

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

2011: THE YEAR OF EDUCATION REFORM

Washington, D.C.

Thursday, April 7, 2011

**PARTICIPANTS:**

**Welcome:**

WILLIAM J. ANTHOLIS  
Managing Director, The Brookings Institution

**Introduction:**

JAMES D. ROBINSON III  
General Partner and Co-Founder, RRE Ventures

**Keynote Speaker:**

THE HON. CHRIS CHRISTIE  
Governor, New Jersey

**Discussion:**

GROVER J. "RUSS" WHITEHURST  
Senior Fellow, Governance Studies

\* \* \* \* \*

## PROCEEDINGS

MR. ANTHOLIS: Thank you for joining us today. I'm Bill Antholis. I'm the Managing Director at Brookings, and it's a real treat to be here in New York. We at Brookings as you know are based in Washington, but we do several events and public events in New York every year and we're delighted that this is one. And in particular we're delighted that the Brown Center on Education Policy could help sponsor this. The Brown Center has been part of Brookings for many years and has been path-breaking in independent, outside-the-box, research including on issues like school choice. And the Brown Center is currently directed by Russ Whitehurst who is with us today and who will be introduced in a bit, but Russ' own work in the field has been particularly focused on evidence-based educational reform in a lot of the areas that I know that the governor is interested in. So we're delighted to have Russ sponsoring this event today.

Today's event is going to focus on two issues or will touch on two issues that are real priorities that cut across Brookings. One is how we advance opportunity for all our citizens, and education is obviously central to that. And the other is how we advance the economic prosperity of the country, particularly through investments in human capital, and those priorities cut across all five Brookings research programs.

We are delighted to have several of our trustees with us here today. I see Jim Robinson -- and Jim Robinson will be introducing the governor and Russ Whitehurst as well as Jim Johnson and Al Engelberg. And I'm not sure if I see any others out there -- oh, and John Wilhelm, of course, here in the front row. We're delighted that you're all with us today.

Lastly, one final word in the spirit of having Governor Christie here, Brookings is proud of our three core values: Quality, independence, and impact. And we're also proud that in Washington, which is a town that is increasingly polarized, we're a place where both Republicans and Democrats are happy to work, happy to convene. Russ Whitehurst is a living example of that, and the governor being with us today is that as well.

So we are delighted to have this event and with that, I'm going to have Jim Robinson, who is a trustee of the Brookings Institution for 33 years, either trustee or honorary trustee, and his introduction -- been kind enough to introduce us to Governor Christie to open the event. Thanks.

MR. ROBINSON: Well, good morning, everybody and welcome. Today's event pulls together two powerful forces in this country, and the first is the governor of New Jersey himself, the Honorable Chris Christie. And the second is the imperative to rethink the way that we educate children in America. Now Chris Christie was sworn in as New

Jersey's 55th governor in January of 2010. He was already a very well-known entity in the state, having been the U.S. Attorney General for the District of New Jersey from 2002 to 2008. And as New Jersey's chief federal law enforcement officer, he earned praise from both parties. He drew national attention and praise for his efforts in battling political corruption, corporate crimes, gangs, terrorism, polluters, whatever was serious enough to come across his radar. His office never lost a single case. One of Chris' finest moments was when he led the team that thwarted terrorists' plans to attack the military at Fort Dix. He also earned widespread praise for standing up to the dirty practices of the political elite. His actions made it clear that stealing from New Jersey taxpayers or abusing power would not be tolerated.

Today's event highlights one of the governor's top priorities, putting New Jersey's children first by challenging the system big time. He will describe New Jersey's education reform efforts, efforts to create career-ready graduates with higher standards, efforts to provide room for innovation in teaching. The governor outlined his reforms last September, promising to move public education away from an antiquated, ineffective model that props up failing schools, toward a system that demands accountability.

We're also fortunate to have with us Russ Whitehurst today. Russ is the Herman and George R. Brown Chairman at Brookings and Director of the Brown Center, as Bill mentioned earlier. Previously, he was a Director of the Institute of Education Sciences at the U.S. Department of Education, and his specializations include program evaluation, teacher quality, preschool, and education data assistance. Russ will lead the discussion with the audience after the governor's remarks.

Now before asking the governor to take the podium, let me add a personal note. Chris and I have a history going back about six years. We started off as adversaries. We ended up as friends. He was the U.S. attorney who imposed a deferred prosecution agreement on Bristol-Myers Squibb. As a board member there, I became the non-executive chairman for three years as part of the agreement. And over those three years, I had the opportunity to get to know Chris very well. I saw firsthand from him how firm, pragmatic, tough yet fair, this man can be. He listens. He quickly understands the issues whether business, political, or public policy. He is very direct, and he makes things happen. He's a man of great principle, a man for whom I have the highest personal esteem. Chris, the stage is yours.

GOVERNOR CHRISTIE: Good morning, and I thank you all very much and to my friend, Jim Robinson. I want to thank him for the introduction and the invitation on behalf of Brookings to be here this morning. To Bill Antholis, the Managing Director of Brookings, thank you for giving me a forum to speak today and to all the guests who are here and members of Brookings. And I also want to acknowledge my Education Commissioner who is here as well, Chris Cerf, who's a veteran of school reform fights here in New York City under Chancellor Klein and Mayor Bloomberg, and now comes to the right side of the river to try to see what he can do in New Jersey as a New Jersey resident to help me reform an education system that is in bad need of real reform.

Let's talk first about what this issue really is and what it isn't. This is not an issue about attacking teachers. This is not an issue about saying teachers are bad and need to be thrown out of schools. This is, in fact, exactly the opposite. This issue is about first and foremost our children and how much those teachers who really are good and really care about education, how they can be empowered to teach those children and prepare them better for higher education or for a career.

Now everyone in America is acknowledging now this fight. You've seen it manifest itself in a number of different ways, whether it's the movie *Waiting for Superman* or the movie *The Cartel*, whether it's Bill

and Melinda Gates working across the entire country talking about why this is such an important issue, or whether it's the President of the United States who is speaking, I believe, strongly and firmly on this issue of education reform. This is an issue that should not have with it a party divide, a partisan tone, or a zero-sum result. Everyone can turn out to be winners in this discussion if we do what we need to do, which is to put aside the feelings of adults and put forward the needs of children and the next generation of Americans who will lead this country. So we need to understand first that the issue is much broader and much more important than any one particular political party.

