

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

SAUL/ZILKHA ROOM

DATA-DRIVEN GOVERNMENT:
A NEW APPROACH TO GOVERNING

A CONVERSATION WITH GOVERNOR MARTIN O'MALLEY

Washington, D.C.

Wednesday, March 11, 2015

PARTICIPANTS:

Welcome and Introduction:

THE HONORABLE NORMAN EISEN
Visiting Fellow, Governance Studies
The Brookings Institution

Keynote Address:

THE HONORABLE MARTIN O'MALLEY
Former Governor
State of Maryland

Moderator:

WILLIAM A. GALSTON
Senior Fellow and Ezra K. Zilkha Chair in Governance Studies
The Brookings Institution

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. EISEN: Good morning, everyone. It's my pleasure to welcome Governor Martin O'Malley to the Center for Public Effective Public Management here in Brookings Governance Studies program.

One of the critical problems that we analyze in our work is how to make government work better for the middle class, for average Americans and for everyone. Martin O'Malley has been a trailblazer in doing that as governor of Maryland for two terms, from 2007 to 2015, and before that, in serving two terms as mayor of Baltimore.

Under his leadership as governor, Maryland recovered 100 percent of the jobs lost during the great recession; was one of just seven states to maintain a triple A bond rating, and the College Board organization named Maryland one of the top states in the nation in holding down the cost college tuition. The state also had the best public schools in America for an unprecedented five years in a row.

Governor O'Malley compiled a similarly distinguished record as the mayor of Baltimore, where *Time* named him one of America's top five big city mayors. He's going to talk today about some of the public management tools that he helped pioneer as governor and as mayor that produced those results, and in particular, ways that he and his team used data to make government work better for everyone.

He will focus on, among other things, the StateStat and CitiStat programs. After his remarks, my colleague, Bill Galston, will ask him a couple of questions, and then we will open the floor to your questions. Ladies and gentlemen, it's my pleasure to introduce Governor O'Malley. (Applause)

GOVERNOR O'MALLEY: Well, thank you.

MR. EISEN: Thank you.

GOVERNOR O'MALLEY: Thank you. Thanks very, very much, Norm,

Ambassador Eisen. Thank you for your kind introduction, and thank you for setting the wheels in motion for this event. This was fun. And thank you all for being here, as well.

It's a great honor to be here at Brookings today. The people that work in and around this building have done some really outstanding work on analysis and research on government performance. So, it's a pleasure to be here with all of you to talk about data driven governing, an issue that is near and dear to my heart.

Our country and world faces some big challenges, whether it's making our economy work again for all of us or confronting security threats or climate change, but all of those challenges, confronting them will require a government that actually works. You and I see a world where our creativity and imagination have now expand --

(audio skips)

GOVERNOR O'MALLEY: -- and help make so much of that progress possible. And yet, creativity and imagination are not exactly the first words that come to mind with most citizens today when we think about our government. And I guess the question I wanted to explore a little bit with you off the bat is, what if they were? What if we tackled our biggest problems by using data-driven strategies instead of conventional wisdom, or the way we've always done it?

Now, what if we could make our communities safer by knowing in real time where crime was actually happening every day, and then, deploying police officers to those precise locations at the right time? What if we could put an end to lead poisoning of children, instead of ignoring it, as if it were a problem that just could not be solved? What if we improved public safety by using big data and the experience now that we have of years of recidivism to actually identify that small percentage of probationers and parolees who are truly the greatest threats to public safety?

And what if, by sharing medical records and targeting the personal

interventions, we could actually cut avoidable hospital readmissions by 10 percent a year, every year? Imagine if the overall performance of any school could be measured over time so that citizens and parents could actually see where we were headed? Imagine if one common platform not only measured the job skills and greatest demand in a given county or metro area, but also, allowed employers to find the skilled workers they need and unskilled workers to obtain the training they need to fill the jobs being created in this new economy.

