

lead to Republican cuts to services like Medicare, health research, and school funding.

How much is \$310 billion?

That is five times what we spend on services to our veterans. We have over 21 million Americans who have served in uniform who are veterans of this country.

That \$310 billion is three times what the Federal Government invests in education, job training, and social services for an entire year. It is over 10 times what we spend annually on medical research to come up with the innovations and the lifesaving treatments that Americans rely upon.

We hear from our colleagues on the Republican side that they are fiscally responsible, that they are fiscal hawks, but they pass these severe budgets that would cut schools, that would cut medical research, that would cut Medicare funding for our seniors, that would cut Social Security, but they have to do it because we have to get rid of that deficit.

Here we have the fiscal pretenders.

In this bill, H.R. 4438, our Republican colleagues propose to blow the deficit wide open by adding \$310 billion to that deficit by passing these unpaid-for tax breaks. Yet when it is time to make the tough choices, when it comes to providing the services that our middle class families want for their children to go to college, they can't do it. But there is a free pass for these corporate tax breaks.

What American citizen and taxpayer would trust this Republican math from our colleagues?

I urge colleagues to vote against this budget-busting legislation and turn our focus to building an economy that works for all Americans, not just a select few.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I would just say the gentleman from California voted three times to extend the R&D tax credit unoffset for a length of time of 8 years.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 4438 is postponed.

ESTABLISHING SELECT COMMITTEE ON BENGHAZI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 567) providing for the Establishment of the Select Committee on the Events Surrounding the 2012 Terrorist Attack in Benghazi, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 186, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 209]

YEAS—232

Aderholt	Graves (MO)	Peterson
Amash	Griffin (AR)	Petri
Amodei	Griffith (VA)	Pittenger
Bachus	Grimm	Pitts
Barber	Guthrie	Poe (TX)
Barletta	Hall	Pompeo
Barr	Hanna	Posey
Barrow (GA)	Harper	Price (GA)
Barton	Harris	Rahall
Benishek	Hartzler	Reichert
Bentivolio	Hastings (WA)	Renacci
Bilirakis	Heck (NV)	Ribble
Bishop (UT)	Hensarling	Rice (SC)
Black	Herrera Beutler	Rigell
Blackburn	Holding	Roby
Boehner	Hudson	Roe (TN)
Boustany	Huelskamp	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (KY)
Bridenstine	Hultgren	Rogers (MI)
Brooks (AL)	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Brooks (IN)	Hurt	Rokita
Brown (GA)	Issa	Rooney
Buchanan	Jenkins	Ros-Lehtinen
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Byrne	Jolly	Rothfus
Calvert	Jones	Royce
Camp	Jordan	Runyan
Campbell	Joyce	Ryan (WI)
Cantor	Kelly (PA)	Salmon
Capito	King (IA)	Sanford
Carter	King (NY)	Scalise
Cassidy	Kinzing (IL)	Schock
Chabot	Kline	Schweikert
Chaffetz	Labrador	Scott, Austin
Coffman	LaMalfa	Sensenbrenner
Cole	Lamborn	Sessions
Collins (GA)	Lance	Shimkus
Collins (NY)	Lankford	Shuster
Conaway	Latham	Simpson
Cook	Latta	Sinema
Cotton	LoBiondo	Smith (MO)
Cramer	Long	Smith (NE)
Crenshaw	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Culberson	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)
Daines	Lummis	Southerland
Davis, Rodney	Marchant	Stewart
Denham	Marino	Stivers
Dent	Massie	Stockman
DeSantis	McCarthy (CA)	Stutzman
DesJarlais	McCaul	Terry
Diaz-Balart	McClintock	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (SC)	McHenry	Thornberry
Duncan (TN)	McIntyre	Tiberi
Ellmers	McKeon	Tipton
Farenthold	McKinley	Turner
Fincher	McMorris	Upton
Fitzpatrick	Rodgers	Valadao
Fleischmann	Meadows	Wagner
Fleming	Meehan	Walberg
Flores	Messer	Walden
Forbes	Mica	Walorski
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Weber (TX)
Foxx	Miller (MI)	Webster (FL)
Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary	Wenstrup
Frelinghuysen	Mullin	Westmoreland
Gardner	Mulvaney	Whitfield
Garrett	Murphy (FL)	Williams
Gerlach	Murphy (PA)	Wilson (SC)
Gibbs	Neugebauer	Wittman
Gibson	Noem	Wolf
Gingrey (GA)	Nugent	Womack
Gohmert	Nunes	Woodall
Goodlatte	Olson	Yoder
Gosar	Palazzo	Yoho
Gowdy	Paulsen	Young (AK)
Granger	Pearce	Young (IN)
Graves (GA)	Perry	

