

Amendments to Student Success Act (1 of 2)

CONTACT: REBEKAH ARMSTRONG, REBEKAH.ARMSTRONG@MAIL.HOUSE.GOV, 202-226-0678

FLOOR SCHEDULE: AMENDMENTS WILL BE CONSIDERED ON FEBRAURY 26-26 UNDER A <u>STRUCTERED RULE</u> WHICH MAKES 44 AMENDMENTS IN ORDER.

#67 <u>Kennedy (D-MA)</u>: This amendment would authorize a new science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) Gateways grant program, which would allow the use of flexible federal funding received by state education agencies. This grant program would be awarded to entities to carry out programs targeted to women and girls, underrepresented minorities, and individuals from all economic backgrounds with the goal of (1) encouraging interest in STEM fields; (2) support classroom success in STEM disciplines; (3) support workforce training in STEM fields, and (4) improve access to continuing education in STEM fields. Grant applicants would have to submit an application outlining the plans to use the grant funding at the elementary and secondary school level. Entities receiving a grant would be required to submit an annual report to the state education agency on the use of funds and the number of students who participated.

#128 <u>Grothman (R-WI)</u>: This amendment would shorten the authorization of H.R. 5 from Fiscal Year 2021 to Fiscal Year 2018.

#73 <u>Meeks (D-NY)</u>: This amendment would require states to measure individual student academic proficiency, instead of making it at the state's discretion. In addition, it would require the state accountability system to measure student growth towards state adopted standards.

#44 <u>Lawrence (D-MI)</u>: This amendment would include students in foster care to the list of groups the results from state assessments would be disaggregated.

#74 <u>Goodlatte (R-VA)</u>: This amendment would allow a local education agency to administer its own assessments in lieu of the state-designed academic assessment. The local education agency would be required to obtain approval from the state and provide data that is comparable among all local education agencies and the state. This amendment is supported by the <u>National Education Association</u> and the <u>School Superintendents Association</u>.

#43 <u>Castro (D-TX)</u>: This amendment would direct the secretary to appoint an ombudsman who oversees and resolves state disputes on textbook standards for K-12 grade levels to ensure states uphold the highest academic standards for textbooks.

#5 Langevin (D-RI); Thompson, Glenn (R-PA): This amendment would expand upon how local educational agency plans support work-based learning opportunities to include the need to gain experience and, if appropriate, academic credit. In addition, it would require local education agencies to use funds to train school counselors to provide students relevant information regarding their career and postsecondary goals.

#52 <u>Barletta (R-PA)</u>: This amendment would require local education agencies to describe in their local plan how they would use funds to support activities that coordinate and integrate before-school and after-school programs, and summer school programs.

#96 <u>Quigley (D-IL); McKinley (R-WV); Serrano (D-NY)</u>: This amendment would strike section 119 of H.R. 5 that repeals the qualifications for teachers and paraprofessionals. It would then replace this section with the paraprofessional qualification under <u>current law</u> in No Child Left Behind. These qualifications include: (1) completion of a least two years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) an associate's degree or higher; and (3) met a rigorous standard of quality in the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and math.

#20 <u>Fudge (D-OH)</u>: This amendment would require states educational agencies to ensure the combined fiscal effort per student of the aggregate expenditures of the local educational agency and the state is not less than 90 percent of that of the second preceding fiscal year. This would require state and local funding remains consistent year to year. In the event a local educational agency fails to meet the requirement, the state will reduce the amount of the allocation of funds by the same proportion.

#101 <u>DeSaulnier (D-CA)</u>: This amendment would require each local education agency to develop agreements with Head Start and other entities carrying out early childhood development programs.

#119 <u>Davis (R-IL); Joyce (R-OH)</u>: This amendment would ensure nothing in Title I of H.R. 5 would be construed to affect the collective bargaining agreements, memoranda of understanding, or other agreements between employers and their employees. This amendment is supported by the <u>National</u> <u>Education Association</u>.

#40 <u>Moore (D-WI); Davis, Danny (D-IL); Wilson (D-FL)</u>: This amendment would delay the implementation of the new funding formulas under Title II until the Secretary of Education determines the implementation will not decrease the level and quality of educational services for families with incomes below the poverty line.

#98 <u>McKinley (R-WV)</u>: This amendment would require states to include in their state application a description of any subjects the state has identified as being workforce critical subjects. A workforce critical subject would be defined as an academic subject of urgent importance to the current and future workforce needs of the state as identified by the state.

#63 <u>Delaney (D-MD); Young (R-IN); Polis (D-CO)</u>: This amendment would allow states educational agencies or local educational agencies to use funds to support state or local pay for success initiatives. These initiatives are defined as those that would: (1) produce a measurable and clearly defined outcomes that results in social benefit and direct cost savings to the local, state, or federal government; (2) make payments only when agreed upon outcomes are achieved (3) require a

feasibility study to evaluate the evidence of effectiveness; and (4) use experimental designs that would use random assignment or other research methodologies that allow for the strongest possible causal inferences.

#88 <u>Jefferies (D-NY)</u>: This amendment would ensure teachers, parents, and students received education on the harms of copyright piracy.

#25 <u>Clark, Katherine (D-MA)</u>: This amendment would allow local funds to be used for professional development for teachers, principals, and other school administrators in early elementary grades. This would include training on child development, meaningful family engagement, collaboration with early care and education programs, improving instruction, and closing achievement gaps.

#75 <u>Cohen (D-TN)</u>: This amendment would allow local education agencies to use Title II funds for professional development on restorative justice and conflict resolution.

#56 <u>Duffy (R-WI); Wilson (D-FL)</u>: This amendment would require a local education agency at the beginning of every school year to notify all parents of any assessments mandated by the state or local educational agency for the student for that school year, and any policy regarding student participation in the assessments. This amendment is supported by the <u>National Education Association</u>.

#126 <u>Messer, Luke (R-IN); Polis (D-CO)</u>: This amendment would insert findings outlining the benefits of charter schools and the populations served. In addition, it would include a sense of Congress that charter schools are a critical part of our education system, and should be supported and encouraged to open more quality charter schools.

#124 Polis (D-CO); Rokita (R-IL): This amendment would require states to demonstrate how it is working to develop or strengthen a cohesive strategy to encourage collaboration between charter schools and local educational agencies on the sharing of best practices.

#35 <u>Kelly, Robin (D-IL)</u>: This amendment would require Statewide Family Engagement Centers to conduct training programs in the community to improve adult literacy, including financial literacy.

NOTE: RSC Legislative Bulletins are for informational purposes only and should not be taken as statements of support or opposition from the Republican Study Committee.

###