

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 222—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE FÉDÉRATION INTERNATIONALE DE FOOTBALL ASSOCIATION SHOULD IMMEDIATELY ELIMINATE GENDER PAY INEQUITY AND TREAT ALL ATHLETES WITH THE SAME RESPECT AND DIGNITY

Mr. LEAHY submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 222

Whereas the Fédération Internationale de Football Association (referred to in this preamble as “FIFA”) awarded \$576,000,000 to the 32 teams that competed in the 2014 Men’s World Cup, but only awarded \$15,000,000 to the 24 teams that competed in the 2015 Women’s World Cup;

Whereas FIFA awarded \$35,000,000 to the team that won the 2014 Men’s World Cup, but only awarded \$2,000,000 to the team that won the 2015 Women’s World Cup;

Whereas FIFA awarded \$6,000,000 more in prizes to each team that lost in the first round of the 2014 Men’s World Cup than to the team that won the 2015 Women’s World Cup;

Whereas FIFA awarded \$420,000,000 to the 32 teams that competed in the 2010 Men’s World Cup, but only awarded \$10,000,000 to the 24 teams that competed in the 2011 Women’s World Cup;

Whereas FIFA awarded \$31,000,000 to the team that won the 2010 Men’s World Cup, but only awarded \$1,000,000 to the team that won the 2011 Women’s World Cup;

Whereas the 2015 Women’s World Cup Final had more than 25,000,000 viewers in the United States, making it more widely viewed than the Major League Baseball World Series or the National Basketball Association Finals;

Whereas the 2015 Women’s World Cup highlighted the need to eliminate the existing gender pay disparity in prize award structure in athletic competitions that has persisted for decades;

Whereas the unfair and unjust prize award allocation system used by FIFA sends a terrible message to women and girls around the world about the value of their contribution to sports;

Whereas, in 2007, Wimbledon finally implemented an equal prize payment structure for all athletes, regardless of gender; and

Whereas gender should not determine the amount of a prize award that a person or team receives in an athletic competition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) urges the Fédération Internationale de Football Association to immediately eliminate gender pay inequity and to treat all athletes with the respect and dignity those athletes deserve;

(2) supports an end to the unfair and unjust practice of gender pay inequity in the workplace, including athletic competitions and related prize awards;

(3) urges all other local, State, Federal, and international organizations to eliminate gender pay inequity; and

(4) instructs the Secretary of the Senate to submit a copy of this resolution to the President of the Fédération Internationale de Football Association.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last week more than 25 million Americans

watched the U.S. women’s soccer team win for the third time soccer’s most coveted title—the Federation Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) World Cup. This thrilling victory was the most widely viewed women’s soccer game in our Nation’s history. Americans are proud of this impressive victory, and we applaud these world-class athletes for their contributions to our Nation’s legacy.

Anybody walking down the road by our farm house the night of the soccer game—we had our windows open—would have heard Marcelle and I screaming with joy at the victory.

But as the celebrations fade, we should all be troubled by the way FIFA discriminates against some of the teams that compete in the World Cup. The U.S. women’s team will receive \$2 million for winning the Women’s World Cup. The 2014 men’s World Cup winner was awarded \$35 million. In fact, men’s teams that lost in the first round of the 2014 men’s World Cup were awarded \$8 million—four times more than the champion U.S. women’s team. The reason for this extreme disparity? Gender.

So today, I am introducing a Senate resolution that calls on FIFA to immediately eliminate this discriminatory prize award structure. Opponents of equal prize awards in sports point to revenue as the reason behind this disparity. But revenue should not be and cannot be accepted as a means for discrimination. In fact, they ought to ask this: How many people watched the women’s soccer team? Most teams would give anything to have that viewership.

The 24 women’s teams that took part in FIFA’s tournament are role models—not just to women and girls but to men and boys across the globe. The World Cup champions should be rewarded for their performance, for their grit, and for their teamwork, rather than devalued for their gender.

