

MC

1. "We'd like to invite you to take your seats at this time as our session is about to begin. As a quick reminder, please take a moment and turn off your cell phones. Thank you. Please welcome the President of the College Board, Gaston Caperton."

Gaston Caperton

2. "It is my honor to welcome you to the College Board Forum 2011, and our first Presidential Candidate Forum Education Election 2012. Education is the issue, and I'm pleased to be joined by candidates who bring strong ideas and u, unique perspectives to this important discussion. The College Board does not endorse, support or oppose any particular candidate for office; what we do support is a robust national dialogue that helps our members and all America learn about candidates' position, particularly the issue of education.

Please be aware that all candidates running in the primary were invited to participate in this evening's event, and each campaign was offered a chance to provide material on their education policies. Moderating tonight's discussion will be Paul Gigot of the Wall Street Journal, and former New York chance, School Chancellor, Joel Klein. Paul Gigot is the editorial page editor, and Vice President of the Wall Street Journal, a position he has held since 2001. Joel Klein served as a Chancellor of the New York City School System from 2002 to 2011 – 2010. He is currently the CEO of the Education Division of New American Corporation, and Executive Vice President of News Corp. I want to thank these outstanding two individuals for moderating Education and Election 2012, and of course, I would like to thank the candidates for taking time to be here, and sharing their views and personal stories.

Now please welcome on the stage, Paul Gigot and Joel Klein."

Joel Klein

3. "Good evening, thank you, Gaston, and my thanks to the College Board for the extraordinary work you're doing on excellence and equity in education. Let me add my welcome to all of you, and I know so many of you are currently involved in education, in making sure that America's prepared for the challenges we face, and I personally want to thank you for that – I know this has been an exciting, uh, conference.

I'm also very grateful for the opportunity tonight, and I want to start with a paradox, which is, all of us know now, and America knows, how important education is to our future, to our global competitiveness, to citizenship; and yet the great paradox is, in presidential elections, and particularly, recently in the debates in the republican party, very little discussion of this issue. So I'm particularly grateful to the four candidates who agreed to show up and join us tonight so we can have a serious and robust discussion about education.

The format is quite simple: each candidate will have a chance to make an opening statement, and then Paul and I will interview them, ask them questions, and we've made clear that we expect to get answers to our questions. No points here for filibuster tonight. Paul."

Paul Gigot

4. "All right, thank you Joel, thank you Gaston, and as well, thank you, uh, to the College Board and to News Corp., uh, and of course to the candidates – it's a real pleasure to be here with Joel who I will say has uh, forgotten more about education than I've ever known, uh. And based on my, but based on my conversations with him, his experience as New York Chancellor, I think he'd like to forget a few things from his experience with education.

Um, just want to set the stage here a little bit with a quote, um: "If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war." Now, many of you will recognize that quote as coming from the Report of a Nation at Risk, which was published in 1983. That was, of course, uh, seen at that time, widely, on a bipartisan basis, as a call to arms for education reform. Yet 20 years later, or nearly 20 years later, what do we have? We've spent, um, we've increased our spending on education to roughly double in real terms, um, in return for very marginal results. Um, some progress at the lower levels, uh, K through eight – but almost nothing in terms of test scores at higher, uh, at, after the high school level.

So, here we are again twenty years later, at another period where there is some promise, some optimism about educational reform, charter schools are expanding, union contracts are being uh, adjusted, debated; teacher tenure being debated, challenged in many areas – an exciting time. But we also know from that quote and our experience of 20 years ago, and over 20 years, that this moment could pass if we don't treat it with the, the energy and attention it deserves. So, we're delighted to have the candidates here, and uh, we hope to, as Joel says, pin 'em down, and see if we can get, uh, uh, if not make a little news at least shine a little light. Joel.

Joel Klein

5. "Uh. So let's start now with our first candidate, Herman Cain, who's joining us today by satellite. Mr. Cain has a long career in business, was godfather of uh, was uh, is the CEO of Godfather Pizza. And, and uh, was on the Federal Reserve Board in Kansas City, and was a talk show uh, host uh, in Atlanta. Mr. Cain, we'll have your opening statement, thank you for joining us today from Arkansas."

Herman Cain

6. "It's my pleasure, and I wish I were there with you live, but as you would imagine, there's a lot of, uh, demands on one's time at this point in this primary process, but thanks for this opportunity, but also, thanks for bringing some attention to this very critical issue, and that is education.

We all agree that education is critical to the future of this nation; and we all agree that it is critical, uh, to our children in terms of their global competitiveness. When we think about education, at least the way I look at it, the children, the students, the pupils – they're the ones that should be at the center of this discussion because ultimately, that should be the focus of changes we make in order to improve our educational system in this country. It is also generally agreed that over the past couple of decades, we have lost some ground, and that suggests that we need to do some things differently.

With the children at the center of this discussion, I see three dimensions surrounding it that we need to address in order to make things better. First, the parents; secondly, the teachers; and thirdly, the institutions themselves.

First, the parents. I happen to believe that we need to positively encourage parents to be more involved in their children's education. I can recall when I was growing up as a young man in Atlanta, Georgia – my parents, unfortunately, didn't have the luxury to be involved in my education; I was self-motivated to want to do well, but I was also blessed that I had some inspi – encouraging teachers that encouraged me to make the most of my education. Also, when I was attending school, growing up in the Atlanta public school system, at the time I did not know that we may not have had the highest quality education, but we had some of the highest quality teachers. And so parental involvement I believe we need to encourage, in a positive sense. I believe that we need to promote the fact that the more parents are involved in the education of their children, the better they are going to do.

Secondly, the teachers. As I mentioned, I was blessed with some teachers, uh, that took an interest in me. They saw it more than just a job, they saw it as a calling. And the good news is today, there are a lot of teachers who feel called to teach, as well as they feel as if it is a profession that they want to pursue. And with respect to the teachers, I believe just as in any other endeavor, that we need to do a better job of providing pay for performance. Everyone likes to be recognized when they do well. Pay for performance structures, I believe, should be introduced in the various institutions, and let's reward those good teachers, and we need to review this whole seniority system in many of our public school systems.

The third component, the institutions themselves. Within the institutions themselves, we have the public school system; we have charter schools; we have private schools; and we have home schooling. All four play a critical role in helping to educate our kids. Fundamentally, I believe that competition makes things better, and competition also helps to contain the costs associated with education. And so the fact that I support charter schools, I support school choice – yes, but I also support trying to make our public schools better by implementing some of those pay for performance programs that can be

developed that we can then put in the public schools, because we won't be able to educate all of our kids through pu – private schools and charter schools; we've got to make the public school systems better also at the same time."

Paul Gigot

7. "Okay thank you...Mr. Cain, let me, let me, let me step in there and uh, 'cause we, we're, our time is limited. You are running for the highest..."

Herman Cain

8. "Okay."

Paul Gigot

9. "You're running for the highest office in the land, so why don't you tell us what you think the federal role in education should be."

Herman Cain

10. "I believe that the federal role should be minimized, and that the local role should be maximized. I believe that the federal government has a responsibility as far as uh, it's keeping standards, but not imposing standards at the local level. So fundamentally, I believe that the federal government should have a minimum role, but that the local areas and the local districts should have a maximum role."

Joel Klein

11. "Why do you believe that, Mr. Cain? You would be the first to acknowledge our country, whether they're in Arkansas where you are, or New York – we compete in a global economy, and we're, we need to make sure all of our kids in every state are prepared for the challenges. So why would you minimize the federal role and especially, given your commitment and passion to improving education?"

Herman Cain

12. "The reason I would minimize the federal role is because I don't believe you can micromanage a good education out of Washington, D.C., pure and simple. That doesn't mean that the federal government should not be involved in helping our nation to be competitive, our helping our, uh, students to get the best education to compete in this global marketplace. I just happen to believe that they have a role in terms of educational strategy, but not necessarily a role in educational tactics; that's the difference in the distinction that I, that I like to make."

Paul Gigot

13. "But where does that leave, uh, Mr. Cain, say a state like, uh, Alabama – not to pick on Alabama, but it shows up in, in most of the ratings as, on the lower end of, of the rankings in the states in student performance. If you do not drive standards at the federal level, are you not taking the risk that you're gonna leave a state like Alabama behind?"

Herman Cain

14. "You do run the risk that you're gonna take a state like Alabama and leave them behind, but here again, every state is competing with all of the other states. It gets back to competition. And if a state continues to deteriorate in terms of its educational performance, and if a state continues to lose its human resources because they're not able to provide a good education, I happen to believe that the forces of competition over time will cause them to make changes, because they will be competing with all of the other states on an ongoing basis."

Joel Klein

15. "Well we haven't seen much of that over the last decade, uh, which does continue to concern me, Mr. Cain. But let me, let me ask you another question – what do you think in terms of resources the federal government should be doing. Should we be putting more resources or fewer resources into K to 12 education?"

Herman Cain

16. "I'm sorry, I did not clearly understand the question."

Joel Klein

17. "I say, in terms of the federal government's involvement in terms of resources, dollars – right now they put about 8 to 9 percent of the total K to 12 budget. Should they be putting more money into this, even in a tight economic time, so that we can help the states improve education? Should they hold the line, or should this be an area for cuts?"

Herman Cain

18. "I believe that the federal government should hold the line because we all have seen studies that show that simply throwing money at the problem is not the answer. Take Washington, D.C., as the best example: Washington D.C., they have nearly twice the national average in terms of the costs spent per pupil, but yet, they have not improved graduation rates - and so I believe that you hold the line. Secondly, those dollars that the federal government can use to provide assistance to the states, I believe that they should be more than a form of block

grants, and not programs that are going to try and specifically dictate, uh, to the local area and to the states, exactly how they should be used. But I believe that we should hold the line, especially given our national economic situation."

Paul Gigot

19. "Would you abolish the Department of Education? Federal, the Federal Department of Education."

Herman Cain

20. "I think saying that the Federal Department of Education should be abolished is premature from my perspective. I, as president, want to look at the Department of Education and make that determination when all of the facts are considered, when all of the programs are evaluated. One of my guiding principles that I have always used in business, and I'll also use as president, is that if you want to solve a problem, go to the source closest to the problem. I will go to the states, I will go to the local school districts and ask them to help me define what that role should be at the federal level."

Joel Klein

21. "What do you think about vocational training in America – do you think we focus enough on career and vocational training versus traditional academic training, and how would you see the right mix on that?"