NAYS—186

Bass	Carney	Costa
Beatty	Carson (IN)	Courtney
Becerra	Cartwright	Crowley
Bera (CA)	Castor (FL)	Cuellar
Bishop (NY)	Castro (TX)	Cummings
Blumenauer	Chu	Davis (CA)
Bonamici	Cicilline	Davis, Danny
Brady (PA)	Clark (MA)	DeFazio
Braley (IA)	Clarke (NY)	Delaney
Brown (FL)	Clay	DeLauro
Brownley (CA)	Cleaver	DelBene
Bustos	Clyburn	Deutch
Butterfield	Cohen	Dingell
Capps	Connolly	Doggett
Capuano	Conyers	Doyle
Cardenas	Cooper	Duckworth

Edwards	Larson (CT)	Price (NC)
Ellison	Lee (CA)	Quigley
Engel	Levin	Rangel
Enyart	Lewis	Richmond
Eshoo	Lipinski	Roybal-Allard
Esty	Loebach	Ruiz
Farr	Lofgren	Ruppersberger
Fattah	Lowenthal	Ryan (OH)
Foster	Lowey	Sánchez, Linda
Frankel (FL)	Lujan Grisham	T.
Fudge	(NM)	Sanchez, Loretta
Gabbard	Luján, Ben Ray	Sarbanes
Gallego	(NM)	Schakowsky
Garamendi	Lynch	Schiff
Garcia	Maffei	Schneider
Grayson	Maloney,	Schrader
Green, Al	Carolyn	Scott (VA)
Green, Gene	Maloney, Sean	Serrano
Grijalva	Matheson	Sewell (AL)
Gutiérrez	Matsui	Shea-Porter
Hahn	McCarthy (NY)	Sherman
Hanabusa	McCollum	Sires
Hastings (FL)	McDermott	Slaughter
Heck (WA)	McGovern	Smith (WA)
Higgins	McNerney	Speier
Himes	Meeks	Swalwell (CA)
Hinojosa	Meng	Takano
Holt	Michaud	Thompson (CA)
Honda	Miller, George	Thompson (MS)
Horsford	Moore	Tierney
Hoyer	Moran	Titus
Huffman	Nadler	Tonko
Israel	Napolitano	Tsongas
Jackson Lee	Neal	Van Hollen
Jeffries	Negrete McLeod	Vargas
Johnson (GA)	Nolan	Veasey
Johnson, E. B.	O'Rourke	Vela
Kaptur	Owens	Velázquez
Keating	Pallone	Visclosky
Kelly (IL)	Pascarell	Walz
Kennedy	Pastor (AZ)	Wasserman
Kildee	Payne	Schultz
Kilmer	Perlmutter	Waters
Kind	Peters (CA)	Waxman
Kirkpatrick	Peters (MI)	Welch
Kuster	Pingree (ME)	Wilson (FL)
Langevin	Pocan	Yarmuth
Larsen (WA)	Polis	

NOT VOTING—14

Bachmann	Duffy	Reed
Bishop (GA)	Kingston	Rush
Coble	McAllister	Schwartz
Crawford	Nunnelee	Scott, David
DeGette	Pelosi	

□ 1829

Mr. BLUMENAUER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

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.

MODIFICATION OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that H. Res. 567 be modified in the manner I have placed at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification offered by Mr. SESSIONS of Texas:

Page 6, line 3, strike "clause (2)" and insert "clause 2".

Page 6, line 6, strike "clause (2)" and insert "clause 2".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the modification is agreed to.

There was no objection.

AMERICAN RESEARCH AND COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 4438 will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When proceedings were postponed earlier today, 28¾ minutes of debate remained on the bill.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 19¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 9 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. CAMP. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our distinguished whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a great deal of sadness. We are punting. USA Today said, "House action on tax extenders forfeits credibility on deficits and national debt." They are right.

The distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, who is my friend, offered a real bill on tax reform. The problem with that real bill was it had tough choices to make. Congratulations to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) for having the courage to suggest those tough choices.

This vote today requires absolutely no courage at all. It gives the ice cream and says forget about the spinach. It is the reason that we have trillions of dollars in debt today on our national debt, because we didn't pay for the '01 or '03 tax cuts.

Now, Mr. CAMP will tell me that I voted for R&D tax cuts six times that were temporary, that were annual, that were not a permanent change in the base. That is what the Republicans want to do. That is what they did in '01 and '03, and that is all inside jargon. And yes, they didn't waive statutory PAYGO, which we passed, which USA Today says was one of the reasons we got to balance 4 years in a row. That is why.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman from Maryland an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I have 3 minutes to discuss with the American public why their country is going to be put deeper into debt by passing this legislation.

It would be good legislation if it were paid for. It was good legislation when it was included in Mr. CAMP's overall tax reform bill. But it is very bad policy and very bad legislation in this unpaid-for, discreet form. And, by the way, there is about another \$160 billion of debt to follow.

What a sad day for America. What a sad day for this House. What a sad day for the Ways and Means Committee. What a sad day for fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues not to vote for the temporary political benefit of saying you gave somebody a tax cut, but vote for fiscal responsibility. Vote to keep on a path of a big deal to solve the fiscal challenges that confront our country. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Well, I would just say that the gentleman from Maryland is correct. He has voted six times to extend the research and development tax credit without paying for it, for a total of 14 years.

Look, I think it is time we are honest with the American people. If we are going to extend these policies again and again and again—in this case, 30 years—and not pay for it, look, we shouldn't have to raise taxes to keep taxes the same.

So, again, I would urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), a distinguished member of our committee, to put it mildly.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill because I didn't think it was honest with the American people, and the chairman says he wants to be honest. I am just surprised that he is responding to this, because I don't think too many people believe this is on the level.

The Senate has spoken on this issue. This is not going to become law. It is not Benghazi. It is not affordable care. So I would think that this has to be something else that we are preparing for in 2014. And I really don't think that the American people are going to go to sleep tonight wondering whether or not we take this billion-dollar bill—even though all of us love the concept of research and development. But so many people are going to be going to sleep hungry. They haven't got extended unemployment insurance. They need a variety of affordable housing. And now we are doing this for 2014. It doesn't fly. It doesn't get off the ground.

Well, what I am saying to the chairman is that he has such a great start with the tax reform, something that we could have worked on together, to pick out one good thing that we have, even though we don't have money to pay for it, is an ideal thing for Democrats and Republicans to sit down and wonder, "How can we make certain that America stays ahead in research and development?" but to do this because we are running out of things to try to embarrass Democrats on is really not fair to our Nation. I really think our national security is being impacted because of our inability to work and get something done.

So I oppose this, as any other thing that is just trying to find something to embarrass us, but I do hope for 2014 that we find something, anything—immigration, unemployment compensation—so that when we do get there there will be a Republican Party.

I really love Democrats. But this used to be the party of Dixiecrats. Now they left us, and I want to make certain that they don't come back.

Mr. CAMP. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a most distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, this bill represents only the first of many installments of hundreds of billions of dollars that the Republicans plan to finance with more debt, borrowing from the Chinese or whoever will lend it to us. Surely we don't need any more research this afternoon to know that such an irresponsible approach is the wrong way to go.

In January of last year, Republicans came to this floor and they told us that they had reserved H.R. 1 for a bill that would do it all. It was going to simplify the Tax Code, it was going to lower the rates, and it would not add a penny to the debt because it would all be financed by closing loopholes.

Where is that bill? It is still reserved, and it will be reserved until the end of this term because the truth of the matter is Republicans could not stand up to the special interests that like those loopholes, that like the complexity of the Tax Code, that benefit from that complexity. They would not stand up to pass a bill that was fiscally responsible.

Both parties, as the chairman has indicated, have repeatedly supported temporary extensions, but neither has had the audacity to come to this floor and say we are going to borrow enough to make it permanent without closing a single loophole. They are doing exactly the opposite of what they have repeatedly promised us and the American people that they would do.