You also have to understand then when you're assessing the issue, well, who could possibly be opposed to this? I mean, in the end what we're talking about is trying to provide accountability, real accountability, for -- if you want to phrase it this way -- the production of a better product for the United States of America. You see, the product that teachers produce, I would suggest to you, is more important than any other product that America has produced or will produce going forward. Yet we don't seem to be thinking about this in those terms, at least some folks don't.

Now, I've been speaking very clearly and frankly over the course of the last few years about this issue, and I want you to understand

why it's personal to me. I was born in the city of Newark. My parents were lifetime Newark residents. My grandparents were lifetime Newark residents, and my great grandparents emigrated from Italy to Newark. Newark had been the center of my family's existence on both sides of our family, my mother and father, going all the way back to the time when their grandparents entered this country. But when I turned five years old in 1967, my parents made a fundamental decision. They decided that my dad, who was working during the day at the Breyers Ice Cream plant in Newark and putting himself through college at night at Rutgers and my mother, who was working to help support paying his tuition, decided that the school system in the city of Newark in 1967 wasn't the type of school system that they thought would give their oldest son the best chance to be everything that he could be. And so with literally no money in the bank, they went to one of my grandmothers and borrowed \$1,000 and to my other grandmother and borrowed \$1,000 and took that \$2,000 and a VA mortgage that my father was eligible for after his service in the Army and bought a house in Livingston in suburban Essex County in one of the most outstanding school districts in our state. They didn't want to live in Livingston. They didn't want to leave Newark. They left for one reason, for me and my brother and then ultimately my sister so that we could have the best public education possible.



When I was elected to this job in November of 2009, on election night it's kind of a crazy scene and there are lots of people who want to be thanked by the winning candidate standing up on the podium, kind of a little bit of a badge of honor if you actually get picked out as one of the people. It's the first sign of importance in the incoming administration. And I thanked five people that night, five. That was it: My campaign chairman, my party chairman. I thanked my wife and children. I thanked my dad who was there that night, and lastly, I thanked my teachers in Livingston who I said that night had been the ones who had laid the foundation to make it possible for me to become the 55th governor of the state of New Jersey. Now I'd suggest to you, despite all the human cries from the teachers union in New Jersey, that someone who has a deep-seated hatred for teachers would not have picked them out amongst all of the literally hundreds of people that were integral in my election to thank that night. And that all the work by some members of the media that try to put me on the couch about what happened to him in elementary school that he's so angry would have thanked his teachers if some traumatic experience had, in fact, occurred.

See, it's personal to me because I know this, and I know this in my heart for certain. If my parents had not borrowed that \$2,000 and moved me to Livingston, I would not be standing here. If I had gone to

school in the city of Newark, I would not be governor. It's that simple. And so now that I have the opportunity to be governor with a chance to change the state of education in New Jersey, what drives me is thinking to myself every day, how many future potential governors are sitting in classrooms in Newark and Jersey City, in Paterson and Passaic, in Trenton and Camden and Atlantic City, who will never have the opportunity to be governor because we were too weak and too timid to tell the truth about a failing education system that serves just some of our children and not all of them because some political lifers are captives of a moneyed special interest that bullies and thugs its way through the hallways of my statehouse to get whatever it wants. And we stand too afraid to take on that fight, too afraid to speak the truth that we know in both our minds and our hearts is absolute because we don't want to rustle things up. We don't want to upset a teacher. We don't want to upset, for goodness sakes, their union. To me, ladies and gentlemen, that is an obscenity. It's an obscenity because each life that comes into being in New Jersey is a precious gift from God, and we should care about each and every one of those lives as if they are our own. And that may sound trite or clichéd, but think about the results of us not doing those things.

We ask ourselves all the time, why is there so much violence in our cities? Why is there rampant drug use in that culture? Why is there

rampant promiscuity and premarital sex and teenage pregnancy? I would suggest to you that all of those things can occur when you live in a society that is devoid of hope. You see, hope is one of the most powerful emotions I believe along with love that human beings can feel, and the lack of those emotions drives behavior as well. Children know when they're not getting a good education. They know it. They're bored. They don't care. They're not challenged. And they know what's happening to them, and they are today even more aware of what the world will require of them to be successful than they were when I was a kid.

Our society, our culture, our media, the Internet, throws at them every day what success looks like and what you need to get there. And so these children growing up in these failing school districts, they know that they're getting a lousy education, and that strips away their hope for a better future. And what happens when they have no hope for a better tomorrow? They look in the mirror, and they don't see a successful person. They don't see someone with great potential or value. The lack of a good education and the lack of hope that goes along with it strip away self esteem. And so when you don't look in the mirror and see someone of value, that's when you put drugs in your body because you want to have that temporary good feeling because you know that you're facing a life that may not have much of that at all.

Why do you engage in acts of violence? Because when you don't see someone with a bright future in the mirror, you have to fight for every little bit you can and do it however you can get away with doing it and when someone says "Well, but what about the consequences of that?" If you don't believe your tomorrow will be any better than your yesterday, the idea of dying at 18 or 19 or 20 or 21 is not nearly as traumatic. When you don't look in the mirror and see someone of value, that's one of the motivations for young women to find affirmation any where and in any act, and then we perpetuate the cycle of single mothers, childhood single mothers, trying to break a cycle that our education system contributes mightily to in these places.

Let's put numbers on the problem. In New Jersey, we have 104,000 children trapped in 200 chronically failing schools today as we speak. Now, some would say "Well, the solution is to spend more money. See, if we just spent a little more money, we could fix the whole problem." Well, let's talk about that for a second. In New Jersey in the 2009-2010 school year, the last full school year we had, New Jersey spent \$25 billion on our K-12 education system, more than any other state in America, \$25 billion. State aid to education included in that number was \$10.3 billion, and the statewide per-pupil spending was the highest in America, an average of \$17,620 per pupil per year. Overall education spending in New

Jersey has increased 343 percent from 1985 to 2012, with state aid in our 31 neediest districts, these failing districts, nearly doubling as a percentage of the total state budget during that same period. Today in New Jersey we have 588 school districts, 31 of them get 59 percent of the state aid. The other 557 get the remainder; \$4.5 billion in state aid just to 31 districts. And what are those districts producing? In Asbury Park, where we spent \$33,000 per pupil per year, less than 50 percent of the students in Asbury Park are proficient in eighth grade math. In the city of Newark, where we spent \$24,500 per pupil per year, you have less than 50 percent of the students who can graduate. And of the 50 percent who do, do not get prepared to take any bows because the overall majority of them don't deserve the diploma they get handed. And the county colleges tell us that when those students come to go to community college, that they need at least a year of remedial coursework to qualify to even sit in a college classroom. And for this we're paying \$24,500 a year.

