MEEKS of New York:

Page 26, strike lines 8 through 17 and insert the following:

“(e) ADDITIONAL DISCRETIONARY USES OF FUNDS.—In addition to the uses described in subsection (d), each eligible applicant receiving a grant under this section may use the grant funds—

“(1) to develop and implement effective mechanisms to recruit into the teaching profession employees from—

“(A) high-demand industries, including technology industries; and

“(B) the fields of science, mathematics, and engineering; and

“(2) to conduct outreach and coordinate with inner city and rural secondary schools to encourage students to pursue teaching as a career.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 310, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I come before this body to offer an amendment to today's Ready to Teach Act. As we here in Congress continue to discuss year in and year out the education of our children, this Nation's future, I am pleased to offer an amendment that I feel will have a large impact not only on the diversity of schools today but also on the future academic achievement of our students.

My amendment proposes to encourage partnerships between educational entities and inner city and rural secondary schools. This partnership will be funded by allowable uses of funds, which will fund outreach and coordinate efforts that encourage inner city and rural youth to pursue teaching as a career.

The need for such collaboration is evident to both educational researchers and anyone who simply walks into nearly any public school in the Nation. Research shows that our educational system must increase its efforts to encourage a higher proportion of students of color and males into the postsecondary pipeline. Too often, students leak out of the college pipeline between their 9th and 12th grade years because they do not consider themselves college material.

My amendment helps prevent that from occurring. By forming partnerships between educational entities and secondary schools, an opportunity is created to identify those secondary students who find teaching attractive

and encourage them to remain focused on their studies.

Not only does my amendment encourage teaching as a career, but it also encourages diversity. Obviously, a teacher's effectiveness depends, first and foremost, on his or her skills and high expectations; yet we also know that students benefit in important ways by having some teachers who look differently or some who look like them, who share similar cultural experiences, who come from similar neighborhoods, and who serve as role models demonstrating that education and achievement are things to be respected. It is important to expose children to a diverse teaching staff and to diverse role models within each of our schools. Where we have a rural or inner city school with teachers unlike the students, we are giving students a stunted educational experience.

Mr. Chairman, as schools are redoubling their commitment to raising standards and closing achievement gaps, we need to seize every opportunity to boost the achievement of inner city and rural students.

This amendment provides us with an opportunity not only to change the demographics of the teacher workforce, but also to encourage students to continue their pursuit of an education and to reveal to them the nature of the work of teaching.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce for their cooperation in allowing me to offer this amendment, and I request the support of all my colleagues as we seek to provide more educational opportunities to all our children.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition to this amendment, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment was also drafted in consultation with the Committee on Education and the Workforce. We feel it makes the bill stronger. We strongly support it, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GINGREY

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 108-190 offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 416, noes 4, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 339]