I support a permanent research and development credit to incentivize research for new products. It has never been a question of whether to support research, but how to do it and how to pay for it. And if the only goal is to encourage more job growth, there are ways we can redesign this credit to get even more growth than it does now.

The Government Accountability Office said the credit in its current form is a windfall for some corporations, and some multinationals have used it as a way to get the taxpayer to subsidize research here and then shift the benefits overseas.

I believe a better research credit on a permanent basis is the best way to encourage growth, not an irresponsible unpaid tax credit.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee and the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I was touring a hospital in the Rio Grande Valley the other day, and we were going through the critical care unit, with young babies 25, 26 weeks old who in past years would, frankly, have never survived. But

today, because of medical breakthroughs, they will not only not have a lifetime of chronic diseases and disabilities, but they will live a full life because the medical breakthroughs and innovations developed here in America are giving them a life, frankly, their parents never hoped for.

I see our veterans coming back from war, some of them with such terrible injuries, who not only are having their lives restored but, through these remarkable prosthetics, are living full lives that, again, wouldn't have been possible in recent years, even, because we are doing innovation here in America.

Each day, we read of another U.S. company being courted to move those medical breakthroughs and that research overseas to other countries, to China, to Europe, to others. We are seeing America lose our edge in innovation, even though everyone knows—Republicans and Democrats—that the country that innovates the most will lead the world in economic growth, period. We know it.

And I look at statements such as this. And I will read this. It is a direct quote:

I believe it is critical that our tax system provide strong incentives to help our manufacturing base. One of the most important tax incentives for the manufacturing sector is the research and development tax credit. Manufacturers do about 70 percent of the private sector R&D conducted in the United States. I have long been a strong and persistent voice for making the R&D credit a permanent part of our Tax Code and strengthening it so that all companies have a strong incentive to do R&D here in the United States.

□ 1845

That wasn't me; that wasn't Chairman CAMP. That was our distinguished ranking member, SANDY LEVIN.

He is not alone. Democrats and Republicans together long have sought a permanent R&D tax credit to make America competitive again. Make no mistake. Today, you have heard people say this really isn't about supporting innovation, technology, biosciences and medical breakthroughs; today, it is about fiscal responsibility and pay-fors; yesterday, it was some other bills we wanted. The truth is that we can't afford these excuses, and that is what they are.

Today, it is a clear choice between those who will stand for medical innovation in America, technology innovation in America, and energy innovation and manufacturing innovation that will create good-paying jobs and good-paying wages for Americans.

I ask our Democrat colleagues to set aside the politics. We know it is an election year. Set that aside. Stay consistent with the values that you have said over and over again that the research and development tax credit needs to be made permanent, and let's send a bill to the Senate so that they, too—we can discover and learn whether they are willing to stand with their

past, longtime statements that the R&D tax credit should be permanent.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I support R&D. Mr. Speaker, I support it now. I have never voted to make it permanent without paying for it. So this bill is a dangerous dodge.

Mr. CAMP, you paid for what you suggested was permanent, and I salute your being forthright. That isn't what is happening, is not happening today. So this isn't only fiscally irresponsible. What it does is to threaten programs that we care about. What was not done with one hand yesterday, automatic cuts, will be done by the Republicans with the other. They will use this deficit to cut programs we care about mentioned earlier: medical research, Head Start, Pell Grants, and other extenders that we deeply care about.

This bill today is, as I said, a dangerous dodge. We should not be party to it. We should not be party to it. It is irresponsible, it is hypocritical, and it is harmful to what we really care about and what the American people care about.

I urge a "no" vote on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the research and development tax credit has been extended repeatedly by members of the other side and members of this side for nearly 30 years, and it has not been paid for in those extensions.

But what does that really mean? Well, what we have done in America, which no other country has done, is we have taken a valuable tax policy like that, something that should be certain and dependable, and made it temporary. Not only do we make it temporary, we allow it to expire for a year at a time. So over this 30-year period, employers, innovators, businesses, and companies have not known whether they can count on this policy in order to do something really important.

I heard Mr. BRADY talk about the medical innovation and how critical that is to making peoples' lives better. I think of Big Rapids, Michigan, and Wolverine Worldwide, which makes military footwear and boots. They are constantly innovating that so that our military servicemen and -women have the best possible equipment on their feet. You can imagine the kinds of climates that we find our military in and how important this is.