Well, as you might have guessed, in Baltimore and in Maryland, we did all of these things and more. And this, my fellow citizens, is the new way of governing. And it's not about excuses, deflecting blame or ignoring problems. It's about transparency and openness and accountability, and it's about performance management. It's not about left or right. It's about doing the things that work that move us forward. And it also is about setting clear goals, measuring progress, and quite simply, getting things done again.

You see, the old ways of governing, bureaucracy, hierarchy, these things are fading away and a new way of governing is emerging, and it also calls for a new way of leadership at every level; leadership that embraces a culture of accountability, embraces entrepreneurial approaches to problem solving and embraces collaboration.

Leadership, in other words, that understands the power of technologies, like smart maps and GIS and the Internet to make the work of progress making open and visible for every citizen. This new way of governing has quietly taken root in cities and towns all across our country, and it's happening in blue states as well as red states, and pursued honestly and relentlessly, it holds the promise of a more effective way of governing at every level of our public life -- local, state and yes, federal.

Now, our approach to this was actually born in the subway system of

New York City. In the early 1990s, there lived a great man named Jack Maple, Lieutenant Maple, actually, of the New York City Transit Authority Police. And Lieutenant Jack Maple believed there was a better way to deploy his police officers than the way they had always done it. And with nothing more sophisticated than paper maps and colored markers, Jack started plotting where and when robberies took place on his section of the subway. He called these "Maps of the Future."

And then, he sent his undercover detectives and transit officers to stop criminals where they were most likely to strike at the times they were most likely to strike. And he put in his own words, the cops on the dots. And Jack and his police officers drove robberies down to record low levels. The media came calling and the new police commissioner came calling.

And soon, Jack wasn't just plotting out a strategy for part of the subway, he was made the deputy police commissioners of the entire New York City Police Department and developed a system that came to be known and used all across the country called Compstat. And the NYPD, under his command and under the leadership of Commissioner Bill Bratton went on to reduce violent crime to levels that very, very, very few people ever would have thought possible in New York City 20 years ago.

New York's ongoing success in reducing crime and saving lives quite literally led to a revolution of performance measured policing in cities and towns all across the United States. And one of the first of those major cities was my city of Baltimore. You see, when I was elected mayor in 1999, our city had sadly allowed herself to become the most violent, the most addicted and the most abandoned city in America, with more population loss over the prior 30 years than any major city in our country.

And at the beginning of our administration, we were able to put an

additional 20 police officers onto the streets of Baltimore which presented us with a really important question -- where to send them. Now, we could have deployed them equally to each of the six council districts. That would be one way to do it. Or, if we wanted to be real political about it, we could deploy them to the council districts with the highest numbers of primary voters.

Or, if we wanted to be real, real political about it, we could deploy them to the districts where the greatest number of people voted for me. Or, or, we could actually deploy them to the concentrated hotspots where the greatest numbers of our citizens were being shot, mugged or robbed. This is the option we chose, and we repeated that Compstat process every day and every week, constantly searching for better tactics and better strategies to save lives and prevent crime.

And over the next 10 years, Baltimore went on to achieve, thanks to courageous police officers and neighbors, some of the biggest crime reductions -- in fact, the biggest reduction in part one of any major city in America in those ensuing 10 years. Now, there's a baseball equivalent of this Compstat strategy. Some call it Money ball. Some call it The Shift.

You put your fielders where the past performance of the upcoming hitter says they are most likely to hit the ball. You put your police where crime is most likely to happen. The Shift. That's the deployment of resources to maximum effect. And that's goal driven, data-driven thinking. It helps win ball games and it helps make a city safer.

And we brought this new way of governing and getting things done not only to our police department, but to the whole enterprise of city government, and we became the first major city in America to do so. We started to create a new culture; a new culture of higher expectations in City Hall, one of accountability, transparency, meritocracy centered around results, and the constant search for better ways to get

things done.