Herman Cain

22. "I do not believe that we provide enough attention on vocational training because vocational training and vocational trades, uh, that's something that is part of the fabric of what makes our economy go. Uh, so no, we do not provide enough emphasis in that area, and I believe that we should as part of an overall program to promote good education in America. We should promote vocational schools and vocational training, and the importance of specific vocations, just like we should promote actively the, the involvement of parents in their children's' education."

Joel Klein

23. "And would you put, uh, Federal money against stimulating greater vocational opportunities to uh, implement the kind of policies you're talking about?"

Herman Cain

24. "I would put some, but see, here, here's where I believe that it's a good use of federal dollars – and that is, if you are promoting education in

general, you're promoting parental involvement, that, like I described, and you're promoting the value of vocational careers – yes, that is a good use of federal dollars in order to help raise the level of awareness for the entire country, with respect to the things that we need to do to get more of the population thinking about education and how we make it better."

Paul Gigot

25. "Uh, change the subject a bit to uh, to college, uh, from K through 12. President Obama said in Colorado this week that uh, "college isn't just one of the best investments you can make in your future, it's one of the best investments America can make in our future," meaning, the federal government needs to help finance college education for, um, most Americans. Agree - do you agree with that?"

Herman Cain

26. "I didn't get the last part of the question, sorry."

Paul Gigot

27. "Do you agree with, with – do you agree with President Obama's, uh, statement about funding college education, essentially as a federal entitlement?"

Herman Cain

28. "No, I do not – and here's why. Let's go back to, let's go back to my, my guiding principle: if you want to solve a problem, go to the source closest to the problem. I believe that if a state wants to help with college education, that they should do that. Secondly, you have people living within communities and within states that are willing to help fund those kinds of programs, so I do not believe that it is the responsibility of the federal government to help fund a college education because here again, our resources are limited and I believe that the best solution is the one closest to the problem: the people within the state, the people within the communities, I believe are the ones that ultimately have that responsibility."

Joel Klein

29. "Uh, let me ask you this – if you were advising a young person today, and it costs now over \$200,000 for a four year college education in many universities, would you think that's money well spent, or are there other ways for kids to get what they need in the 21st Century?"

Herman Cain

30. "I think most young people believe that that is money well spent, but here again, you don't have to spend \$200,000 to get a college education, because our colleges and universities compete against one another, and there are instances where young people can get a better value for their money if they make different choices. But I, based upon the number of young people that I have spoken with, they do feel as if that it is worth the investment, and one of the biggest questions I get is, 'will I be able to get a job once I get out of college' – and this is when I get back to our biggest domestic challenge is growing this economy. Yes, we need to improve education, but we've also got to grow this economy at a more robust rate."

Joel Klein

31. "Let me ask you one last question, I know you have to run. But it is statistic, that uh, I read recently that concerns me, which is that America's 200 most competitive colleges today, two-thirds of the kids who go there come from families with the top quartile of income, and only five percent from families with the bottom quartile. Now, that seems to me to be totally inconsistent with the American dream. Does that concern you, and what would you do about it?"

Herman Cain

32. "Well, obviously, it would concern me based upon the way you have stated those statistics, but also, I happen to know that there are a lot of young people who don't come from, uh, high economic income families, and they've made different choices as to the schools that they go to; secondly, like I did, uh, found a way to work my way through school because my parents were not able to do that.

Let me just close with this, with respect to that question: if you want an education, a college education in America, I believe that people can get it if they're determined to get it. They might have to work a little harder, they might have to work a little longer, but the fact that we have so many options for people to get an advanced education in this nation, I think it is one of the big pluses that we have that we offer our young people that a lot of other countries do not offer."

Paul Gigot

33. "All right, thank you very much for uh, uh, your time, Mr. Cain. Uh, uh, we really appreciate it and it's been great having you. Thank you."

It's now, uh, my pleasure to introduce our second, uh, uh, candidate this evening. He is the uh, a former member of congress from the Pittsburgh area, twice elected to the United States Senate in 1994 and again in 2000, and he was one of the architects of the uh, landmark welfare reform law that passed in 1996 and was signed by President Clinton – Senator Rick Santorum. So, your opening remarks."

Rick Santorum

34. "Um, thank you very much, Joel and, and Paul, it's great to be with you, it's great to be in New York, and um, uh, let me just uh, pick up on, on where the discussion left off and, uh, start by saying that I am the father – (*microphone trouble*) –

Karen and I have uh, seven children, and we are, um, we're raising those seven children, the oldest is 20, the youngest is three, and uh, we about 15 years ago we decided uh, that we uh, were gonna try this uh, this new concept called home schooling. And uh, we felt that it was important, uh, for us to um, uh, to focus all of, a lot of our energy in our, in our marriage and our family, in providing our children the best we could possibly give them. And we felt that um, education was not just about academic achievement, but it's also about, uh, molding the moral imagination of our children – uh, teaching them the virtues and values that are important, uh, to be successful as citizens, to be successful uh, in the workplace, and to uh, to be good members of our family. And, and of course, uh, it was also important for us, uh, to, to mold their, their spiritual world, and to uh, to teach them that component of their life – we look at, at a well-rounded or complete individual.

One of the concerns we have with uh, the education system in America today, particularly the public education system, by virtue of a lot of things that have happened – from courts to legislatures – is that we have narrowed the focus of education in our country and, we did so even more with, in my opinion, with 'no child left behind,' uh, to just test, and academics, and just sort of this piece of what education is supposed to be about. And that's a, that was, that's always been a grave concern of mine, that um, when you look at someone even, let's go to the economics of it – someone you're gonna hire. Uh, we've, I've hired a lot of people in my life and, I'd, sure, I'd look at their academic credentials – but I also look as to whether they're honest, whether they're trustworthy, whether they're hard working, whether they've got the, the kind of virtue and, and uh, and, and, and, and character, uh, to do the job.

And I guess one of the, one of the grave concerns I have about all of these discussions about education, and, is that we tend to just talk about a little slice, and we don't talk about what it means to be a good citizen in this country and whether we're teaching citizenship and patriotism and, and understanding our values and roots of who our country is, and we teaching the kind of virtues that are necessary for us to have a civilization which we can live together. And so, one of the concerns I have about the education debate in America is to whether we're really talking about academic debate in America, we're really talking about the whole child, and one of the reasons I've been an advocate of home schooling, and obviously I know, a, most, the vast majority of people don't have in, the, either the time and, and I can tell you, the patience, uh, to, to do that, or the resources to be able to do it.

Uh, one of the things that home schooling has taught us is that, have, and, and, with having seven children, that each of our children learn differently, and that, and that crafting something that works for them is, is, takes

time, it takes effort on the part of those involved in our little education world to make sure that we get it right; and that if we had just sort of a school, the Santorum school, and said we're gonna do this the same for everybody, uh, I don't think all of our children would ha, would be what uh, where, where, they are today. So I, I just throw that out as, as something that we need to think about in, and how are we – it's not just about how are we gonna achieve and compete economically and getting the best test scores.

Competing economically, I'll take the C student who works their tail off, and honest and loyal, and does the kinds of things that are necessary to get the job done – and I don't know if we measure that, I don't know if we understand that. And I, I really do think that sometimes when it comes to the education, uh, debate in our country, it's too narrow, and we need to think broadly and we need to think how more broadly we're gonna be able to solve this problem. The problem in our country - yes, we have decl - you know, where our academic standards are not increasing; but our culture, and what, and, and the products coming into our school as well as exiting our school, is a very big concern for a lot of pe, people, including teachers who I hear from on a regular basis.

So I'll stop with that, I know I'm sort of out of time and..."

Joel

35. "Oh, no, no, we want to get broad – let's start narrow and then we'll build broad, okay. So, no, no, and, and let me ask you directly, I mean, we have a nation right now where about a third of our children are proficient in math and in English. Globally we're falling behind; we used to lead the way in the uh, industrialized countries, in terms not just about performance, but people today in America who are 55 to 64, we have a net population, a third of the college graduates. People who are 25 to 34, we've got a fifth, and we're moving in the wrong direction.

Now, I do want to get broad, 'cause I think it's important – but staying right there, that must trouble you, I assume."

Rick Santorum

36. "It does. When I talk to teachers, and this sort of comes back to the point I was just making at the end – the, the greatest concern I have, that teachers have with me is parents involvement in their education, and children being prepared to learn when they come. I know at one of the, one of the um, um, points in reading some of the materials that the College Board sent me was, one of their things was to have, you know, early childhood education intervention. How about early parent intervention with their children? Instead of focusing on the child and getting them out of the home and into an educational setting, how about focusing on the parents and trying to get the parents more interested and involved. Parents are the first teacher. I always say, when I give my little stump speech which I spared you today, by the way – uh, that I, I say that we should have a, an educational system that serves the customer of the education system;

and of course the customer of the education system is the parent. Why? Well first, because they're responsible for educating their children – they do so from the moment they're born, in some cases even before as they sing to them in the womb. But they educate their children, that's their job. Number two, they pay for it – so of course they're in, in, directly the customer. And so, what, I think, the key to turning all this around is to help the family.

I wrote a book, uh, in response to another book written by a senator from New York, uh, called *It Takes A Village* – uh, I wrote a book called *It Takes A Family*, and I, I think if we're really gonna solve and crack this nut of the education problem in America, we've got to, to, to do some things to, to help repair and, and bring parents back into the scene. Don't – the, the idea that at a certain age, you sort of drop your kids off and you're done with this and it's now somebody else's job, is, is the cancer that, that is killing the education system in this country, in my opinion."

Paul Gigot

37. "What's, what role can a president play in um, in driving that, in driving that uh, that conversation particularly since I assume it, it conflicts with what otherwise would be your support for relatively local control at the state and local level?"

Rick Santorum

38. "Paul, you know this, because you've, you've been a, you know, covering the political scene for a long time. Um, in the last few weeks, what have we been talking about – for a lot of reasons, but go back three or four weeks, we had a sort of a conversation in America about uh, millionaires and billionaires and sort of class warfare. I mean, there was this discussion about that and everyone was talking about you know, what people should pay – why? Because the president was talking about it.

One of the things I learned as a United States senator, is the greatest, one of the greatest powers I had, you know this – is the power to convene. The power to bring the, a, a subject matter to, to the forefront because you've had a meeting or a hearing or something, and the president has an enormous ability to use the power of his office to start a national debate and discussion. And I know too often, that power is used for political purposes to sort of you know, tweak, well I've got to talk about this today and talk about that tomorrow. I think that Americans, uh, are looking for someone to have a real discussion and not to solve the problem, but to, to engage in what the problem is and how we as a country can work together – how people through their own initiatives in the local level.