But if companies like that don't know whether this tax policy is dependable, yet we extend it 30 years backwards retroactively and forward for a year, then we allow it to expire for a year, it absolutely makes no sense. By allowing it to expire repeatedly, we have called into question whether this R&D credit is available at all.

I would just say by supporting permanent policies—the reason it is so important to make this permanent, we

can actually promote certainty for American businesses, and we need to generate certainly greater economic growth. The reason we are seeing the worst recovery since the Depression, 0.1 percent economic growth, none of us should be satisfied with that, and I don't think any of us are. We can generate more growth by making these things permanent. So we need to wake up to the reality and start offering some concrete solutions that really strengthen the economy and help hard-working taxpayers.

Let me just say the nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation, which is our referee on these matters, says that if we make the credit permanent that actually more research and development will take place, the kind of innovation that really puts America at the forefront of job creation and an economy that is strong and vibrant, that up to 10 percent more research and development will occur. We certainly need more of that, because that is more jobs, more innovation, and higher wages.

Let me just say that the President of the United States voted to extend the research and development tax credit unpaid for when he was a Senator. He signed legislation twice to extend the research and development tax credit unpaid for. I think 30 years of uncertainty has actually been a detriment—a detriment to U.S. business employers and certainly their employees because the jobs they provide are so dependent on our being at the cutting edge.

Look, this is the 21st century. We can't live in the past as if these policies don't matter. This is a very competitive world, and most of our constituents understand the kind of competition that we face. We need to make this permanent. We need to do it now. Let's do something positive and good for America, something that we have repeatedly done. Let's be honest about it.

Since we are going to extend it at some point temporarily another 2 years, let's make this permanent. Let's make this certain. Let's make this something that our employers can depend on so they can create the kind of jobs that we haven't seen.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time. Vote "yes" on this legislation.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the American Research and Competitiveness Act of 2014, a bill to simplify and permanently extend the U.S. research and development (R&D) tax credit. Over the past thirty years, the R&D tax credit has been a key economic tool for businesses in my Silicon Valley district and across our country by directly rewarding business investment in R&D.

At a time of great partisanship in Congress, I think the R&D we speak of today can be said to be 'Republicans and Democrats' because of the bipartisan support this legislation enjoys. For years the R&D tax credit has been essential for out-innovating and out-competing the rest of the world, but now other countries are catching up or already have. While the U.S.

was the first nation to offer a tax incentive for research and development in 1981, according to a study by the Information Technology & Innovation Foundation (ITIF), we now rank 27th out of 42 countries in terms of the generosity of the R&D incentives we offer.

Congress needs to do so much more to improve our national economy, and updating the R&D tax credit is an important policy that will encourage businesses to invest in new technologies which in turn will create jobs and shape a better economy in our future.

Nearly six months have passed since the R&D tax credit expired. To maintain our nation's competitiveness, let's not wait another day to give businesses the certainty they need to continue innovating and investing in America's future.

I thank Representatives KEVIN BRADY and JOHN LARSON for their leadership in bringing this bill to the floor today and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4438.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 569 and House Resolution 576, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the 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. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 4438 is postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

STRENGTHENING EDUCATION THROUGH RESEARCH ACT

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4366) to strengthen the Federal education research system to make research and evaluations more timely and relevant to State and local needs in order to increase student achievement, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4366

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 "Strengthening Education through Research Act".

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—EDUCATION SCIENCES REFORM

Sec. 101. References.
Sec. 102. Definitions.

PART A—THE INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION SCIENCES

Sec. 111. Establishment.

Sec. 112. Functions.
Sec. 113. Delegation.
Sec. 114. Office of the Director.
Sec. 115. Priorities.
Sec. 116. National Board for Education Sciences.
Sec. 117. Commissioners of the National Education Centers.
Sec. 118. Transparency.
Sec. 119. Competitive awards.

PART B—NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION RESEARCH

Sec. 131. Establishment.
Sec. 132. Duties.
Sec. 133. Standards for conduct and evaluation of research.