AYES—416

Abercrombie	Crowley	Hobson
Ackerman	Cubin	Hoefel
Aderholt	Culberson	Hoekstra
Akin	Cummings	Holden
Alexander	Davis (AL)	Holt
Allen	Davis (CA)	Honda
Andrews	Davis (FL)	Hooley (OR)
Baca	Davis (IL)	Hostettler
Bachus	Davis (TN)	Houghton
Baird	Davis, Jo Ann	Hoyer
Baker	Davis, Tom	Hulshof
Baldwin	Deal (GA)	Hunter
Ballance	DeFazio	Hyde
Ballenger	DeGette	Inslee
Barrett (SC)	Delahunt	Isakson
Bartlett (MD)	DeLauro	Israel
Barton (TX)	DeLay	Issa
Bass	DeMint	Istook
Beauprez	Deutsch	Jackson (IL)
Becerra	Diaz-Balart, L.	Jackson-Lee
Bell	Diaz-Balart, M.	(TX)
Bereuter	Dicks	Jefferson
Berkley	Dingell	Jenkins
Berman	Doggett	John
Berry	Dooley (CA)	Johnson (CT)
Biggert	Doolittle	Johnson (IL)
Bilirakis	Doyle	Johnson, E. B.
Bishop (GA)	Dreier	Johnson, Sam
Bishop (NY)	Duncan	Jones (NC)
Bishop (UT)	Dunn	Jones (OH)
Blackburn	Ehlers	Kanjorski
Blumenauer	Emanuel	Kaptur
Blunt	Emerson	Keller
Boehlert	Engel	Kelly
Boehner	English	Kennedy (MN)
Bonilla	Eshoo	Kennedy (RI)
Bonner	Etheridge	Kildee
Bono	Evans	Kilpatrick
Boozman	Everett	Kind
Boswell	Farr	King (IA)
Boucher	Fattah	King (NY)
Boyd	Feeney	Kingston
Bradley (NH)	Ferguson	Kirk
Brady (PA)	Filner	Klecza
Brady (TX)	Fletcher	Kline
Brown (OH)	Foley	Knollenberg
Brown (SC)	Forbes	Kolbe
Brown, Corrine	Ford	Kucinich
Brown-Waite,	Fossella	LaHood
Ginny	Franks (AZ)	Lampson
Burgess	Frelinghuysen	Langvin
Burns	Frost	Lantos
Burr	Gallegly	Larsen (WA)
Burton (IN)	Garrett (NJ)	Larson (CT)
Buyer	Gerlach	Latham
Calvert	Gilchrest	LaTourette
Camp	Gillmor	Leach
Cannon	Gingrey	Lee
Cantor	Gonzalez	Levin
Capito	Goode	Lewis (CA)
Capps	Goodlatte	Lewis (GA)
Capuano	Gordon	Lewis (KY)
Cardin	Granger	Linder
Cardoza	Graves	Lipinski
Carson (IN)	Green (TX)	LoBiondo
Carson (OK)	Green (WI)	Lofgren
Carter	Greenwood	Lowe
Case	Grijalva	Lucas (KY)
Castle	Gutierrez	Lucas (OK)
Chabot	Gutknecht	Lynch
Chocola	Hall	Majette
Clay	Harris	Maloney
Clyburn	Hart	Manzullo
Coble	Hastings (WA)	Markey
Cole	Hayes	Marshall
Collins	Hayworth	Matheson
Conyers	Hefley	Matsui
Cooper	Hensarling	McCarthy (MO)
Costello	Herger	McCarthy (NY)
Cox	Hill	McCollum
Crane	Hinchey	McCotter
Crenshaw	Hinojosa	McCrery

McDermott  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Menendez  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Mollohan  
Moore  
Moran (KS)  
Murphy  
Murtha  
Mushgrave  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Nethercutt  
Neugebauer  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nunes  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Osborne  
Ose  
Otter  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter

Portman  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Renzi  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Rodriguez  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Ryun (KS)  
Sanchez, Linda  
T. Sanchez, Loretta  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Saxton  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrock  
Scott (VA)  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Shadeegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sherman  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simmons  
Simpson  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder

Solis  
Souder  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Strickland  
Stupak  
Sullivan  
Sweeney  
Tancredo  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Terry  
Thomas  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Toomey  
Towns  
Turner (OH)  
Turner (TX)  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velazquez  
Visclosky  
Vitter  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Wexler  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

NOES—4

Flake  
Frank (MA)

Paul  
Sabo

NOT VOTING—14

Cramer  
Cunningham  
Edwards  
Gephardt  
Gibbons  
Goss

Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Janklow  
Millender  
McDonald  
Moran (VA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. QUINN) (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1358

Mr. SABO changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mrs. CUBIN changed her vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, on roll-call No. 339, the Gingrey amendment to H.R. 2211, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

(Mr. ABERCROMBIE asked and was given permission to speak out of order for 1 minute.)

## CASTING OF VOTES

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I know it is the intention of the Chairman and leadership to expedite the casting of votes. I have risen on the floor in the past speaking on behalf of those, particularly in the Longworth Building, to request that we make some attempt either by way of signage, blinking lights sufficient to be able to attract attention. I am not sure of the precise manner, but it is virtually impossible during these months when we are being visited with the number of people that are in the buildings, particularly in Longworth, to make use of those elevators to get here in a timely fashion.

No Member wants to try to tell members of the public to get off elevators or not to come in. They make inquiries and so on, as they should. It is simply unfair to them. We have got to figure out a way to make at least one elevator eligible for exclusive use by the Members during the time in which a vote is taking place.