I use the example, uh, in, in my book, of a, of a town in uh, Chattanooga, Tennessee, that found out that they had the highest, one of the highest divorce rates in their state, they had one of the highest out of wedlock birth rates and fathers, of uh, you know, not providing for their children in the

State of Tennessee. Without any federal dollars or any state dollars, the community got together and said, this is not good – this is hurting our education system, it's hurting our social service system, it's hurting our economy. And so the school district got together with the, with the business community and the, and, and all of the different levers of power in Chattanooga, and they put forth a program called First Things First – and they actually talked about marriage in schools; they talked about the importance of husbands and wives coming together, not just from the standpoint of relationships, but what marriage really means, what the impact is on the, on, on their children economically. We all know that within uh, two peried mar – two parents married homes that the rate of drug abuse and, and drop out and crime and out of wedlock birth is dramatically lower.

So again, it's not necessarily what law we pass or how much money we put in, but using this great resource – you, the American public, and, and the ideas that can come from uh, from local communities, uh, to uh, to make a difference I think is uh, is a good start."

Paul Gigot

39. "Do you think then that, uh, that the national government ought to drive a national curriculum along these lines?"

Rick Santorum

40. "No. No. I mean, again, we have the discussion, you know, I'll give you the example of uh, what Michelle Obama's doing, uh, with uh, with, with childhood obesity, a legitimate, a legitimate issue in this country. Um, there are a lot of schools that have now adopted things dealing with thus, in school lunch programs, there, I'm sure there are people in, in, hopefully, in their homes that have, that have looked at this issue. Sometimes it just takes the discussion to have to, to bring these issues to the fore – there may be some, some things on a, on a federal level that we can do to, to encourage the debate. But I, I, I don't want to, I don't want to you know, put my finger on the scale here. I think there are, there are different ways of, of solving this problem and, um, the most important thing is getting parents engaged in the discussion."

Joel Klein

41. "So, let's talk about in terms of getting parents engaged, one of the things that parents often talk about is choice. Now, in terms of both your values agenda and your view of parents, should we give parents vouchers, let them choose among all the schools – home schooling, religious schools, private schools – is that a policy you would favor. We're gonna, and then we'll come to what role the feds have in that policy."

Rick Santorum

42. "Yeah, I, I, I don't know if you, you used the term choice – but I, I sort of envision a, a model where the school districts work with the parents to design a curriculum in a, and a educational setting for each child. I mean, why can't we customize the education system in this country, I mean the education system in this country was developed during the uh, the industrial age when we, all these people went into factories and, then we put all these kids into factories and we called them schools, and we really still have sort of the factory model. And we don't produce goods and ser – we don't produce goods in America the way we did a hundred years ago, yet in some respects, we still use that model for the education system."

Joel Klein

43. "So if I were a parent and I said, 'for my child, I would like to send my child to a religious school; you spend about \$12,000 a pupil in Pennsylvania, is it okay if I take my \$12,000 and spend it at this religious school in the community?' Would you, would you support that or not?"

Rick Santorum

44. "I would absolutely support it, and the reason is again, I, you know, let's go back to the, to the foundational issue here – which is, uh, you know, people talk, 'well separation of church and state, you've got to separate church and state.' Find it in the constitution – the words don't exist in the constitution. The words in the constitution is the, that congress shall make no law with respect to the establishment of religion, and when you have a choice as to what school you send your children to, the state isn't imposing anything on you. The state isn't, uh, the state is actually allowing you. The other phrase in the constitution that deals with religion with is the free exercise thereof.

And so, we need to, we need to say look, if it's important for parents to, to have their child in an environment where their moral and spiritual as well as their academic life is, is provided for, then why are we denied that when the parents are responsible and, and this is what they want to do, and that they paid for in the first place. It, it doesn't seem to me to be against anything that our founders or anybody, frankly, with an honest view of the role of church and state should object to, when the decision is made not by the government to send your child to a particular sectarian institution, but when the parents decide that this is what is in the best instance for their child and simply that government is pl – the only, by the way, the government supports sectarian institutions on higher education; they just don't in lower education for, again, if the parents have the choice, I don't see the violation of the constitution."

Joel Klein

45. "Is there a federal role in that? As you, as president, would you try to drive those policies, incentivize them through federal _____ 0:39:48..."

Rick Santorum

46. "...again I would, uh, the an, uh, you know, this gets back to that, that, that, that little squishy area about how much the federal or, federal government injects itself in. But I certainly from the standpoint of, of, uh, of allowing federal funds to be used for that purpose, absolutely they should be able to be used for that purpose."

Joel Klein

47. "You mentioned local control and that, this, this ideal of the parents working with local school districts to, to change the schools. It's a nice vision, but a lot of the research by Terry Moe and others, about school governance and local school districts, um, has shown at least persuas, persuasively to me, that that is not the reality; that the reality is that basically, that process is controlled by the people who are most interested in it, which is not the parents who are busy and have a lot of other things to do, but by the teachers, their unions, and the local bureaucracy, and that prevents reform from taking place. Pers, lot of reformers want that federal role precisely to be able to break up that kind of process. Aren't you essentially surrendering, if you surrender that national role, surrendering uh, reform, uh, to, to those groups?"

Rick Santorum

48. "I'm not surrendering it because uh, you know, driving it through, you know, passing laws is one thing. Uh, driving it through having that national discussion and, and, and working with governors and working with local school districts and, you know, I'm, I'm someone who's not opposed and, uh, you know, as, as president, like I was when I was a United States senator – getting into these local communities and, and, and being an advocate, talking about these things. I just highlighted one program in one city, I'll be happy to do that on a regular basis. Look, this is a national debate; you're right, parents have been alienated from the process in part be, uh, because they've been told to sit down and shut up, and, and you know, they're busy, and they're, got lots of things on their mind and they, 'well you know, at least they're getting something.' We have, I think we just have to change that dynamic in this country and I think it can...parents, I hear this from, you know, um, from parents all the time, I mean, you know, they would, uh, sure, there are bad parents out there but gosh, we can't design an education system around parents who aren't doing their job, we have to design an, with the, with the expectation, the hope, if that, parents really do love their children and want what's best for them, and that we need to give them the best opportunity to engage in that process, and um, I, I think you'll see, you'll start to see real changes. You know, we, when I came to the United States Senate, in, back in 1994, I think it was, I think education funding from the federal government was two to three percent; now it's about ten percent. We really don't

have much to show for it, folks. We keep expanding it, or we can really look at how the, the kind of fundamental change and it has to be, um, mom and dad, and um, I think that'll make all the difference."

Paul Gigot

49. "Ask the same we asked Mr. Cain – would you abolish the Department of Education?"

Rick Santorum

50. "I, you know, I'm, I have a, given a single speech – I've heard lots of candidates, you know, say, 'I'll abolish this and I'll abolish this.' I'm not a, I'm not an anti- candidate. I'm not, 'I'm gonna get rid of this.' I'm, uh, you know, 'get rid of this department or that.' I, I want to talk about what I'm for, and you just heard the vision of what I'm for. There's not a big role for the federal government in what I'm for. Uh, lets, so let's just put it that way, uh, that we'll work on policies and painting a positive vision for this country and what, what um, you know, where, where we can both achieve academically and prepare our kids, but also prepare good citizens and, and good hard workers and folks who will be you know, um, the kind of folks that uh, you want to live next door to, uh, in uh, in, in this country."

Joel Klein

51. "One of the things I heard you for at the outset and I said we wanted it broad, and it is a values education, the issues of citizenship, you know, that we were focused somewhat narrowly on the academics. So I'd like to explore how you do things like that. We have a country, when it comes to values, that in many ways, we're not in, all in agreement; there are highly polarized views. And take the issue right now which is in New York and elsewhere, just a simple thing like sex education, and how much we should have or shouldn't have, and these are real world issues in our city, for example. How would you deal with something like that?"

Rick Santorum

52. "Well I would say this – that we agree on many more values than we think we do, number one. Um, certainly that's one that, that there's disagreement. How many disagree that people should be honest? How many people disagree we should be truthful, that should be, should be loyal, that should be te – there's all sorts of val, values, virtues; there are very strong and common agreeing with, number one. Number two, that's why you have the flexibility to be able to go to a, to an educational institution that reflects the values that the parents want to inculcate into their children. And if the parents here in New York want to (inculcate) those values into their children, then they go to the schools that, that reflect those values. But to impose those values, uh, in, and by

the way, there may be things that I want to send my, my kid to a, to a school in New York in the arts, because they have a tremendous talent in the arts and as a result they're gonna be exposed to things that I, I may not – well, that's a balancing act, and we all, you know, there's, there's very little perfect in this world, and so you have to, you have to make those choices. But again, it's, it's really the uh, the opportunity to have different choices to be able to um, uh, to mold your children in the way that you think is in the best interest of them that, that really counts here."

Paul Gigot

53. "You're not against states, uh, driving a common curriculum within a state, are you – because one of the arguments in favor of the public schools historically has been its uh, the fact that it inculcates our kids with those common civic values, and uh, um, the, one of the arguments against vouchers has been, over time, that in fact you could get this effect where we don't share all of that kind of instruction. So, who drives the common curriculum that we would all share?"

Rick Santorum

54. "Yeah, uh – I, look, the curriculum is important, but there's a lot more than curriculum that goes into the values the ch, the children are taught that are important, that hold us together. The things I just talked about, uh, are, are things that, uh, that are, that are, I think should be part of an educational experience but in many cases are not incul, the curriculum. Uh, obviously I would make the argument that a lot of the curriculum, when it comes to civics education, is not reflective of the, the core values of this country, and that we've gotten off the path in lar, in many respects because of, in some respects because of the federal government's intrusion in that. So, this is a battle uh, I, I would, I would trust, candidly, to the states, and I, as, I'm not a governor, but um, at some level, I would trust to the localities to uh, uh, to reflect those. I think you're gonna find a lot more common sense and, and uh, again, reflective of the values of the community, the closer you can get those, uh, that decision to them."

Joel Klein

55. "In a practical sense, so, for example, someone runs a school district, whether it's here in New York City or in Philadelphia, so forth. You, you've got to deal with these issues, and it's not so easy to say, I mean, you were able to home school your kids; I daresay most people in America, certainly in this city, don't have the ability to home school their kids – they're working two jobs, and also - so when you to issues like tolerance, and the values about heterosexuality, homosexuality – and these are, I remember, white hot issues when I was chancellor. Do you really want the public schools to get in the middle of those things?"

