be stimulated and nurtured to help accelerate the commercialization of national nanotechnology developments."

In sum, our bill would boost both applied and basic research. It would boost research by businesses big and small. And it would fuel fundamental research by for-profit and nonprofit alike.

McLuhan’s quote about the global village was taken by many at the time as a wake-up call to a changing world. Since then, many more leaders in this village have emerged. Let us work to see that the next big technological advance is discovered here in America. Only through continued commitment to research can we ensure that it is.

By Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself and Mr. DODD):

S. 2212. A bill to support the establishment and operations of Teachers Professional Development Institutes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation, along with my colleague from Connecticut, Mr. DODD, that will strengthen the content and pedagogy knowledge of present K-12 teacher workforce and thus ultimately raise student achievement.

Our proposal would establish eight new Teacher Professional Development Institutes throughout the Nation each year for the next five years. The funding for this model which has been operating at Yale University for over 25 years. Every Teacher Institute would consist of a partnership between an institution of higher education and the local public school system in which a significant proportion of the students come from low-income households. These Institutes will strengthen the present teacher workforce by giving each participant an opportunity to gain more sophisticated knowledge and a chance to develop curriculum units with other colleagues that can be directly applied in their classrooms. We know that teachers gain confidence and enthusiasm when they have a deeper understanding of the subject matter that they teach and this translates into higher expectations for their students and an increase in student achievement.

The Teacher Professional Development Institutes are based on the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute model that has been in existence since 1978. For over 25 years, the Institute has offered, six or seven 13-session seminars each year, led by Yale faculty, on topics that teachers have selected to enhance their mastery of the specific subject area that they teach. The subject selection process begins with representatives from the Institutes soliciting ideas from teachers throughout the school district for topics on which teachers feel they need to have additional knowledge. It gives them in preparing materials they need for their students, or topics that will assist them in addressing the standards that the school district requires. As a consensus emerges about desired seminar subjects, the Institute director identifies university faculty members with the appropriate expertise, interest and desire to lead the seminars. These faculty members, especially those who have led Institute seminars before, may sometimes suggest seminars they would like to lead, and these ideas are circulated by the representatives as well. The final decisions on which seminar topics are offered are ultimately made by the teachers who participate. In this way, the offerings are designed to respond to what teachers believe is needed and useful for both themselves and their students.

The cooperative nature of the Institute seminar planning process ensures its success: Institutes offer seminars and relevant materials on topics teachers have identified and feel are needed for their own preparation as well as what they know will motivate and engage their students. Teachers enthusiastically take part in rigorous seminars they have requested, and as part of the program, practice the materials they have had to work on and develop. This hands-on experience not only increases their preparation in the subjects they are assigned to teach, but also their participation in an Institute seminar gives them immediate hands-on application of the materials that can be used in the classroom. In short, by allowing teachers to determine the seminar subjects and providing them the resources to develop relevant curricula for their classroom and their students, the Institutes empower teachers. Teachers know their students best and they know what should be done to improve schools and increase student learning. The Teacher Professional Development Institutes promote this philosophy.

From 1999-2002, the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute promoted a National Demonstration Project to create comparable Institutes at four diverse sites with large concentrations of disadvantaged students. These demonstration projects are located in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Houston, Texas, Albuquerque, New Mexico, and Santa Ana, CA.

Follow-up evaluations have earned very positive results from the teacher participants. The Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute, as well as the four demonstration sites. The data strongly support the conclusion that virtually all teachers felt substantially strengthened in their mastery of content knowledge and they also developed increased expectations for what their students could achieve. In addition, because of their involvement in the course selection and curriculum development process, teacher participants have found these seminars to be especially rich and useful in their classrooms and practices. Mr. President, 95 percent of all participating teachers reported that the seminars were useful. These Institutes have also served to foster teacher leadership, to develop supportive teacher networks, to heighten university faculty commitments to improving K-12 public education, and to foster more positive partnerships between educational leaders and institutions of higher education.