The leaders started to emerge, and we recognized them, and their colleagues were able to see who their own leaders were in their organizations by their performance. And we set high goals. We used data to tell us whether or not the things we were doing were working every day and every week. And our CitiStat approach, like Compstat, was built on four principles -- four tenets that we adopted lock, stock and barrel -- timely accurate information shared by all, rapid deployment of resources, effective tactics and strategies and relentless follow up -- always the hard part.

Every two weeks, if you can picture this scene, on a constant and rotating basis, my team and I would hold CitiStat meetings with the agency or department heads and their leadership teams up on the sixth floor of City Hall in the big room with the big boards and the screen projectors that would project the data that the department heads and the agency had submitted prior to the meeting. And everything was mapped out, and everything was indexed to the previous reporting periods of two weeks before so that everybody could see and everybody would know.

And ideas were shared and questions were fired back and forth. If we failed to hit a goal, we wanted to know why. And if we hit a goal, we wanted to know how so we could do it again and again. And it worked. We brought crime down by 43 percent. We reduced the number of children poisoned by lead in our city by 71 percent. And early on, when the former impatient and irascible mayor of Baltimore, William Donald Schaeffer, my mentor and tormentor (Laughter) accused our administration of having no vision, we responded with the 48 hour pothole guarantee (Laughter).

And our crews actually hit that guarantee, and they hit 97 percent of the time. And each of the members of those crews got a thank you note from the mayor when they did it. The Kennedy School at Harvard in 2001 gave us their Innovations in

Government Award. Our innovation was that we started measuring outputs instead of just inputs.

And of course, though, we didn't do CitiStat to win awards. We did it to survive. We did it to make our city safer and cleaner and a better place for kids to grow up. That, by the way, is the international mission statement of every mayor the world over.

For many years in our city, it had seemed like the drug dealers were more effective than our own government. But thanks to CitiStat, that reality was starting to change. And when I was elected governor of Maryland in 2007, we took this approach statewide and we called it StateStat. And the measures more diverse, but the premise was essentially the same. It was data-driven decision making, collaboration, follow up and results.

And we shared those results, good or bad, with an online dashboard so that every citizen could access it and see where we stood as a people and where we were going with that important tool of ours, our government. And with this approach, we achieved something in public safety of a -- like a public safety triple crown. We drove crime down to a 30 year low in Maryland, incarceration to a 20 year low, at the same time, reducing recidivism by nearly 20 percent. There are not many states that did that.

With this approach, our teachers, our principals, our parents and kids with the financial backing they needed and commitment from us, made our schools the best public schools in the nation for an unprecedented five years in a row. That had never happened before, and we did it in the middle of a recession.

We cut in half the number of children placed in foster care, driving that down to the lowest levels on record. We set a goal of reducing infant mortality by 10 percent, and when we hit that goal, we kept going. And we reduced infant mortality by

more than 17 percent, overall, and 25 percent among Africa Americans families.

We took on the big challenge of healthcare costs with a commitment and a goal of driving down preventable hospital readmissions, by creating a platform for healthcare providers to share patient information, by mapping the incidents and the locations of chronic conditions and people who suffer from them, and by aligning the profit incentives to wellness rather than to sickness, we drove down avoidable hospital readmissions by more than 10 percent in just the first year of trying.

It used to be in Maryland that governors of Maryland would set a 40 year hope for cleaning up the Chesapeake Bay. We instead, started to measure actions and results. We created BayStat to identify and map not only the sources of pollution, but the actions that we can take together on land, in the right places to halt the flow of pollutants into the rivers and streams of the Chesapeake Bay.

We set not a 40 year hope, but two year milestones, and we took measureable actions to reduce storm water run-off and to expand the number of acres planted with winter cover crops, top grade clean technology at all of our sewage treatment plants throughout the state. We made it possible for citizens to click on any of the tributary basins where they lived to see whether we were making progress and hitting our goals to restore the health of our waters.