Rick Santorum

56. "The are in the middle of those things, I mean, they're in the middle of them right now, they're in the middle of them with uh, you know, here in New York City, um, you know, teaching kids to use condoms – that's in the middle of those issues..."

Joel Klein

57. "...that's what I'm saying...but that's a, that..."

Rick Santorum

58. "...they've come down on, ups and down on that."

Joel Klein

59. "But that, those are values issues..."

Rick Santorum

60. "Exactly, they are values issues."

Joel Klein

61. "But do you want to have, I mean, is New York City, on the use of condoms..."

Rick Santorum

62. "They're doing it..."

Joel Klein

63. "Is that, is that good or bad?"

Rick Santorum

64. "Well I, uh, the point is they're doing it, and parents are stuck, that if, if you are in a situation where, uh, where we are today, where you don't have options, they're stuck, and your children are gonna be inculcated with values that are inconsistent with your moral framework. Uh, we shouldn't do, we shouldn't, we shouldn't do that to uh, uh, to parents in this country. Parents should, should be, if they have the responsibility to educate their children, that governments should respect that; that means some people are gonna be educated in a way that I find absolutely deplorable – but it's their ki, it's their children; that's what freedom is about, is uh, allowing, allowing those parents, that – I remember when

we first start home schooling 15 years ago in Pennsylvania, you would've thought we were, you know, uh, vigilantes. I mean they, the, the, the teachers unions in Pennsylvania, this was the most anti-homeschooling state in the country. It made you bring reams and reams of material, uh, that, that showed that you were, you were doing all this work with your children. Now that's changed over time, home schooling's been more accepted. But it was the idea of this suspicion that somehow parents are gonna do something harmful to their children. Sure, there are parents who, you know, are not good parents, but the vast majority of parents are, you know, love their children and if uh, again, re-energized into the education process, uh, can be a very important value add to have them be involved in making sure that their children have, are, are going to places that reflect the values uh, that they're trying to inculcate into their kids."

Joel Klein

65. "I want to get to college but would you, would you eliminate compulsory K to 12 education in America?"

Rick Santorum

66. "No, no."

Joel Klein

67. "So the parent doesn't have the choice not to send your kid to some form of organ - and I assume, beyond home schooling, they have to meet certain standards – you can't just say, 'I'm gonna educate my kid at home, and to do it any way I want'."

Rick Santorum

68. "Well I, I would just say this – you're right, I mean, they have, their, they have to show that they've engaged their children in education. Uh, all I know is that most colleges and universities right now are clamoring after home schooled kids, uh, and they do very, very well in uh, in, in the uh, in the educational world. Uh, so I, I would just say that – well, that may not be true for your college, I don't know. But uh, the bottom line, the bottom line is that these kids do very, very well. They, they, they, they exceed, uh, you know, uh, on a lot of different levels and, uh, I'm, I'm very comfortable with parents having that, that responsibility again. If you say, 'well, you know, they're not doing as well academically' – if that's all you measure, if that's all you care about, then you can go ahead and mu, murmur in the crowd; but there's more to those children, there's more than just academics that uh, that is valued by society, uh, and I think we under-appreciate that when it comes to our education system."

Paul Gigot

69. "On the, uh, college, uh, point, uh, the uh, story came out recently that uh, student debt, student loan debt is a, a trillion dollars. Um, have we over-emphasized the value of a college education in this society, should we be thinking about other al, more alternatives for more kids?"

Rick Santorum

70. "Yeah. One of the, you know, Paul, one of the things that I talked about my educ, my um, economic plan, is to try to uh, revitalize the manufacturing sector of our economy. Uh, what, what we've seen in America is this widening gap. It's true, I think republicans 0:51:01 don't talk about this, this widening gap and the hollowing out of the middle income of America is because we have folks who are not college educated, uh, who are not uh, don't have the skill sets that's necessary to, to get jobs that are high enough paying to, to, to support a family. And the, of course the answer that is to uh, have available other types of training – first you have to have the jobs, and that's one of the things that I've focused on. but then you have to make sure that educational dollars that go for uh, for higher education, go for this other type of education to train people on skills that are necessary for them to be able to uh, to, uh, to upgrade their employment opportunities, so uh, that, to me, that equity with respect to uh, educational opportunities for college-bound versus trade school or vocational-bound, uh, has to be, has to be maintained and it even, even accentuated."

Joel Klein

71. "And in term, in terms of sort of the, this hollowing out of the middle class - we're finding more and more that kids from affluent families are going to the most competitive colleges and kids from poorer. What, if anything, should we be concerned about it, and if so, what should we be doing about it?"

Rick Santorum

72. "What, as, having two kids who were admitted to college and they're not in a, the top area – I went to a state school, I went to Penn State, 7 and 1, I always say we're the worst 7 and 1 football team in America, but still, we're 7 and 1. Uh, the, look, uh, we just, just because it's the top, I can tell you, I mean does it, I don't think it means that necessarily it's the best. Uh, there are a lot of great schools out there that don't charge an arm and a leg and provide a tremendous opportunity. I mean obviously, uh, as we all know, uh, at those quote top institutions, you hang out with the top people – and that's, that's one of the quote advantages of going to a school like that, and when it's closed off or at least limited, uh, you know, that, that does prevent that type of network to be developed that could benefit you in the future.

How do we fix that, when they're private schools in most cases, is a pretty difficult thing. I mean it's, private schools and most of these colleges and

univ are very well endowed and uh, don't rely as much on the public funds as, as other institutions. So, um, it's an interesting dis, discussion to have, I'm not too sure that I, I have any great prescription for it. uh, but just to say that I, um, I felt like uh, I did okay, and I had great opportunities going to a good state school, and my kids are going to small private schools and I feel like they're getting the kind of education that's gonna prepare them to be really great ki, great uh, great adults, and uh, and great contributors to our country."

Paul Gigot

73. "Senator Santorum, thanks very much for being here."

Rick Santorum

74. "Thank you, God bless."

Joel Klein

75. "Okay, our next uh, interview is gonna be with Michele Bachmann, who's also joining us by satellite and we thank her for that. Uh, as you probably know, Congresswoman Bachmann, uh, serves as, she was the first woman elected in 2006 to the congress from Minnesota; she's been in the House of Representatives for the past six years, she was a member before that of the Minnesota senate, and prior to that, practiced as a lawyer in the field of uh, tax. So we welcome you and thank you for joining us this afternoon. We'll have your opening statement."

Michele Bachmann

76. "Thank you, it's a privilege, I only wish I could be there in person."

Joel Klein

77. "Why don't we start with your opening statement."

Michele Bachmann

78. "Thank you so much for allowing me – thank you so much, I appreciate it, and uh, perhaps before we go any further, there is a, uh, if, if perhaps the microphone could be fixed, all of the noise is coming back into my ear, I apologize."

Paul Gigot

79. "Well I think we can try to do that – can you, can you hear us, uh, right now, or are you just getting a reverberation?"

Michele Bachmann

80. "I can hear you just – I can hear you just fine the reverberation is coming back in my ear, I'm sorry for that."

Paul Gigot

81. "Can they – well, we're not there, so can somebody – did you see somebody who can fix it there or uh, uh, otherwise do you think you can..."

Michele Bachmann

82. "I think we need an education here, could someone please fix the um, audio, is that possible? Okay."

Joel Klein

83. "Good news is, she didn't say we were the problem, right, and, and the sign here says 'stall,' just so you know (*laughter*).

Michele Bachmann

84. "I'm so sorry we have to go through this, I'm very sorry. Okay, we'll try for just a second – are they working on it?"

Paul Gigot

85. "Well, Joel, uh..."

Joel Klein

86. "The answer is no, I'm not gonna throw my hat in the ring."

Paul Gigot

87. "No, what I'm gonna ask him is, did uh, do you think you dodged a bullet by not being the Secretary of Education?"

Joel Klein

88. " I, I actually think the current secretary, and we should talk about it, I think the current secretary is doing a lot of really good work, and uh, I, I think his race to the top initiative, uh, has had a very good impact. I can tell you personally, it really was responsible for lifting the charter cap here in New York, and enabled us to open up a whole bunch of schools, uh, and brought some legislation on uh, teacher evaluation.

So, and one of the things that strikes me and it's an interesting historical fact – but if you start in the late 80's, after A Nation At Risk, there really

was a remarkable bi-partisan coalition on education reform and the role of the national government, that really became to – okay, I think we're ready for..."

Paul Gigot

89. "Are we, are we back? We're back, okay."

Joel Klein

90. "Phew! Right in the nick of time."

Paul Gigot

91. "Congresswoman, we'd love to hear your opening remarks."

Michele Bachmann

92. "Well, thank you, you're so patient and I appreciate that. I only wish that I could be with you. I'm sorry, I can still hear it – if you don't mind, I'll remove my earpiece and I'll give my opening statement. (*Okay.*)

Michele Bachmann

93. "I apologize for these technical difficulties. My name is Michele Bachmann, I'm extremely grateful for this opportunity to be able to be in front of the College Board – this is a very important subject that we're dealing with, both the K-12 education system, and higher ed as well, and I wanted, uh, to be with you in person, I'm only sorry that I can't be.

Education is the reason that I became involved in politics – I did not have a political background, I was not interested in politics, but I, I came to politics because as a mother, I was involved in our children's education – we have five biological children, and over the years my husband and I took in and uh, raised 23 foster children. Uh, with our foster children I became very concerned by state law in the state of Minnesota, they are mandated that they have one education choice and that is the public schools; and in the public schools I was very concerned with what they were bringing home in the backpack, in particular, one of our 11th grade foster daughters for her math homework brought home homework that was coloring posters. Now that's something that our three and four year olds did, but that wasn't something that I expected that our 11th graders would do, and I was concerned on several levels: first of all, I felt if anyone needed a leg-up with education, and a positive education, it was our foster children. Number two, I was very worried about what this would mean for employers, if she wasn't able to be prepared to go and have a job, and I was also worried about what this would mean for general productivity in our society – because education really is the lifter for people in the United States, I saw that in my own life.