Many agree that teacher quality is the single most important school-related factor in determining student achievement. Effective teacher professional development programs that focus on subject and pedagogy knowledge are a proven method for enhancing the success of a teacher in the classroom.

Though a K-12 teacher shortage is forecast in the near-term and many new teachers will be entering our schools, those teachers who are present on the job will do the majority of teaching in the classrooms in the very near future. For this reason, it is important to invest in methods to strengthen our present teaching workforce. Like many professions, the quality of our teachers could diminish if their professional development is neglected. Positive educational achievements occur when coursework in a teacher’s specific content area is combined with pedagogy techniques. This is what the Teacher Professional Development Institutes Act strives to accomplish.

The Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute has already proven to be a successful model for teacher professional development as demonstrated by the high caliber curriculum unit plans that teacher participants have developed and placed on the web, and by the evaluations that support the conclusion that virtually all the teacher participants felt substantially strengthened in their mastery of content knowledge and their teaching skills. Our proposal would open this opportunity to many more urban teachers throughout the nation.

I urge my colleagues to act favorably on this measure. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be placed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2212

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

SECTION 1. TEACHERS PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTES.

(a) In General.—Part A of title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6601 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"Subpart 6—Teachers Professional Development Institutes"

"SEC. 2161. SHORT TITLE.

"This subpart may be cited as the ‘Teachers Professional Development Institutes Act.’"

"SEC. 2162. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

"(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

"(1) Teaching is central to the educational process and the ongoing professional development of teachers in the subjects they
teach is essential for improved student learning.

“(2) Attaining the goal of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (Public Law 107–110)—having a teacher who is highly qualified and prepared, as well as in the academic subject the teacher teaches—will require innovative and effective approaches to improving the quality of teaching and learning.

“(3) The Teachers Institute Model focuses on the continuing academic preparation of schoolteachers and the application of what they learn to their classrooms and potentially to the classrooms of other teachers.

“(4) The Teachers Institute Model was developed initially by the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute and has successfully operated there for 30 years.

“(5) The Teachers Institute Model has also been successfully demonstrated over a 3-year period in a national demonstration project in cities larger than New Haven.

“(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this subpart is to provide Federal assistance to support the establishment and operation of Teachers Institutes for local educational agencies that serve significant low-income student populations in States throughout the Nation.

“(1) improving student learning; and

“(2) to enhance the quality of teaching and strengthen the subject matter mastery and the pedagogical skills of current teachers through teacher preparation.

SEC. 2163. DEFINITIONS.

“In this subpart:

“(1) SIGNIFICANT LOW-INCOME POPULATION.—The term ‘significant low-income population’ means a population of which not less than 25 percent of the individuals included are from families with incomes below the poverty line, as determined by the Secretary on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data.

“(2) TEACHERS INSTITUTE.—The term ‘Teachers Institute’ means a partnership, joint venture between 1 or more institutions of higher education, and 1 or more local educational agencies with significant low-income populations, that is to provide for the planning and development of proposals for the establishment of Teachers Institutes.

“(3) ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE TO THE TEACHERS INSTITUTES.—(a) IN GENERAL.—The Teachers Institutes established during the National Demonstration Project for their further development and for their support of the planning and development of proposals under paragraph (1) shall continue to be eligible for additional assistance for the purposes described in section 2164(b).

“(5) DIRECTION.—The operations of a Teachers Institute are managed by a full-time director who reports to both partners but is accountable to the institution of higher education partner. A grantee shall appoint a director to manage and coordinate the work of the Institute.

“(6) EVALUATION.—A grantee shall annually review the activities of the Institute and disseminate the results to the members of the Institute’s partnership community.