And for all of that effort, we reduced nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment levels by 14, 15 and 18 percent respectively. We restored hundreds and hundreds of acres of stream buffers and natural wetlands, and we doubled the number of native oysters that are now filtering the waters of the Chesapeake Bay.

Did we meet every goal we set? No. We did not meet every goal we set. But with true performance measured governing and with openness, failure has to be an option, albeit a temporary option. If we met every goal that we set, then we probably

weren't setting our sites very high or picking very worthy goals.

One tragic example is this: After six years of steady progress saving lives, increasing drug treatment, Maryland, like many other states, experienced a really deadly spike in heroin overdoses. So, we set a new goal. Instead of merely expanding drug treatment, we set the goal of reducing drug overdose deaths by 20 percent.

We made some progress reducing prescription drug abuse by mapping out facilities and doing a better job of monitoring the pill mills and shutting them down when we identified them. We got more people into treatment than we ever had, but it wasn't enough to prevent or reverse this tragic spike. As with any of these efforts, when what you're doing is no longer working, you have to come up with new approaches. And so, we did, and so, we must.

What I've learned in 15 years of executive service, taking Compstat to CitiStat, taking CitiStat to StateStat, is that the larger the human organization, the more important performance management becomes. We should not ever accept the excuse that because it's so big, it can't be managed. That's a copout.

Our framers never set out to create a nation that muddles through or gets by with less. We came together to form a more perfect union, and data-driven decision making and performance management, making our government work are essential to that mission of pursuing a more perfect union in these modern times. As some of you may know the problem at our federal level isn't a lack of goals or a lack of data. Man, we have agencies with dozens and dozens of goals and performance metrics and strategic objectives.

But what are the truly big goals for our nation? And what are the actions that allow us to achieve those big goals together? Too many federal goals are about process, not about outcomes. And having meetings is not a goal. To the public, all of

this process, process, process means very, very little to their lives. At our federal level, we have to have a clear view of the most important things our government is setting out to accomplish, and why.

And this requires clear goals that reflect what we, the people, actually value. And the difference between a goal and a dream is a deadline. Without a doubt, there is no progress without jobs. And job creation should be our highest goal. But let me give you just three other examples that speak to our values as a people.

The infant mortality rate in the United States of America is the highest of all the developed countries in the world. If we value reducing infant mortality as a nation, then our goal at the federal level should be to do just that by a measurable amount, by a certain time. If we were to reduce infant mortality across the nation at the same rate we did so in Maryland, we would save more than 4,000 American babies a year. That's 4,000 families that would be spared of that unfathomable loss. It is so easy to become lost in measuring everything from soup to nuts. We must measure what we value and value what we measure.

Second example: If we increase kindergarten readiness across the nation at the same rate we did in Maryland, we would have 825,000 more American children ready to learn on their very first day of school. That's 825,000 more children that would not start out behind. Eight hundred and twenty-five thousand more children taking their first vital steps towards success in education, and therefore, in life.

Final example: If we reduced preventable hospitalizations across the country at the same rate as we did in Maryland, we would keep 600,000 more Americans out of the hospital each year. That's 600,000 of us on our feet instead of flat on our backs in expensive hospital beds. In other words, Americans should know what our federal government's top five objectives are: Job creation, improving the security of our

people, improving the education and skills of our people, improving the sustainability of our way of life, improving the health and the wellness of all Americans.

And federal employees should know how their work and the work of their agency contribute to the achievement of those objectives. And leaders, staff and the public should all know whether we're making progress together, and where work still remains to be done.

Finally, coming to the table at the federal level cannot be simply a box checking exercise. We're doing this because somebody said we had to do this. Now, what good are lofty policy goals without follow up on the ground in the small places close to home where it really matters? What we need is nothing short of a new method of executive management; a method that becomes central every day to the important work of our federal government.