And now our Supreme Court has before it the question of whether another \$1.6 billion will be the final straw that will tip us into raging success. Well, let me ask you a question. Isn't the definition of insanity doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different result? If \$25 billion doesn't fix the problem, what is another \$1.6 billion going to do to fix the problem? Don't be fooled by the argument

that this is a financial problem. You see, that's what the educational establishment, the teachers union, those with a vested interest in this business -- and when you're at \$25 billion, you're a business that people are making a profit off of. Don't let them fool you into thinking that they have the children's interest first because they don't.

You listen to numbers like that and you understand why taxpayers in New Jersey are angry. You understand why parents in failing school districts are angry because here's the answer we give to a mother or a father who has a child in a failing school in one of these 31 districts. We say to them, "Listen, we know you don't have the money to send your child to another school. We don't want to open up any more charter schools that can innovate and provide a better education because that competes with the regular public schools." I had a conversation with a teacher just the other day with the commissioner who said, "Why are you getting charter schools that take money away from us?" And I'm thinking to myself, it's not your money in the first place. Who told you it's your money? It's the money for the children, not for you. We tell them no charter schools, no school choice. And by the way, we're not going to do anything to change the conditions in your school except send your administrators more money and hope that somehow magically that fixes the problem. And our final counsel to them is, "Wait, it will get better."

Well, I'll tell you this, I have four children between seven and 17, and I know this much. If they have one bad year in school, unless we're paying to get them tutors to help them catch up, they'll never catch up. You have a bad third grade, you're going to have a bad fourth grade and a bad fifth grade and a bad sixth grade because you're going to be further and further and further behind. So I've had some people call me emotional about this issue and call me impatient. And you know what? I think the situation demands impatience. I think we've had too much patience while we've watched the American school system fall behind almost every other modern, industrialized nation in the world. And if you think that all of us in this room, the old people, that we're going to be able to sustain America forever based upon the great education we got, the clock is ticking and time is running out. And whether we want to face our own mortality or not, it's coming. And who are we leaving to keep America the greatest nation in the world, the kid in Asbury Park who can't do eighth grade math? The kid in Newark who's got a diploma that's worthless? I don't understand why people don't have an understanding of this issue that then drives them to action.

Well, when people elected me in November of 2009, I don't know if they knew exactly what they were getting, but if they listened they did. If they watched me for the seven years before I became governor

they did. I have no interest in marking time in this job. I have no interest in this job to get another title. I've got plenty of titles already. I was U.S. Attorney. I'm a lawyer. I'm a husband. I'm a father. I'm a son. I'm full of titles. governor's a nice one, but I could have done without it. It's time for us to move.

And I suggest one other thing on the politics of this that I'd suggest to you in a state like mine, only a Republican governor can do this and here's why. Democrats in this instance are too beholding to the special interests which drive the stopping of this debate and discussion. The Democratic Party in my state has been the captive, a captive of the teachers union. And so we know that the greatest harm is happening in urban districts. And some in my party say to me, "Why do you care? You get about 25 votes out of those cities. I mean, what's the difference? The people who vote for you are in the suburbs and on the farms in New Jersey." The same way that Richard Nixon was the only one who could go to China, you need to have a Republican governor who's going to go in and say, "I care about those kids." Not about the educational bureaucracy that has grown around them and is leeching off of them. I care about those kids and their parents and their future.

Now, I have a very famous relationship with the teachers union in New Jersey. Some of my earlier comments may indicate to you why we



get along so well. But you see, to me, I understand this issue very well. The overall majority of teachers in New Jersey are extraordinary public servants. They're great people who don't make a lot of money and who care deeply about the satisfaction that you get when you're a good teacher of a classroom and you look out into the eyes of children and you see them getting it and you watch them achieve and accomplish. My problem is that I think it's time for the teachers of New Jersey to demand that the union is good as they are, and believe me they don't have it. This is a union that collects \$130 million in compulsory dues a year that spent \$7 million on TV ads attacking me last year and are back on the attack this week with network and cable and radio ads attacking me again and again.

Why is that exactly? Why is that? I'll tell you it's because they've never had anybody tell them the truth and tell them publicly and tell them right to their face. Because politicians all whisper about this. We got to do something about this, but they give me \$5,000 a year and they could spend millions in my district and defeat me and then I'd lose my title. God forbid. I'd lose my title. We should do something though. And then they walk away. They walk away, they take the money, they take the influence that comes from these bullying unions. And I don't know how they sleep at night after they've done it. I don't know how they sleep at night. I don't know how those children don't jump into their mind. So I've

decided since I can't talk to the union because they're completely clueless and universally self-interested. And when you've got the executive director of the teacher's union in New Jersey making \$550,000 a year, he's got no interest in changing the current system. He sits down in office across from the State House and walks out every once in a while across the street to stare at legislators to make sure they don't do what they know in their heart is the right thing to do, and you get 550 grand for that? That's pretty good work if you can find it. So they have no interest in changing the system.

So I've started to go out with the Education Commissioner and meet teachers directly over the last couple of minutes. No union representatives in the room, no members of administration in the room, and most importantly with no disrespect to the folks in the back of the room, no press either, because I want to hear directly from teachers and I want them to hear directly from me. What I've found in these conversations is there's not one teacher who doesn't understand that we need to reform this system. They all know it. And I understand there's fear that goes along with change. There always is. Real changes brings real fear, but we can't allow that fear to stand in the way, stand in the way of us developing a better future for the kids in New Jersey and the kids across this country.

So from these meetings that will continue for as long as this issue remains important and I suspect that will be the rest of my governorship, I'm going to continue these meetings and I suspect I'm going to continue to hear the same thing. I had one teacher who said to me, "I'll make whatever sacrifice I need to make if I'm convinced that it will make the kids in my classroom learn more." I had another teacher say to me, "I don't know why my union is so afraid of accountability. I'm happy to be held accountable." That's the kind of people that we want to work with.

And that's what brings me here this morning to talk about changing the way we do everything in education. The root cause of these problems I believe is evident once you know what through every independent, valid study that's ever been done is the most important element in a child learning, and the single most important element to a child learning is an effective teacher at the front of the classroom. Every study has shown that, that there is no greater influence. There are other influences of course. The use of technology, the child's background, their home situation. They all contribute. But the single largest factor is an effective teacher at the front of the classroom. So if we know that, then shouldn't our first goal be to make sure we have an effective teacher in the front of every classroom? So that's why tenure reform is an absolute necessity.