I was born into a middle class family, but I, when I was 12 years old our parents were divorced, we went from middle class to below poverty almost overnight, and my mother said something to me at the time because we'd lost almost everything as a family, financially. She said to me, 'Michelle, there's one thing that can never be taken away from you, and it's your education.' And I was 13 years old, but I listened to my mother and I applied myself in school, and I was lucky – Minnesota and Iowa both had very good public schools, and I studied, I worked very hard, we had absolutely no money, and I had worked – I worked at jobs through high school, and so when I went to college I also worked.

Now, credits were much cheaper, and I didn't have a lot of guidance. I started out at a local community college – at that time, credit hours were eight dollars a credit hour; but even so, I, I worked about three jobs to put myself through, uh, the community college, and then I moved onto a state school from there. After that, I put myself through law school, and then through a post-doctorate program in federal tax law at the College of William and Mary. I believe very strongly in education – I've been a recipient of a good education, and I'm very grateful for that.

And so, I became involved as a parent because of what I saw with our foster children. I was very concerned about the educational standards in Minnesota, they'd always been very high, and I was worried that the curriculum and the assignments that I was seeing coming home in the backpack weren't what I thought were high academics. I began a course of study, investigating what was going on in our schools, and I gave five years of my life to this effort, dealing with education reform in Minnesota.

There was an education reform movement that had started at the federal level called Goals 2000, and School To Work. It was very well-intentioned, but I saw the results in our local school classroom, and what I saw is that there is a diminution of emphasis on knowledge, facts and information – in other words, a shared body of knowledge – and what I saw put in its place was an emphasis on politically correct attitudes, values and beliefs. Now, one may agree or disagree with those attitudes, values and beliefs, but there was no doubt a shift in what was going on in the local school classroom, and I became involved.

And so as a parent, I, I started to work for academic excellence in our Minnesota public schools, and as a result of that work, I ran for the Minnesota state senate. I served on the education committee when I was there, and I'm happy to say that after five years worth of work, we were the first state in the country that had repealed our national education standards that were imposed on Minnesota through Goals 2000, and we were able to improve our academic standards. Because I believe for all children, they deserve the absolute best, and I'd like to add as well, I want to get your questions, but I've – I also want to add, my husband and I worked together with several other couples, and we started the first K-12 charter school in the United States in Minnesota, in our city, for at-risk children, and it's still going on today. It's nearly 20 years old, and we're proud of that option that we have in Minnesota. Minnesota was the

first state in the nation that had offer charter schools – it's not the answer for everyone, but it was one answer, and we were, I was very proud to be a part of that effort as well, and now I'll try to put my earpiece back in and we'll hope that this works. And thank you for your patience."

Paul Gigot

94. "All right, well thank you for your remarks, uh, congresswoman. Uh, and I hope we can, I hope you can hear this. Um, let – I want to talk about uh, this, the federal role in education, in particular, the No Child Left Behind act, which was promote – proposed and signed by a republican president, pushed through congress by the current republican speaker of the house when he was chairing the education committee. Has that law, after decades of experience with it, in your estimation been a success or a failure?"

Michele Bachmann

95. "Well I think I would say that I think it's delivered less than what had been hoped initially, and I think it's important to know that No Child Left Behind is really a continuation of the Elementary and Second Education Act which was first put into place in, in about 1965 through Lyndon Baines Johnson, and that's really Title One, and that was the, the aim was to increase the academic standards of low economic, of, of children from low economic backgrounds. No Child Left Behind, the purpose was to hold the local public schools accountable (*right*). What we received, however, in the local public schools was more bureaucracy – it was a well intentioned law, but what I saw firsthand as a parent is that the federal government essentially took over control of the local schools, both through imposing national standards on the local schools, and also with curriculum that uh, essentially became nationalized curriculum in many respects, and then the testing - the testing also became nationalized in many respects. On one hand, the argument would be, 'Well isn't this a good thing? We want all children to come up to a certain standard?' But what I saw happen is that a bar was, was put by the federal government for a standard, but it was a bar that was low enough that all children could go uh, could achieve that bar; but the problem is, often times, that's where the bar remained, and so we weren't seeing children excelling at the level that we had hoped that they would – again, well intentioned; I don't think that it achieved the result that they had hoped."

Joel Klein

96. "Do you think there's a role for the federal government in K to 12 education in America?"

Michele Bachmann

97. "I think you asked me the question, is there a role for the federal government in K-12 education (*right, that's right*). And, and my, and, and my

opinion is, I believe that children would be better served, and I believe that society would be better served if that role would devolve back to the states and to the local governments for each state to figure out. We've had this experiment with the federal government involved in education. Really the genesis came primarily in a big way in 1965 through the Greta Society programs, and it was enhanced even more, uh, I think, in the 90's and certainly expanded in, in the 2000's under George Bush with No Child Left Behind. I don't think that the billions that have been expended by the fe, federal government have born the fruit that they thought.

If you go back to 1983 and the study that was done, *A Nation At Risk*, I'm sure that you can quote, uh, the language verbatim. Um, I can't but I'll paraphrase, that uh, if, if any nation had its education standards lowered to the extent that they were, that it would be considered an act of war by an outside nation. I'm very concerned about education, both from children who come from intact families and also children who are at risk. My husband and I have dealt with both at-risk children, and obviously that come from an intact family; all children deserve a chance at a great education, and not all children come from the same type of family backgrounds, but I think it's important that children have an academic, focused education so that all of them get a chance at the most positive background that they possibly can have, and I believe that the best results emanate from the local level, and I would like to see as much control remain both in the hands of parents, because parents truly do know what is best for their children, but also in the hands of the local public schools."

Paul Gigot

98. "But what about the accountability provisions of uh, No Child Left Behind, I mean, for the first time, they focused on the achievement gap, for example, between minority children and, and, and white kids, privileged kids. Uh, you saw, they focused attention where finally we saw those differences. You also, we've also required schools that were failing, for the first time, to be able to have to face some accountability. Hasn't that been a useful exercise for even schools at the local level to have to, to, for, so parents can understand when their schools aren't measuring up?"

Michele Bachmann

99. "Well that, that was the intention, and No Child Left Behind was about data gathering, you're exactly right – but actually that isn't necessarily what the schools are about is data gathering; they're about passing on a body of knowledge to the next generation, and again, my preference would be to see the end of the federal government involvement, and to enhance the um, and to enhance the local schools and the parent's hand in all of that.

If you look at the academic standards and if you look at the outcome prior to the imposition of a (Federal Department of Education), and again, we didn't have a Federal Department of Education until the late 1970's

under President Carter – prior to that time, if you look at the educational outcomes, the outcomes were actually higher prior to the federal government Department of Education than they were after."

Joel Klein

100. "Would you uh, continue federal funding for education in some form of block grant or otherwise?"

Michele Bachmann

101. "Well I've had many discussions on this, and I've been involved with other members of congress. My preference, again, would be to see the money go back down to the states and I'll tell you why: there's approximately today 4200 employees at the Federal Department of Education making on average one, over \$103,000 dollars a year – that was last year. This year, there will be a 23 percent increase at the Federal Department of Education, and I believe that the department will grow from 4200 employees to 4600 employees, so we're seeing a great growth in education bureaucracy, I believe that they'll expend 1.8 billion dollars, but I also believe that that money, those monies would be better spent in the local classroom, and better determined by local parents. And, uh, I, again, I think it's important that we keep it as local as possible, but I think we need to strengthen the parents hands of children – they have had very, very little power in the past, in, in controlling the direction of their children, and I think the more choices we can put in the hands of parents, the better we'll be."

Joel Klein

102. "Let me just be clear about one thing, uh, right now, the federal government under Title 1, the Education For All Handicapped Act, and other federal provisions, spends maybe 30 billion, 30-plus billion dollars a year that they send to the states for education. Would you continue those federal expenditures or would you eliminate them?"

Michele Bachmann

103. "I believe you're talking, if you're talking about Title 1, that that would be under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and again, uh, I, I think that this money is better spent at the local level and when the money is taken from the states and sent to the federal government, there, that money is skimmed off the top and it stays in Washington D.C. to feed the bureaucracy, and I'd prefer to see that money stay in the states, and each of the states would then determine how best to spend that money. There, there is a terrible inequity in the way that spend – money is spent locally per student; I see that in my own state of Minnesota; a tremendous inequity between uh, could be the exact similarly situated child, but because they're in a different district, monies are expended far uh, far more unequally, depending upon, uh, the, the formulas that are set up to,

to uh, to teach children. And again, I think it, it's important to remember that parents need to have a say in the schooling and what they see would best suit the needs of that child."

Paul Gigot

104. "If the uh, states and localities are supposed to lead the reform effort, then uh, who would be your models that you've seen over the last several years, either governors or local leaders who've really done, who has led on this in a way that you admire, uh, and that you think should be a model, and, and why. What have they done."

Michele Bachmann

105. "Well, I think in Minnesota, in my home state, one thing that we tried to do and that we did successfully of all 50 states in the country, we were the only state that had repealed the imposed federal standards, and we, we changed and put our in, our new standards in. I don't know that any other state has done that other than Minnesota; and what we did is we had a academic based standards set, and we, we increased those standards for every child. And I think that was a positive. So I'm very grateful for what we were able to accomplish in Minnesota, and um, not to be self-aggrandizing, but that was the bill that I had introduced and championed and put five years of my life into improving. I believe that this is an extremely important issue across the country, education. And we're not only hurting the children themselves, the parents, but we're hurting employers and we're hurting America's productivity if we don't focus on academic achievement for every child. I don't believe that the best model is centralization of power in the federal government in Washington D.C.; I think that the better model is de-centralization, all the way down to the home so that the parent can have the, can be empowered to choose the best educational option for their children. One option that is available, I know in our state and in many states, is the fact that parents, if they so choose, can have virtual education via technology in the internet beamed into their own home, and it's paid for by tax money. And so parents could be homeschooler's if they would like, for instance, uh, and do that at home – or, they can have a semi-option where they are involved with public school teachers but they also have curriculum that they beam at home as well.

In our family's case, my husband and I taught our biological children how to read at home. We felt that reading is so crucial, that if a child knows how to read, they can almost be self-educated if they're highly motivated. Now, that isn't to say that we let the children to themselves, we certainly didn't. But we believe that as parents, it was our responsibility to make sure that our children at least were proficient in reading, and that's a real concern in America; we still haven't got a very good handle on teaching children how to read. We have a much poorer rate of literacy today than we did right after the turn of the century, uh, you know, 111 years ago."

Joel Klein

106. "Congresswoman, do you, do you think that there's a federal role for supporting college education through, which as you know currently it's a considerable role through Pell Grants and student loans – do you think that should continue?"