□ 1400

Simply to ring the bells and then expect people to know what that means, let alone to be able to follow up on it during the 15- or 16- or 17-minute period, is impossible.

I guarantee you, you are going to have people, as has happened recently and almost happened again today, that are going to miss votes and be upset about it, unless we are able to figure out some way to figure out the logistics associated with that.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I think if you look at the historical context in which Members were allowed to vote, if you go back to the earliest House building, the Cannon Building, you will find that they went to the extreme position of having two sets of buttons, one with which the elevators operate exclusively when Members are to vote.

Clearly, in today's kind of relationship with people who visit, we do not want to impose our desire to move around the Capitol at our pleasure. But during the vote period, it seems to me that either we have people on the elevators, or we use modern technology to allow us to utilize those elevators.

Historically, they had people on them and separate buttons. You are just asking for a fair shot to get to the floor to cast your vote. I do not think that is unreasonable at all.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman, most especially because I like to be supportive of him as much as possible.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The gentleman from Alaska controls the time, or Hawaii.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. It is a common mistake, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Hawaii, who looks like he is from Alaska.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, both the gentleman from Alaska and myself are shy and retiring types, and so it is often the case that we are mistaken for one another.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I yield to the gentleman, who has been working very hard to resolve this issue and for whom I have great respect as a result.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out just a couple of things. One, we have worked on this situation before. People are touchy politically I know about having someone on the elevators. In fact, there was a vote on this floor a few years ago where somebody thought it would save their election by trying to throw these people off. The bottom line is you need people on there to help. We have had some shortages. Let us not have a vote to do that kind of thing again.

The second thing is that the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) and I have been looking at this, and also the elevator repair, because people were stuck on elevators. We never again want that mixture of Members on the elevators.

Finally, let me just say that there is an appropriation in 2004. If we can get that moved up a little bit, we can get that sped up. The gentlemen are both correct.

In closing, I promise the gentleman, I will bring the plan personally to him and visit him in Anchorage.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. There being no other amendments, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. QUINN, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2211) to reauthorize title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965, pursuant to House Resolution 310, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 404, noes 17, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 340]

## AYES—404

Abercrombie	Costello	Hastings (WA)
Ackerman	Cox	Hayes
Aderholt	Crane	Hayworth
Akin	Crenshaw	Hensarling
Alexander	Crowley	Herger
Allen	Cubin	Hill
Andrews	Culberson	Hinche
Baca	Cummings	Hinojosa
Bachus	Cunningham	Hobson
Baird	Davis (AL)	Hoefel
Baker	Davis (CA)	Hoekstra
Baldwin	Davis (FL)	Holden
Ballance	Davis (IL)	Holt
Ballenger	Davis (TN)	Honda
Barrett (SC)	Davis, Jo Ann	Hooley (OR)
Barton (TX)	Davis, Tom	Hostettler
Bass	Deal (GA)	Houghton
Beauprez	DeFazio	Hoyer
Becerra	DeGette	Hulshof
Bell	Delahunt	Hunter
Bereuter	DeLauro	Hyde
Berkley	DeLay	Inslee
Berman	DeMint	Isakson
Berry	Deutsch	Israel
Biggart	Diaz-Balart, L.	Issa
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart, M.	Istook
Bishop (GA)	Dicks	Jackson (IL)
Bishop (NY)	Dingell	Jackson-Lee
Blackburn	Doggett	(TX)
Blumenauer	Dooley (CA)	Jefferson
Blunt	Doolittle	Jenkins
Boehlert	Doyle	John
Boehner	Dreier	Johnson (CT)
Bonilla	Duncan	Johnson (IL)
Bonner	Dunn	Johnson, E. B.
Bono	Ehlers	Johnson, Sam
Boozman	Emanuel	Jones (OH)
Boswell	Emerson	Kanjorski
Boucher	Engel	Kaptur
Boyd	English	Keller
Bradley (NH)	Eshoo	Kelly
Brady (PA)	Etheridge	Kennedy (MN)
Brady (TX)	Evans	Kennedy (RI)
Brown (OH)	Everett	Kildee
Brown (SC)	Farr	Kilpatrick
Brown, Corrine	Fattah	Kind
Brown-Waite,	Feeney	King (NY)
Ginny	Ferguson	Kirk
Burgess	Filner	Klecza
Burns	Fletcher	Kline
Burr	Foley	Knollenberg
Burton (IN)	Forbes	Kolbe
Buyer	Ford	Kucinich
Calvert	Fossella	LaHood
Camp	Frank (MA)	Lampson
Cannon	Frelinghuysen	Langevin
Cantor	Frost	Lantos
Capito	Gallegly	Larsen (WA)
Capps	Garrett (NJ)	Larson (CT)
Capuano	Gerlach	Latham
Cardin	Gillmor	LaTourrette
Cardoza	Gingrey	Leach
Carson (IN)	Gonzalez	Lee
Carson (OK)	Goode	Levin
Carter	Goodlatte	Lewis (CA)
Case	Gordon	Lewis (GA)
Castle	Granger	Lewis (KY)
Chabot	Graves	Linder
Chocola	Green (TX)	Lipinski
Clay	Green (WI)	LoBiondo
Clyburn	Greenwood	Lofgren
Coble	Grijalva	Lowe
Cole	Gutierrez	Lucas (KY)
Collins	Hall	Lucas (OK)
Conyers	Harris	Lynch
Cooper	Hart	Majette