The teacher's union in New Jersey will tell you that the tenure system as it is now is just fine, and really the only tweaking that needs to be done is that when there's a tenure appeal it should no longer be in front of an administrative law judge, it should be in front of an arbitrator. Talk about rearranging the deck chairs on the "Titanic." Let me tell you about the tenure system in New Jersey. Over 150,000 teachers in New Jersey each and every year, for the last 10 years want to know how many teachers have been fired for incompetence in New Jersey? Seventeen. A hundred and fifty-thousand teachers a year every year, 10 years, do the math. It's 1.5 million teacher jobs being evaluated or not every year, 17 have been found to be incompetent. It defines common sense. It makes lawyers and doctors look robust at policing themselves. Seriously, we disbar a whole lot more lawyers than that and we take away medical licenses every year from a lot more doctors than that, in a year, let alone in 10. Let's less than two teachers a year for 10 years in a state that has 150,000 teachers.

Why is it that we're going to allow teaching to become one of two professions left in America that has no reward for excellence and no consequence for failure? You of course know that the other profession I'm referring to as weathermen. You know you turn on the weather on the 11 o'clock news and they tell you what it's going to be tomorrow. They tell

you it's going to rain, you get the raincoat, you get the umbrella and you go out and it doesn't rain. That SOB is back on TV the next night. The storm blew this way and went that way and there was a high-pressure system that pushed it. You were wrong. What are you still doing here night after night? That's a relative inconvenience in our lives. The fact that incompetent teachers remain at the front of classrooms in our state is much more than an inconvenience. It is a tragedy and a tragedy with consequences.

When you go to the teachers and you say you want to reform the tenure system, you go to the union and say you want to reform the tenure system and you want to hold teachers accountable, here's what they tell you. It's too complex. It's too complex. You can't understand how to evaluate a teacher. It's too complicated. You need your Ph.D. in education to do that. It's much too complex.

I see a lot of faces out here who I suspect either have children in school now or have had children in school over the course of your life. How many weeks does it take you to figure out whether your child had a good teacher or a bad teacher? Once you leave back to school night isn't the verdict pretty much in? You pretty much know. And most of the time you know before because when they tell you, you say, oh, my daughter got Mrs. Smith and they go -- good luck. Have a good

year. I have a good math tutor that I could suggest to you. Or when you say my daughter got Mrs. Jones and the smile comes across another parent's face and they can't stop talking to you about Mrs. Jones. They can't stop. She's wonderful. She's great. My children love her. She was wonderful. They learned so much. They enjoyed going to school. She communicated to us. She told us when there were problems. She was great. You can't get them to stop talking. Yet the teacher's union will tell you much too complex. Much too complex to evaluate this.

Those are the words of the self-interested obstructionists who care more about serving themselves than serving these children or the public. It's as evident as anything could possibly be. And if anyone tried to do this in any other business, you'd laugh them out of your office. Hi, I'd like to work for you. Good. Good. This is the way we do it. We give you a job to do and then we evaluate your performance and if you're doing well we give you more money and we keep you here, maybe we'll give you a promotion. No, no, no, no, no. With my job, sir, imagine saying this to John Robinson when he ran American Express. I go to Jim and I say, Jim, listen. I understand you don't normally do that, but see my job is so complicated that you can't really effectively evaluate me. So, Jim, here's what you have to do. You have to keep me for the rest of my life and you have to give me 4- or 5-percent raises every year. And I know

some people will tell you I'm awful on doing my job and you may even tell me of some metrics that prove that to you? You just are misunderstanding them, Jim. So when you hire me, Jim, at American Express, what you need to understand is I got a job for life whether I'm good or I'm bad. American Express would have been out of business in 10 years. Yet that's the way we run our public education system. That's the way we run it.

I'll give you another example. Let's say since I know these two guys, these are my two teachers in my class. I'm the principal of an elementary school and Chris Serf and Jim Robinson are my two teachers that teach third grade. And I evaluate them at the end of the year. I bring them in and I say, Chris, you've done a fabulous job. Parents love you. Your kids really achieved not only on the test scores but also in every other way we measure student achievement and accomplishment. You've done a great job. You come to school early. You leave school late. You stay with these kids. You help them. You tutor them. You never complain about it. You're always trying to figure out new ways to develop your lesson plans to make them speak to your kids and they do a fabulous. We'd like you to come back next year and we'd like to give you a 4-percent raise.

And we turn to old Jim here. We say, Jim, you're a disaster. The kids don't like coming to your class. You're using lesson plans from 30 years ago. You don't use any of the new technology we give you because you don't understand it. We try to sent you to learn about that new technology and you don't go. When the parents email you, call you, come in to see you, you tell me you don't have time. You come in right before the bell rings and you leave right after it rings. And no matter how much we talk to you to try to make you better, you're not interested. So, Jim, we'd like you to come back next year and we'll give you a 4-percent raise.

You know why? Because we pay them based on seniority. If the fog the frosted mirror, they get to stay and they get a raise. And when they get to a certain number of years they get a bigger raise. And we don't care whether they're good or bad. And if they're really bad, you know what I do? I go to you and I see your principal at the other elementary school and I said, do I have a teacher for you. This Jim Robinson, he's special. Right? And we try to get Robinson the heck out of our school and dump him on this guy because God forbid we can't fire him. That would cost me hundreds of thousands of dollars that I've lose anyway.



Are we crazy? Do we understand that that's why our schools are behind Finland, are behind every other industrialized country in the world? That's why. So let's talk about what we need to do.

We need to reform the tenure system and we need to set up a system where, first, teachers believe they're being effectively and fairly evaluated. So it's not a perfect science. I hear the Commissioner say this all the time, teaching is a craft, and it is. It's a craft. You have to adjust to the new set of students you have, the new technology that comes into effect that you can use. It is not a science. It is a craft.

So we have to use multiple measures to evaluate teachers and what we've proposed is something that I think is simple and straightforward and easily understood, that 50 percent of the evaluation of every teacher should be student achievement and performance. Now let's stop right here because this is when the teacher's union is going to say, he wants to do it by tests. My proposal is very clear about that. We say it can't just be test scores. Test scores are important. They're important to see as a baseline. But we also have to look at the other ways we measure student achievement, grades and participation, and advancement from grade to grade. Each school district should look at the way they measure those in addition to the test scores. So in the first have you have student achievement and performance.