Michele Bachmann

107. "I think the direction that the president suggested earlier this week is completely wrong, and I disagreed with the president's formula for having the federal government essentially take over student loans through the Obamacare Bill. Uh, that's, that was the locus of that, uh, transfer of authority. I think that it was unwise for the president to make the suggestion that he did. One, I believe it's abuse of power from the executive to impose via an executive order, a wholesale change in the student loans. Uh, formerly, the student loans were limited to 15 percent of income; now they will be devolved down to 10 percent of income, the repayment rate, over a period of 20 years, and then the loans will be forgiven after 20 years. This, this will lead to a bubble in education; this year we're, we'll be crossing the threshold of over 100 billion dollars that will be uh, ta, borrowed by, by students, and we now have passed the threshold of a trillion dollars in student loan debt. I, I fear that we are creating another bubble and the federal government is inducing that bubble and adding to that bubble. (Congresswoman...) and uh, there is certainly, obviously, higher education is a tremendous benefit in the United States, (Congresswoman..) but I think we are putting forth disincentives for work, for college graduates (Congresswoman), uh, because there will be the greatest incentive to borrow as the maximum amount of money, and then the, the disincentive to work, uh, because um, because of the limits on in, um, on the amount of repayment based upon income (Congresswoman), to extend that out as long as possible (Congresswoman), then in fact not have a repayment of the student loan, and it is a matter of fact, that's something we've seen, uh, most recently in some of the Occupy Wall Street forums, where uh, people have been calling for the federal government just to assume the student loan debt; I think that's a tremendous moral hazard in our society, because I think that, that we need to ha, we need to, there is a morality in keeping our financial promises, and I don't think that we should um, push that off onto the taxpayer. I think the individual needs to repay and be responsible for repaying their student loan debt."

Joel Klein

108. "Congresswoman, I, I don't know if you can hear us right now but I want to, on behalf of everyone here, thank you and apologize for whatever inconvenience the earpiece had, but we really appreciate your hanging in there with us, and thank you for your participation this afternoon."

Michele Bachmann

109. "Well, thank you for your graciousness, your kindness and your understanding. Thank you so much."

Joel Klein

110. "I believe our final, uh, candidates, uh, this evening is here, uh, yes? Uh, he, we have the former two-term Speaker of the House, who in 1994 helped to usher in the uh, first republican majority in 40 years at that time. He describes himself as a history teacher, and as the author of at least eight books, I may have missed one or two or more than that, on subjects ranging from American revolution, the American revolution, to reforming the modern federal government, uh, speaker Newt Gingrich. Mister speaker. You've got some time for opening remarks."

Newt Gingrich

111. "Okay. Well, I wanted to share with all of you a couple of quick thoughts, and I think you all have a handout that is the links to sort of newt.org and the things we're doing there. Start with the basis of the American system. Um, in the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, the founding fathers who are trying to organize, um, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan and part of Wisconsin, write, religion, morality and knowledge being important. It is vital to have good schools, and that leads to uh, the federal government giving land to the territories to organize and pay for schools.

Uh, interestingly, a couple of years ago when the Capitol Visitors Center was being developed, the staff, for whatever reason, cut off the first three words, and began knowledge being important. But I want to go back to the founding fathers model, and say, suggest to you that, that in their sense of religion, they're not talking about a state religion, they're talking about an understanding of larger meanings of life than just secular. 1:19:04 a Jefferson writes in 1820 – anybody who believes that you can be free and civilized without knowledge is asking for something that's impossible, that never has been and never will be – I'm paraphrasing, but you have the exact quote.

We had a couple example in my own career, in, in, of how much trouble we're in. In 1983, the Reagan administration released a report called A Nation At Risk, and said, what we're doing to our children is so bad that if a foreign power did it, we would consider it an act of war. And I went around the country with Secretary Bell and we held hearings and governors gave, giving speeches, and there was a brief flurry of, of reformism, and it began to die out. Then in the 1990's there was a little bit of reformism, uh, Bill Clinton and I created the Hart-Rudman Commission which spent three years looking at national security, uh, uh, looking out 25 years the most comprehensive look since 1947. The report says, which came out in the beginning of 2001 before 9-11 – the

report says, 'the greatest danger to the United States is a weapon of mass destruction going off in an American city, probably by a terrorist.' It says, and I was amazed that this wasn't picked up, it says: 'the second greatest threat to the United States is the failure of math and science education and the failure to invest in new science and technology, and it is a greater failure than any other – a greater danger than any conceivable conventional war.' Now I don't know how to make it clearer than that.

So where are we today. I just want to give you a very brief sort of mental imagery, and then we'll get down to the normal discussions. I have to say I'm delighted to be here, I am a big fan of Joel and the work he did and the courage he showed, uh, it was a remarkable job, uh, and I think that uh, to have he and Paul come here tonight is really the right kind of panel to be chatting with.

This is my word picture for all of you: if you sat down, when I do a book, couple of years ago with Nancy Desmond called *The Art Of Transformation*, and we suggested people ought to start with, what are your values, what's your vision of success, what are the metrics that would tell you whether or not you're succeeding, and therefore, what are your strategies. So if you took whatever you call education, which I'd like to call learning, 'cause I'd like to distinguish it from the current bureaucratic unionized professionalized system – so if you took learning in America, and you sat down on your own and you said, what are my values, what's my vision of a successful learning America, which I would argue should be uh, pre-natal care to senility – those are in fact, we're gonna all learn all of our lives, it's impossible to measure 19th Century industrial models. If you then said to yourself, okay, how would I know if were achieving it? What would be the metrics that are objective? You would find yourself in a new world.

And then if you, if, forget everything you think you currently know about education if you said, just applying common sense, how would I organize it? You'd do a couple of things – it would all be individual, it would be learner pooled forward, that is, the lar – the person that needed to learn would be looking for the things they needed to learn. It would all be asynchronous, so people could learn 24/7. It would have a huge component of online capability and mobile capability. It would involve a great deal of mentoring. It would involve a great deal of apprenticeship. It would probably not have a Carnegie Unit. It would probably be achievement rather than process oriented.

You probably couldn't tell - I had a mother in Council Bluffs, uh, Iowa, say to me about three weeks ago, her two four year, fourth graders had just scored in the middle of the senior class on the ACT. In fourth grade. She said, they're now faced with eight years of very great difficulty, because they're already totally bored. So the probably wouldn't be where we commonly place them. Mitch Daniel just passed a terrific small step in the right direction, which says that if you get out of high school in less than four years, you get a scholarship for the state's share of the cost of your high school for every year you get out early. Just a little step in the right direction.

So I think, I'm going to erase all the current assumptions and just leave you this thought: we should be in favor of the most rapid possible learning by the widest possible number of Americans, appropriate to what they need in order to be successful as citizens, as family members, as, as economic workers or producers or business owners, and we should want to do it at the least possible cost with the greatest possible speed. Now if you design that, you will find it bears almost no relationship to all the things we're currently trying to prop up."

Joel Klein

112. "Well thank you mister speaker, there, there's a lot to discuss you know, those brief remarks. Let, let me, let me start, 'cause you referenced this, and it's an interesting historical development and you're a history professor. Starting in really the first term, uh, the, the term of the first President Bush, through this term uh, of our presidency – there's been a pretty strong bipartisan coalition that's worked together, and you mentioned it with you and President Clinton, and despite all the divisiveness, education has been a place where we've seen both sides of the aisle working together, perhaps epitomized by No Child Left Behind when you had second President Bush, you had Senator Kennedy, you had John Boehner, you had George Miller – it seems now to be fraying, and we're at a point where sort of the, the, a lot of republicans and the unions are saying let's send this back to the states. Is my perception accurate, and if so, is this a good historical development?"

Newt Gingrich

113. "Well I think your perception is probably accurate, I think the unions always wanted to send it back to the states once there was any kind of genuine assessment. And I think a large number of republicans didn't want to vote for it, but because it was early in the Bush administration, they felt constrained to do so because it was the president's **RAN 1:24:59** Coalition. Um, but it, it violates all sorts of general pre, prese, premises and I think frankly, um, while I have a, you know I have a lot of respect for Secretary Duncan and I th, but I worked with Secretary Duncan on uh, getting more charter schools around the country and I actually went around the country, um, with uh, Reverend Al Sharpton and uh, Secretary Duncan in what was truly a fairly unusual trio."

Joel Klein

114. "As we say in New York, what's up with that?"

Newt Gingrich

115. "I mean, one of the things we were able to do that Secretary Duncan fully appreciated is, we could automatically get press coverage anywhere we went, just for the spectacle of the three of us standing there so, it

was, yeah. But it was a good cause, and there was a call – one of the places, relatively few places that I agree with the president on. uh, but what you get is, inevitably, gradual movement towards national standards; gradual movement towards more national con – I mean, everything conservatives historically fear, gradually inch by inch starts to show up and I also think, uh, and this was just something I failed out of the 90's that I tried when I was speaker to get a number of my good friends, like Tommy Thompson, who really launched the first voucher movement, um, actually working in conjunction with Jesse Jackson's state chair, who was an African-American woman state representative, and, and a single mother who thought that they ought to have, and that the parents should have the right to send their child where they wanted to go. But I, I've really failed in the effort to break through the normal educational mindset to suggest that there really are dramatic things happening. The Florida virtual school system, which was Jeb Bush's creation, I mean, these are really fascinating breakthroughs that offer potential for uh, dramatic improvements in learning in ways we don't yet understand."

Joel Klein

116. "But do you think – so, it's, you seem to be saying that you think the federal government does, in fact, have a role to play in driving the reform process in the states, and in the localities, through accountability provisions?"

Newt Gingrich

117. "No, I mean, I didn't mean to say that, if I did. Um, what, what I mean to say, I do think there's probably a very narrow research and information dissemination role of the federal government. Uh, but I want to, I want to start with the opposite, 'cause I think you can't understand the mess we're now in unless you understand how the, the progressive movement's desire to professionalize things, to avoid local citizens, has shaped almost all of modern America, and, and it'd been a steady drive - for example, go back and look at the role of parents in 1900, and then look at the role of parents by today in most school systems. Look at schools where they don't even want parents to show up, uh, because you know, they're not professionals, they're not certified. Um, and I think I would suggest that, that in fact there is an older model that if you create the information flow, the majority of parents – not 100 percent, but a substantial majority would like their children to do better. Among the children of parents who don't care, a significant minority would like to do better, and you can find ways to create choice that enable people to move more rapidly and innovate dramatically more effectively, because the very structure of the current system is extraordinarily inhibiting in terms of real change, and I think, and you've lived through this, 'cause you've negotiated, and I had people underestimate between the schools of education, the departments of education, the union contracts, the administrative bureaucracy, how much we have now limited the capacity for real innovation."