Maloney	Peterson (PA)	Slaughter
Markey	Petri	Smith (MI)
Marshall	Pitts	Smith (NJ)
Matheson	Platts	Smith (TX)
Matsui	Pombo	Smith (WA)
McCarthy (MO)	Pomeroy	Snyder
McCarthy (NY)	Porter	Solis
McCollum	Portman	Souder
McCotter	Price (NC)	Spratt
McCrery	Pryce (OH)	Stark
McDermott	Putnam	Stearns
McGovern	Quinn	Stenholm
McHugh	Radanovich	Strickland
McInnis	Rahall	Stupak
McIntyre	Ramstad	Sullivan
McKeon	Rangel	Sweeney
McNulty	Regula	Tanner
Meehan	Rehberg	Tauscher
Meek (FL)	Renzi	Tauzin
Meeks (NY)	Reyes	Taylor (MS)
Menendez	Reynolds	Terry
Mica	Rodriguez	Thomas
Michaud	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (CA)
Miller (FL)	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (MS)
Miller (MI)	Rogers (MI)	Thornberry
Miller (NC)	Ros-Lehtinen	Tiahrt
Miller, Gary	Ross	Tiberi
Miller, George	Rothman	Tierney
Mollohan	Roybal-Allard	Turner (OH)
Moore	Royce	Turner (TX)
Moran (KS)	Ruppersberger	Udall (CO)
Murphy	Rush	Udall (NM)
Murtha	Ryan (OH)	Upton
Musgrave	Ryan (WI)	Van Hollen
Myrick	Ryun (KS)	Velazquez
Nadler	Sabo	Visclosky
Napolitano	Sanchez, Linda	Vitter
Neal (MA)	T.	Walden (OR)
Nethercutt	Sanchez, Loretta	Walsh
Neugebauer	Sanders	Wamp
Ney	Sandlin	Waters
Northup	Saxton	Watson
Norwood	Schakowsky	Watt
Nunes	Schiff	Waxman
Nussle	Schrock	Weiner
Oberstar	Scott (GA)	Weldon (FL)
Obey	Scott (VA)	Weldon (PA)
Olver	Sensenbrenner	Weller
Ortiz	Serrano	Wexler
Osborne	Sessions	Whitfield
Ose	Shadegg	Wicker
Oxley	Shaw	Wilson (NM)
Pallone	Shays	Wilson (SC)
Pascarell	Sherman	Wolf
Pastor	Sherwood	Woolsey
Payne	Shimkus	Wu
Pearce	Shuster	Wynn
Pelosi	Simmons	Young (AK)
Pence	Simpson	Young (FL)
Peterson (MN)	Skelton	

## NOES—17

Bartlett (MD)	Hefley	Paul
Bishop (UT)	Jones (NC)	Rohrabacher
Flake	King (IA)	Tancredo
Franks (AZ)	Kingston	Taylor (NC)
Gilchrest	Manzullo	Toomey
Gutknecht	Otter	

## NOT VOTING—13

Cramer	Harman	Moran (VA)
Edwards	Hastings (FL)	Owens
Gephardt	Janklow	Pickering
Gibbons	Millender	Towns
Goss	McDonald	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) (during the vote). Two minutes remain to vote.