PART C—NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

Sec. 151. Establishment.
Sec. 152. Duties.
Sec. 153. Performance of duties.
Sec. 154. Reports.
Sec. 155. Dissemination.
Sec. 156. Cooperative education statistics systems.

PART D—NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION EVALUATION AND REGIONAL ASSISTANCE

Sec. 171. Establishment.
Sec. 172. Commissioner for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance.
Sec. 173. Evaluations.
Sec. 174. Regional educational laboratories for research, development, dissemination, and evaluation.

PART E—NATIONAL CENTER FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION RESEARCH

Sec. 175. Establishment.
Sec. 176. Commissioner for Special Education Research.
Sec. 177. Duties.

PART F—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 182. Prohibitions.
Sec. 183. Confidentiality.
Sec. 184. Availability of data.
Sec. 185. Performance management.
Sec. 186. Authority to publish.
Sec. 187. Repeals.
Sec. 188. Fellowships.
Sec. 189. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE II—EDUCATIONAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Sec. 201. References.
Sec. 202. Definitions.
Sec. 203. Comprehensive centers.
Sec. 204. Evaluations.
Sec. 205. Existing technical assistance providers.
Sec. 206. Regional advisory committees.
Sec. 207. Priorities.
Sec. 208. Grant program for statewide longitudinal data systems.
Sec. 209. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE III—NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS

Sec. 301. References.
Sec. 302. National assessment governing board.
Sec. 303. National assessment of educational progress.
Sec. 304. Definitions.
Sec. 305. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE IV—EVALUATION PLAN

Sec. 401. Research and evaluation.

TITLE I—EDUCATION SCIENCES REFORM

SEC. 101. REFERENCES.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002 (20 U.S.C. 9501 et seq.).

SEC. 102. DEFINITIONS.

Section 102 (20 U.S.C. 9501) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking "Affairs" and inserting "Education";

(2) in paragraph (10)—

(A) by inserting "or other information, in a timely manner and" after "evaluations," and

(B) by inserting "school leaders," after "teachers,";

(3) in paragraph (12), by inserting "school leaders," after "teachers,";

(4) by striking paragraph (13);

(5) by redesignating paragraphs (14) and (15) as paragraphs (13) and (14), respectively;

(6) by inserting after paragraph (14), as so redesignated, the following:

"(15) MINORITY-SERVING INSTITUTION.—The term 'minority-serving institution' means an institution of higher education described in section 371(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1067q(a)).";

(7) by amending paragraph (18) to read as follows:

"(18) PRINCIPLES OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH.—The term 'principles of scientific research' means principles of research that—

"(A) apply rigorous, systematic, and objective methodology to obtain reliable and valid knowledge relevant to education activities and programs;

"(B) present findings and make claims that are appropriate to, and supported by, the methods that have been employed; and

"(C) include, appropriate to the research being conducted—

"(i) use of systematic, empirical methods that draw on observation or experiment;

"(ii) use of data analyses that are adequate to support the general findings;

"(iii) reliance on measurements or observational methods that provide reliable and generalizable findings;

"(iv) strong claims of causal relationships, only with research designs that eliminate plausible competing explanations for observed results, such as, but not limited to, random-assignment experiments;

"(v) presentation of studies and methods in sufficient detail and clarity to allow for replication or, at a minimum, to offer the opportunity to build systematically on the findings of the research;

"(vi) acceptance by a peer-reviewed journal or critique by a panel of independent experts through a comparably rigorous, objective, and scientific review; and

"(vii) consistency of findings across multiple studies or sites to support the generality of results and conclusions.";

(8) in paragraph (20), by striking "scientifically based research standards" and inserting "the principles of scientific research"; and

(9) by adding at the end the following:

"(24) SCHOOL LEADER.—The term 'school leader' means a principal, assistant principal, or other individual who is—

"(A) an employee or officer of—
"(i) an elementary school or secondary school;

"(ii) a local educational agency serving an elementary school or secondary school; or

"(iii) another entity operating the elementary school or secondary school; and

"(B) responsible for the daily instructional leadership and managerial operations of the elementary school or secondary school.".

PART A—THE INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION SCIENCES

SEC. 111. ESTABLISHMENT.

Section 111 (20 U.S.C. 9511) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking "and wide dissemination activities" and inserting "and, consistent with