The second half is teacher practice. That's the craft portion of this program to address the things that teachers are rightly concerned about. But the teacher scores are not going to evaluate every teacher. How do you test the music teacher? How do you test the art teacher? And don't you have to test the special education teacher a little bit differently than you need to test the child who is in a mainstream class and evaluate the teacher who teaches that mainstream class? So 50 percent of that teacher practice should be based on clear standards, performance standards, that define effective teaching and let the teachers and the administrators in that school come up with their definition. Empower them based upon the students they have in their district to define what that means. And then have 50 percent of it be based upon classroom observation. And not just the once a year when you tell them you're coming in. This is going to be hard work. The principal has to be able to be not just sitting in his or her office filling out forms from Trenton, but has to actually be out in the classrooms observing these teachers, in the hallways watching how they interact with kids.

Of course it's subjective. The objective part is in the student performance part. This is subjective and that's why teaching is a craft. And if they don't trust their colleagues to evaluate themselves, then who are they going to trust? Not us because they've already told us that it's too

complicated for us to figure it out, so I assume it's not too complicated for another teacher to figure it out. So set up a system that emphasizes student achievement and teacher practice to evaluate teachers each and every day, 50 percent each, and make those evaluations real every year.

And then let's change our compensation system for teachers in order to reflect this new reality of evaluating their effectiveness. We should be paying good teachers more than we're paying them. In my view we don't pay our good teachers enough. We should be carrying those good teachers to school on our shoulders every day because they are gold and we should be paying them that way. But the current system is inside out. You saw my example with Chris and Jim. That's the way it happens. So I'm not so much worried about Jim because he's just in cruise control anyway in front of that school. I'm worried about Chris because he's going to leave. When the psychic reward of teaching starts to fade for him not only because he's under financial pressure but also because he sees the guy down the hall who's not doing anything and is still being compensated and rewarded in the same way both with having a job at all, or with being compensated at the same rate we're going to lose great teachers and I suspect we already have. So let's prohibit salary schedules or compensation policies that reward seniority alone. Seniority alone doesn't determine a good or effect teacher. We know that. The

same say seniority alone doesn't evaluate a good executive, a good salesperson, a good lawyer, a good doctor. It's an element, but it's not the determinative factor and right now in our education system it is the determining factor for employment and for compensation.

We have to prohibit the use of graduate degree accumulation as a basis in and of itself for salary increases. You know how this game works. They go get a master's degree in something or a Ph.D. in something and they do it just to get more money. And except in the areas of math and science, there is no provable study out there that a graduate degree in anything else necessarily makes you a better teacher. It might, but the key word is might. So then let's evaluate whether in fact it does or it doesn't. Demonstrably evaluate it, and if it does, great. We'll pay you. But we're not paying you for the degree, we're paying you for the performance, for the performance, not simply going and sitting in a class and getting a piece of paper.

And we leave discretion to the districts and the teachers, but require that the primary factors in salary increases be a demonstrated effectiveness in advancing student learning in our classroom. And teaching in high needs or difficult districts should be a factor. Or teaching in a recognized shortage area like science or bilingual education. We need more science teachers, we need more bilingual education teachers.

We need teachers in those high-risk districts. Let's reward them more. If you're willing to go into the city of Newark or the city of Paterson and work with kids who need more time, who need more energy, who need more attention to effectively learn, why are we paying that person the same we're paying to somebody who's going into a classroom with a group of 95-percent achievers?

It's the same thing as running a business. You have a need in a particular place, you want to attract great talent there and it's going to be a difficult job, show them that out in the distance if you do your job the right way there are greater rewards available for you. When did capitalism become a dirty word in education? We reward everyone else in our society based on that, but we left teachers by the side of the road. Why? Because the unions are in place to absolutely protect the worst.

Good teachers in our school system today don't need a union. They don't need one. I'm not saying they shouldn't have one. If they want one, they can have it. I don't care. But they don't need it. They don't do anything for the good teachers. They're there to protect the lousy ones so they continue to pay their compulsory dues every year.

Jeff Canada from the Harlem Children's Zone who I have great admiration for said it best when talking about teachers who are giving everything they've got in the hardest districts with the more difficult

students: "The system doesn't acknowledge it or reward it. If you want a system that's going to work with these children, you need to attract the best teachers there and acknowledge the fact that they're making a sacrifice and reward them for producing success." This does not seem to me to be a radical idea. It's time to liberate teachers from the yoke of the union rules that are placed upon them and us that prevent achievement. These things do that. We base it on merit.

Let's give flexibility to every teacher and to every principal to run their school the best way they can. Let's get rid of last in and first out. It's a ridiculous corollary to the seniority pay. And so we have these great programs like Teach for America where some of our finest young minds from some of our greatest colleges and universities across America decide they want to go in to teaching. And then when we have fiscal problems like we have now, they're the first ones we lay off. It makes no sense. Layoffs should be based on merit. Merit. Nothing else. If you're a good teacher, you stay. If you're not, you go. I don't understand why this is so radical either, and let's end the forced placement of guys like Jim Robinson once they're failing into bad schools. If you can't cut it in my school, I shouldn't be able to force you into anybody else's. And no principal should be forced to have to take that teacher.

These are not difficult things to understand. So let's make sure we understand that I don't to end tenure them. I want tenure to be based on merit. So can you get tenure after 3 years into the system I'm proposing? Yes. But if you are evaluated as ineffective for 2 years in a row, then you use your tenure protection. It doesn't mean you necessarily get fired. But it means that you're now on probation and you'd better get it together or you're going to be fired and you're going to be fired without the cumbersome legal rules and expense that go along with a tenure action that in New Jersey has only succeeded 17 times in the last 10 years. So when the teacher's union tells you I want to abolish tenure, the only thing they're right about is that I want to abolish the tenure system that we have today. We're always going to need some protection for teachers against arbitrary firings, retaliatory firings, political firings. You're always going to want to have protections for that. But that teacher after 3 years should not have a job for life anymore than I should have a job for life with Jim Robinson at American Express when he decides to hire me straight out of collage. And that's what happening.