SEC. 2167. APPLICATION, APPROVAL, AND AGREEMENT.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—To receive a grant under this subpart, a Teachers Institute shall submit an application to the Secretary that—

“(1) meets the requirement of this subpart and any regulations under it;

“(2) includes a description of how the Teachers Institute intends to use funds provided under the grant;

“(4) includes measurable objectives for the use of the funds provided under the grant; and

“(5) contains such other information and assurances as the Secretary may require.

“(b) APPROVAL.—The Secretary shall—

“(1) promptly evaluate an application received for a grant under this subpart; and

“(2) notify the applicant within 90 days of the receipt of a complete application of the Secretary’s determination.

“(c) AGREEMENT.—Upon approval of an application, the Secretary and the applicant shall enter into a comprehensive agreement covering the entire period of the grant.

SEC. 2168. REPORTS AND EVALUATIONS.

“(a) REPORT.—Each Teachers Institute receiving a grant under this subpart shall annually report to the Secretary on the progress of the Institute in achieving the purpose of this subpart.

“(b) EVALUATION AND DISSEMINATION.—The Secretary shall evaluate the activities funded under this subpart and submit an annual report regarding the activities assisted under this subpart to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives. The Secretary shall also disseminate successful practices developed by Teachers Institutes.

“(c) REPEAL.—If the Secretary determines that a Teachers Institute is not making substantial progress in meeting the purposes of the grant by the end of the second
year of the grant under this part, the Secretary may take appropriate action, including revocation of further payments under the grant, to ensure that the funds available under this part are used in the most effective manner.

**SEC. 2169. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

“There are authorized to be appropriated grants, including planning grants, and technical assistance under this subpart—

(1) $4,000,000 for fiscal year 2008;

(2) $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2009;

(3) $6,000,000 for fiscal year 2010;

(4) $7,000,000 for fiscal year 2011; and

(5) $8,000,000 for fiscal year 2012.

(b) Sections—The table of contents of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 note) is amended by inserting after the item relating to amendments of 1972 (Public Law 92–315) the availability of clean water for future generations; whereas water pollution problems persist throughout the United States, and significant challenges lie ahead in the effort to protect and restore the water resources of the United States.

Whereas in the most recent National Water Quality Inventory of the 19 percent of the nation’s rivers and streams assessed 45 percent of streams were impaired of the 37 percent of the nation’s assessed lakes, ponds and reservoirs, 47 percent were impaired and of the 35 percent of the nation’s assessed bays, 40 percent were impaired; the remainder of the assessed waters met their intended uses;

Whereas further development and innovation of water pollution control programs and advancement of water pollution control research and technology are necessary and desirable; and

Whereas October 18, 2007, is the 35th anniversary of the enactment of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) (commonly known as the “Clean Water Act”); Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That, as the United States marks the 35th anniversary, on October 18, 2007, of the enactment of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 (Public Law 92–500), which formed the basis for the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) (commonly known as the “Clean Water Act”), it is the sense of the Senate that all citizens of the United States and all levels of government should—

(1) recognize and celebrate the accomplishments of the United States under that Act; and

(2) recommit to achieving the objectives of that Act: restoring and maintaining the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the waters of the United States.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3404. Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mrs. HUTCHISON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3405. Mr. VINOIVICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3406. Mr. BLICK (for himself and Mr. DeMINT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3407. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3408. Mr. BAYH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3409. Mr. BAYH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3410. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3411. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. BUNNING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3412. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3413. Mr. DeMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3414. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. Enzi) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3415. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. Enzi) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3416. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3417. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. Enzi) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3418. Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself and Mr. Durbin) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3419. Ms. SNOWE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3420. Ms. SNOWE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3421. Mr. DeMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3422. Mr. DeMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3423. Mr. DeMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3424. Mr. DeMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3425. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. Stevens) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3426. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3427. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3428. Mr. DOHGAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3430. Mr. FEINGOLD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3431. Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself and Mr. Alexander) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3432. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3433. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3043, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3434. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. Gregg) submitted an amendment intended