Paul Gigot

118. "Well how do you avoid the repeating the 20 years of us attempting to do this and running into those obstacles. What are the, what are the tools we have now, what is the leverage we have now, to, to, to drive a faster rate of change and avoid those obstacles?"

Newt Gingrich

119. "Well there, there are a number of things you could do, I mean, you, you could for example go through every bureaucracy of education with a very simple test: are you affecting children or not, everybody who's not gets to go find a new career – you could take that amount of money, put it into a pot and say, all this will be spent on classroom teachers if you agree to merit pay. But we're not gonna give it to you unless you break up the current assumptions and go to merit pay. I mean, merit pay – the ability to re-train or dismiss bad teachers and the ability to give merit pay to good teachers is a small but very important key part of this."

Paul Gigot

120. "I think Michelle re-tried that, and I think the union turned her down."

Newt Gingrich

121. "Look, one of the great mysteries here, which you two um, I'm, I'd be curious to get your reaction to – I don't think you can get this done until you run over the union. I, I think anybody who says I'd like the maximum amount of educational reform the union will tolerate – I mean, why would you go to L.A. Unified and waste your time? The union is a conspiracy in defense of bad teachers at the cost of children."

Joel Klein

122. "So, so, if you have that view, let's..."

Newt Gingrich

123. "I'm, I'm talking specifically about L.A. Unified, I'm not talking about unions in general including those that, which some of my relatives belong to as teachers."

Joel Klein

124. "But this, it seems to me in one sense, you, you've identified in your view a problem, then when you were working with Secretary Duncan and the

Reverend Sharpton, you were out there using federal money in a program called Race To The Top as a leverage (*sure*), to try to overcome. Somebody says, facilitate charter schools, teacher evaluation, merit pay, accountability and so forth. Now as president, would you try to create those kind of federal incentives, uh, so that...

Newt Gingrich

125. "...I'd much rather walk around it and go to the governors and say to the governors, you have a challenge. I'd much rather have me, Mitch Daniel invented his scholarship program with no federal incentive."

Joel Klein

126. "But how about L.A. Unified? How about what's gonna happen in _____ 1:30:38..."

Newt Gingrich

127. "...I think, I think until you recognize how much Sacramento is, is a disaster, and until there is a populist rebellion against bad government in California, nothing good will happen."

Joel Klein

128. "...and if you block that..."

Newt Gingrich

129. "I just think that's a fact, I mean, I think if – let me say, by the way – having grown up at a time when California was the golden land and the future of America, it is a tragedy what has happened in Sacramento, and it is a disgrace that the people of California have not yet thrown everybody out and insisted on starting over. That's bipartisan."

Joel Klein

130. "I have some friends out there."

Newt Gingrich

131. "You want to talk about Albany?"

Joel Klein

132. "Fair enough, touché, you got – I got one in, you got one in, let's call it even and sit here and focus on education."

Joel Klein

133. "Let me read you a quote: "It's ludicrous to think that multiple, multiple, multiplication in Alabama and in New York are really different. In terms of math textbooks, why can't you have the scale of a national market?" Right now we have a Texas textbook that's different from a California textbook that's different from a Massachusetts textbook – that's very expensive. That quote is from Bill Gates – is he right?"

Newt Gingrich

134. "He – baloney, it – that's all ____1:31:57 and he knows that in his own industry. That would imply that everybody should only buy one kind of computer with one kind of program, because look at the value of mass production. I mean, he knows better than that."

Paul Gigot

135. "His argument is, his argument is, that he wants to drive standards up across the board (*okay*), because some states, or L.A. Unified or Alabama, what have you, are falling behind and they're not living up to the standards of Massachusetts..."

Newt Gingrich

136. "...and is that a, wait - are Alabama math textbooks substantially, I mean does, is two plus two not four in an Alabama textbook? I mean, I don't, you know, I'm in Georgia and I just actually did a tape for an Alabama group, my, my memory was, when I would go to Montgomery and Birmingham, that almost everywhere two plus two equaled four – that wasn't always true in Washington, but is almost always true – so, so let me start, secondly, why would a guy like Bill Gates even talk about text *books* – why isn't every child, and I testified in 1995 on this – why isn't every – and people thought I was nuts – why doesn't every child in America got a device, uh, which could resemble an iPad or a Kindle, which over the la, which in fact is less expensive than a textbook and which you can change the science parts to match up with current science...uh, you live in a world of exploding knowledge and you always have bureaucrats and people who think they're brilliant who want to constrict choice to one national thing picked by one group, and here's what it really does: it cripples the rate of innovation. It is the exact opposite of market theory, it is as true in education where you basically now have an oligopoly between the schools of education, the large bureaucracies of the unions – they've created an anti-choice, anti-competition, anti-innovation structure of reactionary behavior, which is crippling the whole country."

Joel Klein

137. "So as a matter of policy – two part question. First of all, it's pretty clear to me listening to you, you would favor a true choice system – let's give people dollars and let them choose..."

Newt Gingrich

138. "I would like to have a Pell Grant for K through 12."

Joel Klein

139. "Exactly. And then the federal level? At the federal level?"

Newt Gingrich

140. "I'd like to give out block grants to states, and as president I would advocate to every governor, you need to create Pell Grants. Some states will, some states won't. The states that don't, parents are gonna look over and say, how come they get the money and I don't? You'll have huge brawls in the state legislature, it'll be wonderfully educational, and over – this, but this is the key, this is the key: free societies have to think like a moving picture; bureaucracies think in terms of a Polaroid. It's a fundamental difference - over this is free markets **1:34.28**, over time, free markets are enormously more productive than static socialist models. For one second, a socialist model is dramatically more controllable, and this is the tension you've always got. So I would, as president, I, I think you need to go to block grants, 'cause I don't think you can, you can possibly go to suddenly stopping all the things we have. I mean, the, I think the amount of dislocation would be unmanageable. But if you went to block grants, I'd be very comfortable as president using the bully pulpit to suggest across the country that a, that a, that a Pell Grant model, which every liberal loves at the college level, is actually very applicable from K through 12 and wouldn't it be great if poor children got educated so they could then take advantage of the Pell Grant in higher education."

Joel Klein

141. "So you would give block grants with zero accountability – in other words, whether New York or California spent imprudently or poorly, you're okay with that...just keep throwing **1:35:24**."

Newt Gingrich

142. "..well much, much as I worry about Sacramento and Albany, I'm not sure Washington is the center of prudence in America."

Joel Klein

143. "But the answer is zero accountability."

Newt Gingrich

144. "What I would say to parents is, we are giving, I mean, they'd have to spend it on education, on learning (*right*). But what I'd say to parents is, you have an obligation to get involved. Now I would, by the way, encourage governors to attach something like the Kipp School Contract, where in order to get your, your Pell Grant, the parent, the teacher and the child sign a contract (*sign a contract*), 'cause I think the Kipp School model is a very persuasive model about how to help children actually, uh, get educated."

Joel Klein

145. "Now I want to come back to in your opening comments, you snuck in a little ledger speak there, so I'd like to unpack it. You talked about asynchronous 24/7 learning. Now you, you did, you must have learned that hanging out with Arnie and the Reverend, is all I can figure out. Let, let's speak from my words..."

Newt Gingrich

146. "... 'cause you know, Reverend Sharpton often goes around talking about asynchronous [1:36:20](#), it's a key part of his basic..."

Joel Klein

147. "[1:36:22](#) that in your vision, you've got these kids now on some form of device, an iPad, obviously you're thinking about this could be 24/7, could be run year-round (*sure*). Give, give some more, put some meat on the bones of this vision."

Newt Gingrich

148. "Capitol, Phoenix University, I mean start there. Uh, Florida Virtual School, uh, these, these things you know, think of it this way: go and watch children randomly, when they're not engaged in school. They Google 24/7, they Youtube 24/7, they Facebook 24/7, they uh, do all sorts of things that enable them to access a world of learning except it doesn't count 'cause it wasn't the curriculum this Tuesday morning from 10 to 11. But in fact, people who want to learn – I bet almost everybody in this room has learned something outside of school time. That's the modern world. I mean, ideally, learning should imitate the modern world. Why do we sit in a row looking straight forward for 50 minutes? Because that was perfect training to work in a textile mill. Why would you do it now? I mean, how many of you want to voluntarily go to classes that resemble your childhood, as opposed to the way most of you now learn – you either learn on your own through a member, or you go to a three-day short course that's very intensive. But how many of you actually voluntarily say, you

know, 'I'd like to take a class three days a week at the convenience of the professor, uh, and I'd like to go and sit around waiting for him to show up, and wait for the 50 minute lecture which he actually wrote an entire textbook on, which he actually required me to buy in order to sit through the class, to listen to the lecture that's actually chapter six.' I mean, that's not how the modern world works."

Paul Gigot

149. "Could we have a show of hands?" I was gonna ask, I was gonna ask if you would abolish the uh, Department of Education but I know your answer would be, you're gonna transcend it."

Newt Gingrich

150. "Yeah, I, I, I'd like to see the Department of Education become a research and information center. I'd like to uh, see us re-privatize the student loan program before the president bankrupts the entire country by promising to every young person, you will not have to pay your student loan as a student, however, you will later on have to pay off the national debt as a taxpayer, but I'm being good to you so by the time you figure out you're paying it off as a taxpayer, I'll be gone, but you'll have re-elected me 'cause of your gratitude 'cause you won't be paying it off as a student – which is a Penza scheme, even by Governor Perry's standards."

Paul Gigot

151. "I told you this would be lively, I knew it would. You mentioned, you mentioned – uh, before we uh, with, there's a lot to, to talk about for college, but you mentioned the, the unions as, as uh, as a central obstacle. What's your strategy for overcoming the unions as obstacles in, in, in this kind of vision for education that you've laid out."