That's what happening in school systems all over this country. And you want to know why the teacher's unions are spending so much money to fight it? Because this is it. Because if all this is finally adjudged based on merit, what's their use and purpose? What's their use

and purpose? They've decided that they care more about their own survival than they are about the achievement of our children. They care about their own self-interest more than they care about the future of our country. Let me be clear again. I'm not talking about teachers. I'm talking about the teachers who have left the classroom to shepherd the union hall. They're union organizers. They're not teachers any longer. They're union organizers and we should treat them as such. They're political players, not people who are teaching our children.

So what's wrong with a system where you say every day you earn it? You earn it. No good principal is going to kick a good teacher out of school. They're just not. There's not enough of them. They want good teachers who make parents happy, who make kids happy and who achieve. And so we set up a system where there is a fair and balanced evaluation system to evaluate educator effectiveness. We use that system not only to set up a system where folks are paid based upon achievement and accomplishment of the students in their classroom, but also on the circumstances that they're willing to undertake and the difficulty of those circumstances. And then we set up a tenure system that says we will reward and protect those teachers who are judged every year to be effective, and those who are judged to be ineffective will get a chance to fix their problems and if they don't they'll be fired.



I think all of us in any business we're in would sign up for that deal wouldn't we? We all should be treated so well and have a union then to protect us in case there is arbitrary firings or retaliatory firings or political firings. We should only be so lucky in the corporate world to have that kind of setup. This is not about attacking teachers. This is about building a system that celebrates teachers and rewards them based upon their accomplishment.

So in the end this is about giving kids a voice in their future. It's about giving parents an opportunity to empower their kids. And in the end that's what we want as adults to make ourselves a better country and to make our children's future everything that it can possibly be. I hope everyone wants to have the experience that my wife and I who's here with me this morning are currently having with our oldest son. He's going around and he's a junior in high school now, and he's going around and he's looking at schools. And we came out of college counseling meeting with him on Sunday and the counseling was talking to him about his safety schools. What are your safety schools? We know what schools you want to go to. But what are your safety schools? He looked at us and said the place where we met and went to college is one of his safety schools. Every parent wants to achieve that. Right? The place that you strove to get into and got your education and now your safety school for your kid.

That is the measure of accomplishment and achievement that I want every parent and every child to have the experience to have, that your child is getting a good enough education and achieving at a high enough level that he can look at you say, yeah, where you went to school? If I have to. But I'd rather go to some place better. That should be what we're striving for instead of worrying about offending the feelings of adults more than we care about having each child be able to achieve his or her maximum potential.

So you're going to see a lot of fighting and arguing gone on over on the other side of the river, and I don't do things subtly as Jim implied to you in his introduction. But I don't think this is the time for subtly. I don't think we have time left to wait. We've been waiting for too long. And the ramifications for our country are too severe for us to wait any longer.

So that's why I came over here to speak to you all this morning. I hope you care about this issue as much as I do. I suspect since you're here you do, and I'm happy to take questions and start with you.

MR. WHITEHURST: Thank you, Governor Christie, for an impassioned presentation. I agree with almost everything you've said. Let me ask you a two-part question and it's a low-level and a high-level

question and I think they're connected. You've indicated that there's a system that's badly in need of reform particularly with regard to evaluating teachers, and yet as I understood you, you're going to leave to the individual school districts in New Jersey, the teachers there, the responsibility for designing that evaluation system. Why would you trust the bureaucracy that you think has screwed things up to come up with evaluation systems that will be fair and that will be equitable across the State of New Jersey?

The connected question is what do you think the appropriate local, state and federal role is with respect to these issues? Where should Washington be involved? Where should the state be involved and where is it essentially a local responsibility?

GOVERNOR CHRISTIE: I'll start with the last question first. My view is that the federal government's main role is to use money to incentivize change. I don't think they should be setting specific policies at the federal level or specific requirements. I think that's government that's much too far away from the actual place where learning is happening or not. So I think that the federal government, and I think the President has done a pretty good job at this with Race to the Top and some other issues where he's used money to try to drive change. And so I think that's what the federal government should be using predominantly, is decide how we

in very broad strokes want to change the system, and let's use federal money to try to drive that change.

On the state level, I think we've gotten much too -- and Christian and I have talked about this a lot -- much too involved in the micromanagement of each and every school district, which leads me into your first question.

Listen. I trust teachers. I think teachers hate the current system. They hate having an ineffective teacher next door and making the same as they are and hurting those kids. And I believe if you empower teachers to be a large part of the decision-making process in how those evaluations work, it will set standards for what needs to be in there.

Fifty percent of it has to be on student performance, 50 percent on teacher practice. Of the student performance at least 35 percent of it has to be based on test scores. The other 15 percent could be on measures that allow flexibility in that district, because each district is going to judge their children a little bit differently. And all of the evaluation and the use of tests should be based on growth, not on the raw score, because some kids are going to start out in the 50s and some kids are going to start in the 80s. The raw number can't be what we determine. I think that's one of the mistakes we've made.

It has to be about growth and progress, and that's the way teachers need to be evaluated. How did this child walk in, and how did they leave? And if they left significantly better than when they walked in, even if their number is still low because they started low, that teacher should be rewarded for that, because he or she has made progress happen.

I think where we get in trouble on the state level is when we dictate to them every term of this, because then they're not empowered to be able to give the kind of innovation that we need to be able to have each school district deal with their particular population.

What needs to be done in Short Hills, New Jersey -- Millburn, Short Hills -- is significantly different than what needs to be done in Patterson. And we should empower folks. But in the end -- I think the theme throughout this entire talk I hope has been about accountability -- you've got to be accountable for results. If you're not accountable for results, that's where the state has to come in and provide the penalties for a lack of accountability.

So, I want to empower teachers to be part of it. I think that we'll go over the fear level a bit. But remember, even implied in your question is a conflating of teachers and the union. I don't trust the union to develop these rules. In my plan, the union will have nothing to do with

developing these rules. The teachers in the individual districts will have to do it. The union will play no role in trying to do it, and I think that's where maybe the disconnect is a little bit.

Other questions.

Yes, sir, in the back? There's a microphone coming for you.

SPEAKER: Thank you. I thought your comments were very comprehensive. And how is it -- how are we going to succeed as a country when our kids are going to school 180 days a year -- we're still on an agrarian school calendar, as if my kids are going to bring in the harvest next week -- where kids in Singapore, in Zurich, in Stockholm are going 225 to 226 a year? You know, how is it that, you know, we think the American dream is, you know, two acres and a nice house, whereas in other parts of the world they're investing in their kids' education, in private tutors? In the American dream, their legacy is how prepared they've made their children this 21st century world. How do we compete in just the difference in school year?