Our federal government's objective should be a reflection of what we value most, and those critically important things that we can only accomplish together. Now, early in my administration in the city of Baltimore as mayor, we would hold regularly, it seems in retrospect, every week (Laughs), town halls, community meetings all across our city.

And we came together as a community and as a people to talk about our fears very often; to talk about our frustrations; to talk about our hopes. And I invited neighbors to come and ask me, their mayor, anything. And that one of these meetings, I will never forget in East Baltimore, a little girl about 12 years old came up to the microphone, and she said, "Mr. Mayor, my name is Amber. And there are so many drug dealer and addicted people in my neighborhood that people in the newspaper refer to my neighborhood as Zombie Land. And I want to know if you know they call my neighborhood Zombie Land. And I want to know if you're doing something about it."

The question that she asked of me was really a question that she was asking of all of us. Do we know and are we doing something about it? Because behind all of our data, there are real people living their lives, shouldering their struggles, working hard every day to give their children a better future, and they deserve a government that works. Thanks very much. (Applause) Thank you.

MR. GALSTON: Well, let me begin by introducing myself. I'm Bill Galston, a senior fellow in government studies here at the Brookings Institution. And I want to congratulate the governor on his speech. I cannot imagine a more appropriate speech to be delivered under the aegis of the Center for Effective Public Management in governance studies here at Brookings.

Let me also add, on a personal note, that if you could find a way of bringing your 48 pothole guarantee to Washington, D.C. (Laughter), I would follow you to the end of the earth, and so would 500,000 other people. So, that caught my attention.

GOVERNOR O'MALLEY: It's hard to do in the middle of the snow.

MR. GALSTON: Yeah, well, it seems to be hard to do in the middle of the summer in this city, but that's a different point. I am informed that there's a little bit of wiggle room on the back end, so we have close to half an hour for the question and answer period.

Let me tell you what the plan is. I'm going to ask you one question. Then, I'm going to turn to the audience, first taking four or five press questions, and then moving on to this very large and interested standing room audience that has gathered to hear you talk and to hear you answer questions. If there's time at the end, I will wrap it with a question, and if not, I won't.

So, let me begin with my question. As you know, there is a pretty long history of trying to bring effective goal based performance measures to the federal

government, and to bring it more in line with the sorts of governance that you talked about in Baltimore and in the state of Maryland, I think it's fair to say that those efforts have met with incomplete success, and the level of current trust in government reflects that.

So, what is your analysis of why these prior efforts haven't gotten the job done, and how do you think that your approach would have a higher chance of actually being able to bring goals and effective performance measures to the federal government?

GOVERNOR O'MALLEY: I think it's important to realize that the ability to actually collect this sort of data and to do it in real time is a relatively recent phenomenon. I mean, 15 years ago, like 90 percent of the requests for service came in on paper in the city of Baltimore.

So, the Internet, GIS, you know, Excel spreadsheets and those sorts of things, they were a relatively sort of technology in terms of making our government work. But I think one of the great variables in all of this is leadership commitment. There are many, many mayors who visited our CitiStat room and saw the big boards and saw how nice it looked and how effective, and they loved the picture. But they lacked the commitment when they got home to actually do it every day, because it does require the leader not to sort of shout with the megaphone from the organizational triangle. It requires you to be in the center of the search for truth, and to be there constantly -- a presence in the middle, if you will, of a collaborative circle.

I think mayors have taken to this a lot easier than governors, frankly. I mean, if you look, there's more and more literature coming out on this. John Bernard just did a book called "Governor that Works" where he traces this. Mayors embraced it first, and I think it's because the works that mayors do is so very, very visible that they never

enjoyed some sort of information situational advantage of knowing what was going on six months before the public.

I mean, everybody knows whether their city is becoming cleaner or safer. So, mayors have embraced this first. There's a lot of governors that are now heading in this direction. They were slower. And there have been some points in the federal government where it's actually kind of popped up there. The Recovery and Reinvestment Act was one example.