Nelson Mandela, a person I met often and admired, once said: “Sport has the power to change the world.” Well, sports bring us together in our communities and on the global stage. They remind us what we have in common, they inspire us to dream, and they push beyond every boundary.

This weekend, millions of people watched American tennis star Serena Williams win the women’s final at Wimbledon, marking her sixth championship at the All England Club. The next day, Serbian tennis star Novak Djokovic won the men’s final on the very same court. Both of these athletes competed against the very best players in the world, and they were awarded the very same amount of prize money for their impressive victories. This is because Wimbledon chose to be on the right side of history in 2007 by ensuring pay equity for female and male athletes. For years, tennis champions such as Billie Jean King and Venus Williams fought for equal treatment for the future champions of their sport.

I hope the story of the American Women’s World Cup champions not re-

ceiving fair treatment will inspire more people to join the fight for equal prize awards. With the resolution I introduce today, let the Senate be on record in support of fair treatment for all World Cup champions as we urge FIFA to change its policy, just as the All England Club did years ago.

The fight for gender equality continues and is a fight worth winning. In 2009, I proudly voted for passage of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, which amended the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to clarify the statute of limitations for filing an equal-pay lawsuit regarding pay discrimination. And I supported Senator MIKULSKI’s Paycheck Fairness Act, which would ensure that all Americans receive equal pay for equal work.

We have had a lot of civil rights fights in our Nation’s history. The battle for true equality has persisted for too long. Let’s join together. Let’s send a powerful message of equality to those who aspire to one day become a champion. Equal pay for equal work should no longer be an ideal, but instead the reality for all.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2215. Mr. REID (for Mr. NELSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2089 submitted by Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY) to the bill S. 1177, to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that every child achieves; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2216. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2089 submitted by Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY) to the bill S. 1177, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2217. Mr. ALEXANDER (for Mr. PAUL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2089 submitted by Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY) to the bill S. 1177, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2218. Mr. ALEXANDER (for Mr. PAUL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2089 submitted by Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY) to the bill S. 1177, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2219. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2089 submitted by Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY) to the bill S. 1177, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2220. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2089 submitted by Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY) to the bill S. 1177, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2221. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2089 submitted by Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY) to the bill S. 1177, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2222. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2089 submitted by Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY) to the bill S. 1177, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2223. Mr. DONNELLY (for himself and Mr. REED) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2089

submitted by Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY) to the bill S. 1177, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2224. Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2089 submitted by Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY) to the bill S. 1177, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2225. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2089 submitted by Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY) to the bill S. 1177, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2226. Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2089 submitted by Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY) to the bill S. 1177, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2227. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2089 submitted by Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY) to the bill S. 1177, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2228. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. BARASSO, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2089 submitted by Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY) to the bill S. 1177, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2215. Mr. REID (for Mr. NELSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2089 submitted by Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY) to the bill S. 1177, to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that every child achieves; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 373, strike line 22 and all that follows through page 374, line 3, and insert the following:

“(C) information on student exposure to and retention in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields, including among low-income and underrepresented groups, which may include results from a pre-existing analysis; and

“(D) an analysis of the quality of pre-service preparation at all public institutions of higher education (including alternative pathways to teacher licensure or certification) for individuals preparing to teach science, technology, engineering, and mathematics subjects in the State.

On page 381, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

“(vi) partner with current or recently retired science, technology, engineering, and mathematics professionals, such as Federal employees, to engage students and teachers in instruction in such subjects;

“(vii) tailor and integrate educational resources developed by Federal agencies to improve student achievement in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics;

SA 2216. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2089 submitted by Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY) to the bill S. 1177, to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that every child achieves; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 385, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

“SEC. 2508. REPORT ON CYBERSECURITY EDUCATION.

“Not later than June 1, 2016, the Secretary, acting through the Director of the Institute of Education Sciences, shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives, a report describing whether secondary and postsecondary education programs are meeting the need of public and private sectors for cyberdefense. Such report shall include—

“(1) an assessment of the shortfalls in current secondary and postsecondary education needed to develop cybersecurity professionals, and recommendations to address such shortfalls;

“(2) an assessment of successful secondary and postsecondary programs that produce competent cybersecurity professionals; and

“(3) recommendations of subjects to be covered by elementary schools and secondary schools to better prepare students for postsecondary cybersecurity education.”.