GOVERNOR CHRISTIE: Um-hmm. Well, I think it's a really a good point. One of the things that charter schools are doing pretty well, because they're not under the same restrictions, is they're doing longer school days and longer school years, and many of them are

showing achievement as a result.

Now, some of that's based upon the environmental differences in some of these districts. You know, I had one charter school principal in Newark say to me I'm not letting my kids out there in June and July in the middle of the summer in Newark with nothing to do all day, with parents who are working. That's a recipe for them not to come back. So, some of it has been charter schools.

Remember what charter schools were set up to be? Let's remember, first, charter schools are public schools. They're not private schools; they're public schools.

Secondly, they were set up to not operate under all the onerous union rules that we've been talking about today but to be able to have the freedom to innovate. One of the innovations they put in is longer school day and longer school year.

Well, part of the deal with charter schools is we were supposed to take what we learned from charter schools and apply it to the broader system. Why don't we do that? Because union rules and union contracts block our ability to do that. And so you want to know why we don't have a longer day or a longer school year? Because the first thing -- the commissioner goes to the teachers union and says how about a longer school year. The first thing they're going to do is this:

pay me more; how about a longer school day: pay me more -- without accounting for the fact that current teacher salaries aren't annualized.

They like to say the average teacher makes \$60,000 a year in New Jersey. That's on a non-annualized basis of course. That's for 180 days of work. When you annualize that salary, it looks a lot better. But they don't want to talk about that, because that would take the mask off of what they're doing.

So, the problem that you point out is a real problem and one that I think we can improve by having a longer school day and a longer school year, but we spend 25 billion as it is. If the attitude's going to be from the teacher's union well, if you want us to work in June or July or you want us to take less holidays, then you're going to have to pay me more, we're going to bankrupt the system. So, you know, this is the fundamental fight.

People don't -- a lot of people can't see why are you fighting with the teacher's union. Because everything that we do from tax policy to fiscal policy to education policy is hamstrung by the chokehold that the teacher's union has on the politicians in this country. And that's why I'm really proud of the president in this area, because he's having his own Nixon to China moment going after the NEA, because they're with him in the main, and he's got to continue to push



that, and so does Secretary Duncan in my view. I think if we work together on those kinds of things -- Republicans and Democrats -- then we can actually eliminate that chokehold. But I think your observation on longer school day and longer school year is absolutely right.

Yes, sir, up here.

SPEAKER: Two quick unrelated questions. The first one is what can corporations do to help you affect your vision? And the second one is a lot of money is spent on special education, which I applaud, but it seems to be even less effective than the mainstream money that is spent. Do you have a vision for how we can make those expenditures more effective?

GOVERNOR CHRISTIE: Yeah, on the first issue I think that the corporate world and the philanthropic world are doing a lot to drive change right now. You know, whether it's the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, most famously, or the Mark Zuckerberg gift that was given to Newark of a hundred million dollars that's going to be helping to drive change in Newark, or the dozens and dozens of other people that I can't begin to mention who are driving change, I think the corporate world and the philanthropic world can be a driver of change, because, again, some of the arguments about money -- when you have money helping to drive change, and non-taxpayer money, that gives the union

and others a lot less standing to be able to object to it, because you're not draining money.

Why are you draining my money, like that teacher said to me in the teacher meeting -- why are you taking my money away for charter schools. Well, this isn't your -- that's not her money to begin with, but you don't even have to get to that argument if we have private and philanthropic help to try to drive change. But they should demand accountability, as they are, for the money that they wind up putting forward in trying to bring change to the system.

Second, special education. One of the things we've been talking about in New Jersey is trying to centralize some of the delivery of special education a little bit more. You have districts all trying to figure out how to do this, and so we've talked in general, and this is in the very embryonic stages of our conversations but about having in every county Centers for Excellence on special education so we can bring together the best ideas -- because some of our districts -- you know, Chris lives in Montclair, and Montclair is famous for being one of the districts that deals with issues like autism and other developmental disability needs as well or better than any district in New Jersey. What are they doing in Montclair that's so great? And should we have to replicate that in 588 school districts with the expense that goes along with it, or can we set up

Centers for Excellence in every county that will allow people to be able access that without having to move? I can't say how many people move into places like Montclair and others purely because they have a child with developmental disabilities. And so, you know, one of the ideas that we're batting around is setting up Centers for Excellence, trying to bring all this talent together in a centralized place, and being able to, as a result, get certain economies of scale that will help with the cost of it and make the whole cost-effectiveness ratio look a little bit better than it looks right now.

Yes, sir.

SPEAKER: Governor, first off, thank you very much for taking on what I view as the most important domestic policy fight in the United States. You reference the movie, *Waiting for Superman*, in your remarks. I happen to be fortunate to live in an affluent town with very good schools. Our school district chose a public screening for parents of a movie called *Road to Nowhere*, which basically takes a bit of an opposite theme than does *Waiting for Superman*. The theme of this movie is that the children in similar affluent towns with good school districts are over-scheduled, stressed out, and have way too much on their plate. I have my own opinion of that. If this type of reforms that you are proposing go through -- more robust standards, longer school days,

etc. -- do you foresee a similar fight, if you will, in towns that are perceived to have good school districts?

GOVERNOR CHRISTIE: I would hope not. I mean, you know, on education I think what you can anticipate is that it's such an emotional issue that you'll fight about almost anything. There will always be a sector that will fight with you about that. But I would think that the evidence of why a longer school day and a longer school year should be in effect is pretty self-evident. So, I would hope you wouldn't have the same kind of fight, especially in affluent districts. I think -- one of the things that we know about in New Jersey's really good districts is that they're not nearly as good as they think they are, okay? They have extraordinary reputations, but they're not nearly as good as they think they are. And so can there be improvement in those districts? Absolutely. There can be. And this type of system will help to improve in those districts as well and will unmask some of the non-achievers in those districts as well. Those districts tend to take great bows for college placement when oftentimes they haven't had nearly as much to do with it as they claim to do with it.

So, I would hope that you wouldn't find that kind of pressure, and I've heard about this over-scheduling, too much pressure. Listen, you know what I think that is? I don't think that's a product of the

school at all. In my experience -- and my son and my daughter, who are here today as well, go to, you know, I think very achievement-oriented parochial high schools. What we find is it's not the schools that are putting pressure on these kids; it's us crazy parents.