Newt Gingrich

152. "The same as uh, Bob LaFollette and Hiram Johnson's strategy for breaking the railroads in the 1890's. Every time in American history you've had a, you get a centralization of power, sooner or later the American people rise up and say, 'enough.' And uh, ironically, if the Occupy Wall Street really wanted to help uh, children, they would have an occupy, uni, you know, teachers union headquarters movement, uh, because in fact, that is a major impediment. It's a major cause of income inequality in America, because when poor children are trapped in neighborhoods with poor schools, they have no future in a world of information. So, I think somebody, and this is as president, I would say this very directly and I'd be quite cheerful to go, uh, to the NEA convention, uh, or the FT convention and say it there. I think that, and, and Sharpton has said this very well – I mean, he and I disagree on about 99 items out of a hundred, but I have

been in rooms with him where he, which were essentially all black, in which I had obviously no standing as, as a white republican conservative, they, I was there sort of as the oddity, they thought you know, here, here's the Rev and that weird guy. Uh, and Sharpton has been very good about saying to them, 'don't give me some excuse for keeping a mediocre teacher who destroys children.' Now, that ought to be in a pretty good battle cry nationwide, and L.A. Unified is one of the places that they ought to replace the entire contract and the entire structure, and it's a pretty good argument, although you've done a brilliant job in New York City, as a general rule, I would say there's a pretty good argument against large, centralized structures in which the unions become so big you can't possibly deal with them in any kind of effective way."

Joel Klein

153. "But let me ask you one other question before we turn to college. I'm curious, in, in your pantheon, uh, Paul actually asked you a question where you disagreed with Bill Gates. But Bill Gates recently said, the single greatest challenge facing this country is K to 12 education. Do you agree with him, and if not, where would you put it in terms of the challenges we face as a nation?"

Newt Gingrich

154. "You mean of all the challenges we face as a nation? (*Yeah.*) Well, I mean, I wrote the section on education in the Hart-Rudman Commission, I said it's the second greatest threat to the United States after a nuclear weapon going off, so I think it's pretty high up there. Uh, I think the tragic collapse of basic education, particularly for children in relatively poor neighborhoods, is one of the greatest crises in American society. I think it cripples us economically, I think it threatens us socially, I think it divides us politically, and I think if we truly believe we're endowed by our creator with the right to pursue happiness, we have to have fundamentally new, very deep and very aggressive strategies to save the lives of people who are currently being cheated by the very governments that are supposed to take care of them."

Joel Klein

155. "You wanted to talk about college, Paul?"

Paul Gigot

156. "Sure. Um, have we been over um, you, you, you, you got into this a little bit with your talk about the student loans, and uh, uh, but uh, you also mentioned for profit, Kaplan and some of the others – and there's' a, uh, been a big debate going on in Washington about for profit colleges, the argument being that 47 percent of all student loan defaults I think are at for profit schools. So uh, should the government be subsidizing those kinds of for profit, uh, endeavors, uh, um, uh, with 1:42:46 dollars."

Newt Gingrich

157. "...well I mean, should the government be subsidizing schools that have a billion dollar endowment?"

Paul Gigot

158. "That's a separate question."

Newt Gingrich

159. "But it's, but it's, but it's the same quote..."

Paul Gigot

160. "...answer them both."

Newt Gingrich

161. "Oh, okay. I mean, first, first of all, I'd be much more skeptical about the government subsidizing. I mean, I think that there are, if the government has a public purpose for doing things, it's a good thing, and let me say up front – I went through graduate school under National Defense Education Act Fellowship. I also was fortunate enough to get a Georgia State scholarship, which I paid off by teaching in Georgia. So I'm, I, I think there are times and places – I would frankly give, of this sub – I, I would eliminate all interest for math and science and engineering students, because you want to incentivize people to go into those areas, but I would do it as a matter of a National Security bill, not as a matter – I wouldn't think of that as education. I mean, what we did late in the Eisenhower administration in response to Sputnik, is we said, look, there are real national interests here. It's frankly the same reason I would give a, a uh, a Visa to every person who graduates in math, science and eng, and engineering, uh, from an American school so they can stay here instead of going back to India to start a business against us. I mean, I'd rather have them create jobs in America than have them create jobs overseas.

But I was starting to say, we, we have the right to scrutinize and say, a for profit school should in fact deliver – first of all, it should deliver real graduates, and most of them do. And then if you have to distinguish between the places that are set up purely as diploma mills, and the, the places that actually in many cases have a higher graduation rate than the public institutions they compete with. So I would start and look carefully and not lump the two – it's not a for profit. What about the not-for-profit schools that have a high dropout rate? What about schools in which people, grad, on which 25 percent of the, of the freshman graduate? I mean, it strikes me, this, it's very fair to ask things about everybody, but not to assume an automatic bias for one or the other."

Paul Gigot

162. "Well if, if, uh, Zuckerberg, Gates and Jobs all dropped out of college, uh, had reasonably successful lives, careers – have we been overemphasizing college as uh, as uh, the uh, necessity for uh, success in America?"

Newt Gingrich

163. "I'm gonna give you a brief commercial. My wife, who's sitting over here, just did a book called Sweet Land of Liberty, in which Ellis the elephant takes four to eight year olds through American history. There's a scene where Ellis and Abraham Lincoln are sitting under a tree, reading – this is young Abe. Abraham Lincoln got about approximately one and a half years of education, and was probably the smartest person ever to be president. That doesn't mean, therefore, there's an equation that says if you're clever enough to drop out after one and a half years, you'll become Abraham Lincoln. Um, you know, Jefferson read for the law – he didn't go to law school, that's probably a good thing.

Uh, but I think you've got to look at the whole notion, uh, people – people who, I would argue that people who are truly entrepreneurial should be entrepreneurial, in fact, I think you ought to rethink for very poor children, if there aren't ways to help them earn money at a much earlier age. At one point, I was advocating, to no avail, that New York City janitors, they should have one janitor per school, and they should hire kids from the poor neighborhood to do all the janitorial work – both 'cause they could use the money, and they'd then have a sense of ownership of the school.

So I, I think that you want to look at models, or how do you get people engaged in life as early as possible? Benjamin Franklin moves to Philadelphia at 13 and goes to work as an apprentice to his uncle, and he, he does okay. Uh, I don't think you should automatically block people in, but I would say on behalf of higher education, I'm, I'm gonna try to convince every state to model off of the College of the Ozarks and have a work-study college.

The College of the Ozarks, you go, you, you, you work 20 hours a week during the year, and you get your tuition and books – you work 40 hours a week in the summer, you get room and board – 93 percent of students graduate owing no debt; seven percent owe an average of \$5,000 'cause they bought a car. You can't even apply unless you need student aid, and they have no student aid, and they rank fifth, I think, after Columbia in relative number of students they accept. Every state ought to have if for two reasons: one, you can say to the poorest kid in the state, 'if you'll work, you can get through college;' two, it benchmarks price against all the universities in the state, and you begin to wonder – tell me again why you have this many bureaucrats, this many administrators, this much overhead – and you'll find that higher education is in fact a bubble sustained only by public indulgence."

Joel Klein

164. "So, don't - you can ignore that, they said since you're the end we can go on a little bit. So, uh, let me, let me ask you..."

Newt Gingrich

165. "I'm gonna be less amusing next time, if that's the cost."

Joel Klein

166. "If you look right now, I mean, you ended on a point that I, I do think is worth pursuing – so if you look right now with, we're sending out two messages in America: one, kids, we need more kids to go to college, complete college, particularly in math and science; and the second level, what you're hearing more and more of is, college is becoming increasingly unavailable financially. The state universities are pinched, they don't have the revenue streams, private universities are pricing themselves out of the market – what are we gonna do to turn this around, 'cause the message and the reality are divergent."

Newt Gingrich

167. "Well first of all, I'm gonna go back to something I said earlier in passing. Why does a university with a billion dollar endowment charge tuition? I mean, why does Harvard even charge tuition? I think Harvard's got what, 36 billion?"

Paul Gigot

168. "Because its, because it can get it. People will pay it."

Newt Gingrich

169. "Right, so I'm saying – but he was asking a moral question, not a practical question. The practical, I mean yeah, they'll pay, it's a practical world, and it turns out that Harvard behaves like the one percent – if they can gauge, they gauge, but that's not, that's not morally very good, and the Harvard faculty being good socialists should all be worried about the degree to which they are ripping off the country. I mean, what strike me that the values of the Harvard and neo-faculties would lead them to rise up tomorrow morning and demand free education for students, as long as the endowment's there. I mean, I just, I think we ought to strike there. Why do the university systems have as many bureaucrats? There's one study that suggests that by 2014, virtually, we will have approximately the same number of administrators and clerks that we have teachers in higher education. Now only one to one may be an interesting model if it's student teacher – but one to one as bureaucrat to teacher strikes me as absurd. Uh, go through and look at why these schools are expensive, and what we've done with student aid, of course, is we have now, uh, student loans is,

we've made it possible for students to live beyond their means for longer than they should, selling off their future. And then suddenly when they get out of school realizing, oh, I borrowed that much? I mean this is, if you think about it, this is not a very smart model for a country, because it's a model which sells short the future, maximizes the present, and, and doesn't teach people true costs and what the president did yesterday is very destructive. It just, it just expands the bubble, higher educa – higher education last year, I think this is correct – the, the fact, I think I read it in your paper, uh, so it's, I'm certain..."

Paul Gigot

170. "So it must be true."

Newt Gingrich

171. "Uh, the uh, the uh, public universities for the fifth straight year rose in expense faster than private universities. Now, why isn't every state have a commission on the cost of higher education? Now one of the places Governor Perry had started down an interesting road, is he had instructed that they ought to find a way for students to get through it faster, and less expensively. And every state ought to have that kind of a drive to say, what's the fastest you could go through college, and what's the least expensive, and should an addition to a work college, shouldn't they have at least one track for people who are serious about getting through school willing to give up partying on, on Wednesday night, prepared to actually study all weekend, and get through in two or three years. I mean, the, we don't have those models right now because sociologically we've adopted a model that says, you know, drag it out as long as you can, it's really a great place to be for a while, you don't have a, there's no urgency. Uh, and I think this is just part of the general restructuring of American society. We're at the beginning of a period of disruptive reform, and one of the disruptive places will be education."

Paul Gigot

172. "Well I think on that, uh, that uh, note, ambitious note, uh, we will all repair to how we can uh, think about uh, the provocative ideas you threw out. Speaker Gingrich, thank you very much for being here. Thank you ladies and gentlemen, thank you for, thank you for the uh, College, to the College Board, thank you, Gasper Caperton, thank you uh, News Corp, thank you all of our candidates, Joel, and all of you for your kind attention. Thank you.