□ 1424

Mr. ROHRBACHER changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 339 and 340, I was unavoidably

absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye".

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2211.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

## AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2211, READY TO TEACH ACT OF 2003

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 2211, the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections and conforming changes to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

## TEACHER RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION ACT OF 2003

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 309, I call up the bill (H.R. 438) to increase the amount of student loans that may be forgiven for teachers in mathematics, science, and special education, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 309, the bill is considered read for amendment.

The text of H.R. 438 is as follows:

H.R. 438

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Teacher Recruitment and Retention Act of 2003".

## SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL QUALIFIED LOAN AMOUNTS.

(a) FFEL LOANS.—Section 428J(c) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1078-10(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS FOR TEACHERS IN MATHEMATICS, SCIENCE, OR SPECIAL EDUCATION.—Notwithstanding the amount specified in paragraph (1), the aggregate amount that the Secretary shall repay under this section shall not be more than \$17,500 in the case of—

"(A) a secondary school teacher—

"(i) who meets the requirements of subsection (b); and

"(ii) whose qualifying employment for purposes of such subsection is teaching mathematics or science; and

"(B) an elementary or secondary school teacher—

"(i) who meets the requirements of subsection (b), other than paragraphs (1)(B) and (C);

"(ii) whose qualifying employment for purposes of such subsection is teaching special education; and

"(iii) who, as certified by the chief administrative officer of the public or nonprofit private elementary or secondary school in which the borrower is employed, is teaching children with disabilities that correspond with the borrower's training and has demonstrated knowledge and teaching skills in the content areas of the elementary or secondary school curriculum that the borrower is teaching."

(b) DIRECT LOANS.—Section 460(c) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087j(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS FOR TEACHERS IN MATHEMATICS, SCIENCE, OR SPECIAL EDUCATION.—Notwithstanding the amount specified in paragraph (1), the aggregate amount that the Secretary shall repay under this section shall not be more than \$17,500 in the case of—

"(A) a secondary school teacher—

"(i) who meets the requirements of subsection (b)(1); and

"(ii) whose qualifying employment for purposes of such subsection is teaching mathematics or science; and

"(B) an elementary or secondary school teacher—

"(i) who meets the requirements of subsection (b)(1), other than subparagraphs (A)(ii) and (iii);

"(ii) whose qualifying employment for purposes of such subsection is teaching special education; and

"(iii) who, as certified by the chief administrative officer of the public or nonprofit private elementary or secondary school in which the borrower is employed, is teaching children with disabilities that correspond with the borrower's training and has demonstrated knowledge and teaching skills in the content areas of the elementary or secondary school curriculum that the borrower is teaching."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill is adopted.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 438

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Teacher Recruitment and Retention Act of 2003".

## SEC. 2. INCREASED QUALIFIED LOAN AMOUNTS.

(a) FFEL LOANS.—Section 428J(c) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1078-10(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) INCREASED AMOUNTS FOR TEACHERS IN MATHEMATICS, SCIENCE, OR SPECIAL EDUCATION.—

"(A) SERVICE QUALIFYING FOR INCREASED AMOUNTS.—Notwithstanding the amount specified in paragraph (1), the aggregate amount that the Secretary shall repay under this section shall not be more than \$17,500 in the case of—

"(i) a secondary school teacher—

"(I) who meets the requirements of subsection (b), subject to subparagraph (D) of this paragraph; and

"(II) whose qualifying employment for purposes of such subsection has been teaching mathematics or science on a full-time basis; and

"(ii) an elementary or secondary school teacher—

"(I) who meets the requirements of subsection (b), subject to subparagraph (D) of this paragraph;

"(II) whose qualifying employment for purposes of such subsection has been as a special education teacher whose primary responsibility is to provide special education to children with