I mean, I'm -- you know, I remember when my oldest son, Andrew, was in grade school. He had friends who have parents who, in grade school, were trying to get them to start taking the SATs to get them ready. You know, Chris, if they don't start getting used to that test now, they're not going to get the 1600 they need to get into Princeton. And the kids are, like, in 6th grade. Like, you know, you think these kids are going to be, like, you know, have some, you know, issues? I mean, listen. All this is parents, right? No. Right now, that we're doing something that will cause our children to see a counselor sometime in the future. (Applause) We just don't know what it is, because if we knew what it was, we wouldn't do it. But we don't know. They're going to be on the couch for something, all right?

But I think that when you see those kinds of issues about pressure and over-scheduling, that's parents. You have to have another extra curricular activity to get into the ivy league school. You play another sport and it will help you get into the ivy league school. You know, take another AP class; it will help you get into the ivy league

school. I mean, I think that that pressure is not something that principals and teachers are putting on kids.

In fact, I find in my children's schools that they're trying to take that pressure off them and that they're trying to talk parenting off the ledge about this process, to say, like -- take a deep breath, okay -- is there a huge difference between your child going to Penn or going to UVA? Is their entire life going to be changed if they wind up going to, you know, Dartmouth or Boston College? Is their whole life going to be completely turned upside down if they have to go to North Western, you know, rather than go to Harvard? Because that's what we're talking about with these kids.

We're not talking about going to a community college versus going to, you know, an ivy league school. We're talking about going to Georgetown versus going to Yale. I think either way if they study hard they're going to be okay. So, I think there is an issue on that, but I think we'd better look in the mirror on that issue. I don't think our schools are causing that problem. I think we're causing that problem, you know? The people who want to have the story that I told, which as my son says, you know, our school is a safety school. Well, I mean, everybody wants to have that story. Hopefully, we've done it in a way where, you know, he's not going to be on the couch about that, but, you

know, we'll have to see. But I think that's what that issue's all about.

SPEAKER: Can I tell my wife you said that?

GOVERNOR CHRISTIE: Yes, you can. (Laughter)

I can take one more question. This guy right over here near the wall.

SPEAKER: Hi. As a former New York City teacher and the head of a group of 2300 teachers in New York that are fighting for many of the changes that you're talking about, one thing that I think was missing that I want to ask about is you said great principals or great administrators would never fire great teachers. How are you going to tie administrator evaluations in to teacher evaluations in that if teachers are held accountable for their students' growth, shouldn't, then, principals be accountable for teachers' growth?

GOVERNOR CHRISTIE: Absolutely, and I missed that part of the speech. I got so wound up on other stuff that I forgot to tell you about that part.

Our Educator -- it's called our Educator Evaluation Effectiveness Plan, and it is to evaluate, at the same time, teachers and principals, because we do know that the other thing that determines a great school is having a great leader in the principal's office and that it's really one of the indispensable parts of having a great school. And so

we're also talking about setting up statuses like master teacher and master principal for folks who not only achieve that level based upon the accomplishment that they show in their school and the leadership they show in their classroom and in their school but also to their being mentors to folks who also want to know why is it that you're being as effective as you are; how did you get this designation; and what have you accomplished to be able to do it? So, that was my fault. I completely missed that part of the conversation. But our task force that put together this plan made it very clear to us -- and we had a task force of school superintendents, principals, teachers in both the public schools and the private and parochial schools. All of them came back and said that you cannot just evaluate teachers; you must evaluate principals and that principals have to be covered by the same rules, that if the principal is not providing the leadership necessary, they've got to get booted out, too. And so there is no doubt that those are an inextricable pair. The teaching staff and the principals are an inextricable paring, and if you have failure in one of those, you very well could have failure throughout the entire school. So, thanks for reminding me that I forgot that part of it.

I'm glad to hear that you're fighting for those things, because there is this illusion -- and I'll end with this -- there's this illusion that the union really speaks for teachers. That the union speaks for



some teachers I will not deny that, but you would think that they do because you say well, why would they join if the union doesn't speak for them? Well, I don't know what the laws are in New York, but I suspect they're probably similar to New Jersey. In New Jersey if you teach in a public school, you must join the union, and your dues are taken out in a compulsory fashion directly from your paycheck by the state and deposited directly into the account of the teachers union. But you can get out if you want -- I guess I should be technically correct -- you can get out. But if you want to get out, you have to pay 85 percent of the dues to get out -- 85 percent of the dues to get out. It's like the Hotel California, right? You can check out anytime you like but you can never leave. (Laughter) The teachers union gets 85 percent of the dues for you to quit. And then if you try to come to a teachers union meeting, they say you're not allowed in, you're not a member. Well, wait a second, I paid 85 percent of the duties. No, well, that's to be out. If you want to be in give me the other 15 percent. And for teachers now -- this is in New Jersey -- \$735 a year. They pay more for their union dues than they pay for their health insurance from the state. Think about the problem that creates, okay? They're getting full-family health insurance for near nothing -- near nothing. If you take an average teacher who's making \$50,000 a year, they pay 1½ percent of their salary for their

health insurance -- \$750 for a health insurance policy that cost anywhere between 18 and 24,000 a year. Taxpayers are paying the rest of it. And they're paying the same amount just about for their union dues. It's crazy.

So, you know, I believe -- and these teacher meetings have had a -- really reinforces with me that teachers in the main know that the system is broken. They know it needs to be fixed. But their voices are being muffled and silenced in some instances by the people who represent them. It's an incredible situation that we've allowed to happen in our country. It's the people outside the system who are trying to empower the teachers to speak their mind. There's the people inside the system who are trying to quash the voices of their members, because it doesn't serve their personal interests.

If you ever ran a business like this, it would just be insane, and it's the most important business we have in America in my opinion. It's how we perform, how our kids are going to perform for the rest of their lives based on what they're doing in classrooms right now.

So, I thank Brookings for the opportunity to come and talk about this. We're going to be talking a lot about this over the course of the next year. I know that here in New York Government Cuomo is going to be talking a lot about it, too. Mayor Bloomberg has already spoken a

lot about it. This is an issue whose time has come, and it's time for us to force resolution of this issue, because if we don't we're going to write off another generation, and that's something that none of us can afford.

So, Jim, thanks for the introduction, the invitation, and thanks, Brookings, for having me.

MR. WHITEHURST: I'd like to thank the governor for being here. Could I ask you to remain seated while the governor leaves, please.

\* \* \* \* \*

## CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

/s/Carleton J. Anderson, III

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2012