SA 2217. Mr. ALEXANDER (for Mr. PAUL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2089 submitted by Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY) to the bill S. 1177, to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that every child achieves; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike line 18 on page 36 and all that follows through line 5 on page 44 and insert the following:

“(2) STATE-DESIGNED ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT SYSTEM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each State plan shall provide an assurance that the State educational agency, in consultation with local educational agencies, has implemented a State-designed academic assessment system that—

“(i) includes, at a minimum, academic assessments in mathematics, reading or language arts, and science; and

“(ii) meets the requirements of subparagraph (B).

“(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The assessment system under subparagraph (A) shall—

“(i) be aligned with the challenging State academic standards, and provide coherent and timely information about student attainment of such standards;

“(ii) be used for purposes for which such assessments are valid and reliable, be of adequate technical quality for each purpose required under this Act, be consistent with relevant, nationally recognized professional and technical standards, and not evaluate or assess personal or family beliefs or attitudes;

“(iii) involve multiple measures of student academic achievement, which may include measures of student academic growth;

“(iv) provide for—

“(I) the participation in such assessments of all students;

“(II) the reasonable adaptations and accommodations for children with disabilities (as defined in section 602(3) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act) necessary to measure the academic achievement of such children relative to the challenging State academic standards;

“(III) alternate assessments aligned with grade-level academic standards, unless the State develops alternate assessments aligned with alternate academic standards, consistent with subparagraph (F), for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; and

“(IV) the inclusion of children who are English learners, who shall be assessed in a valid and reliable manner and provided reasonable accommodations on assessments administered to such students under this paragraph, including, to the extent practicable, assessments in the language and form most likely to yield accurate data on what such students know and can do in academic content areas, until such students have achieved English language proficiency, as determined pursuant to the English language proficiency standards described in paragraph (1)(F);

“(v) notwithstanding clause (iv)(IV), provide for assessments (using tests in English) of reading or language arts of any student who has attended school in the United States (not including the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico) for 3 or more consecutive school years, except that if the local educational agency determines, on a case-by-case individual basis, that assessments in another language or form would likely yield more accurate and reliable information on what such student knows and can do, the local educational agency may make a determination to assess such student in the appropriate language other than English for a period that does not exceed 2 additional consecutive years, provided that such student has not yet reached a level of English language proficiency sufficient to yield valid and reliable information on what such student knows and can do on tests (written in English) of reading or language arts;

“(vi) produce individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports, consistent with clause (ii), that allow parents, teachers, and principals or other school leaders to understand and address the specific academic needs of students, and include information regarding achievement on assessments, and that are provided to parents, teachers, and principals or other school leaders in a timely manner after the assessment is given, in an understandable and uniform format;

“(vii) enable results to be disaggregated within each State, local educational agency, and school, by—

“(I) each major racial and ethnic group;

“(II) economically disadvantaged students as compared to students who are not economically disadvantaged;

“(III) students with disabilities as compared to nondisabled students;

“(IV) English proficiency status;

“(V) gender; and

“(VI) migrant status; and

“(viii) produce, at a minimum, annual student achievement data in mathematics and reading or language arts that is valid, reliable, of adequate technical quality, and comparable among all local educational agencies within the State and that will be used in the State accountability system under paragraph (3) and to meet reporting requirements under subsection (d).

“(C) EXCEPTION TO DISAGGREGATION.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (B)(vii), the disaggregated results of assessments shall not be required if—

“(i) the number of students in a category described under subparagraph (B)(vii) is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information; or

“(ii) the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.

“(D) STATE-DESIGNED SYSTEM.—Each State plan shall provide a description of its State-designed assessment system, which may include—

“(i) yearly academic assessments of all students against the challenging State academic standards in the subjects required