But the great variable here is really executive commitment. You need the executive, whether it's the mayor, governor or president very committed to this, not as some sort of one-off press conference for a nice announcement. He or she has to be committed to this being a new way and a new method of executive management.

MR. GALSTON: Thank you very much, Governor. And I will now turn to the press questions. I believe that most of the press is in this sector, and so if you just want to raise your hands and identify yourselves, and then we'll move on. Yes?

Let's wait for the microphone. Sorry. I should have said that.

Do you we have another one? This one doesn't seem to be working.

GOVERNOR O'MALLEY: I think they should read it first, and I think that we have to be very careful about lowering our standards, whether it's environmental standards or whether it's how we treat workers, just in the interest of getting a trade deal done for the sake of the trade deal. I think that we should be -- when we enter into trade deals, it should be with a view towards yes, bringing down barriers, but bringing up standards. And I think we should consider very carefully and not in a precipitous way, that proposed agreement.

SPEAKER: (Inaudible) from the Washington --

GOVERNOR O'MALLEY: I don't know that I'm -- I have many times, John, as you know, from having covered state government for many years in Annapolis, answered FOIA, as we abide by all of our state rules on emails. I've many times turned over emails in response to FOIAs, even though some of them due to colorful language, might have caused my mother great embarrassment (Laughter).

So, we'll abide by whatever FOIAs we have to turn over. We had a retention policy, and you know, unless there was open litigation there and open FOIA, we general would hold onto those for a certain number of weeks, and then delete them or purge them from our system. But we always abided by whatever the state law was on that, and I relied on my legal counsel to do that.

MR. GALSTON: I understand there's a press --

GOVERNOR O'MALLEY: And there's also no --

MR. GALSTON: I'm sorry.

GOVERNOR O'MALLEY: There's also no archiving requirement in Maryland on emails. But we did archive a ton of StateStat operational memos (Laughter) for all of you to peruse for eight years.

MR. GALSTON: I understand there's a press question in the back.

(Audio skips)

SPEAKER: -- what our official duty is.

GOVERNOR O'MALLEY: Really (Laughter)? In our -- I'm not expert on federal requirements or state requirements, and frankly, I'm a little sick of the email drama. But in our state, whether you used a personal email or the public email or a carrier pigeon, it was all public record subject to disclosure of and response to any FOIA. You're not going to ask about emails, are you?

SPEAKER: No (Laughter).

(Audio skips)

SPEAKER: -- environment of it with Hearst Television. The message you brought here today, Governor, is this something you want to share with the national audience as a presidential candidate?

GOVERNOR O'MALLEY: Well, I'm seriously considering running in 2016, and I believe that if we want to continue to heal our economy and heal our democracy, we're going to have to make our government work, and we're going to have to do a better job of making our government perform for the dollars that people pay for it. And I think those three things all go together.

So, there's not a doubt in my mind that this is the new way of governing and getting things done. And you see it emanating out over these last 15 years up from cities to states, and this is how our federal government should operate, and some entrepreneurial department heads in the federal government already are operating this way.

But it is coming, just as sure as the rising tide of expectations of Americans under 40. They see their banks being able to operate in secure and personally responsive ways. They see it from retailers, and they want their government to actually work and perform and function. So yes, I intend to talk about this whenever I can.

MR. GALSTON: I believe Dana Millbank has a question for you, governor.

MR. MILLBANK: Yes, hi, Governor. Dana Millbank from the Post. This all sounds like terrific stuff you're talking about, but perhaps may not fire up the Democratic primary electorate. How do you propose to do that?

GOVERNOR O'MALLEY: I'm going to be giving a number of talks over

the course of these next couple of months, including a discussion about how to make our economy work again for all of us, or at least, the majority of us, which with wages declining for 12 years in a row, it's hard for us to say that our job is done. We're creating jobs again, but we need to get wages going up.

There are many, many challenges, as I alluded at the beginning of these remarks. I mean, I appreciate Brookings having an interest in effective governance and performance management, which is why I came here to give this particular talk. But in order to meet the big challenges we face, whether they're security challenges, whether it's climate change or whether it's fixing what's still not working in our economy, it's going to require a government that works. And I think people are actually far more interested in a functioning government, an effective governance and people with executive experience than we might give them credit for.

MR. GALSTON: I'll take last press question, and then move to the audience questions.

MR. ROTH: Thank you so much, Governor. Jeff Roth from the *New York Post*. How are you? Just to put it -- forgive me, an email question. To put it more directly, were you satisfied with Secretary Clinton's response yesterday, which I assume you saw, that she or her attorneys personally went through her cache of some 60,000 emails and determined on their own which ones were personal and which ones were government, and turned that portion over to the State Department?

Or, do you think there's a public interest in having an independent person or some other entity figure out whether all of the proper emails were scooped up?

GOVERNOR O'MALLEY: Jeff, I respect your interest in this issue (Laughter). And I didn't watch the press conference yesterday, so I don't know. You know? I'll leave that to you to figure it out. I didn't really -- I didn't watch it.

SPEAKER: Why not?

GOVERNOR O'MALLEY: Because I was working. (Laughter)

MR. GALSTON: That seems like an excellent note. And oh good, this does allow me to stand up. And it's been my experience that the people in the back get short shrift at Brookings events, so I'm going to reverse the usual procedure and start back there. There's a gentleman on the aisle. That's right. You've got it.

MR. MOORE: Good morning, Governor. My name is James Moore. I'm a presidential management fellow with the Department of Housing and Urban Development. You spoke about having real time statistics on fighting crime. Did your administration also measure community policing, police training and building trust with citizens in communities?

GOVERNOR O'MALLEY: Thank you. Our whole campaign in 1999, James, was all about community policing, Compstat, what was sometimes called at the time, zero tolerance policing. So, we had a very, very robust conversation in 1999 about all of that. And our strategy was that we needed to improve the effectiveness of our police. We needed to do a better job of policing our police, which includes some of those things you mentioned; training, random integrity stings, beefing up internal affairs.

We staffed for the first time, with independent detectives a relatively new civilian review board, and we put the money in to give them their own detectives so that they could investigate case. We tracked openly and reported regularly the number of discourtesy complaints in excessive force and those sorts of things. And the third part of that strategy was to intervene earlier in the lives of young people. But those three. More effective policing, a better job of policing our police and intervening in the lives of young people.

And then, we put the numbers out there all of the time, and we put out a

big plan, and we took the plan all around the city. We did town hall after town hall after town hall in every single district. And when bad incidents happened, as they do and as they will -- no profession is you know, above bad incidents or bad actors, we address it in a very forthright way, and we continued to put those numbers out there more openly and transparently than we ever had before.

And I guess some of the strongest proof that we were able to maintain, that's precious consensus and that basic level of trust, was in the fact that in that first campaign, after these discussions, we won every single council district, including the two of my two opponents, which were the two hardest hit areas by crime.

And even with a much increased police effort and the rolling back of open air drug markets and an heightened level of enforcement, I was re-elected with 88 percent of the vote four years later. So, look, there is no issue around which there is greater fear and pain in America over our racial divisions, probably, than around the issue of public safety. And there's just no substitute for leaders wading into the center of those fears and leading the conversation and the dialogue, and making these institutions of policing and policing the police more open and transparent.

MR. GALSTON: Thank you. There's a hand right there. I can't tell whose hand it is, but I am certainly willing to recognize the bearer.

MR. SNYDER: Hi, Jim Snyder from iSolon, a member of the D.C. Open Government Coalition and a resident of Maryland.

My question is, what is your definition of a high value dataset? And specifically, does it include politically sensitive data? Now, this is an endemic problem all over the country as governors and mayors open up their datasets, that tends to be a significant (Inaudible) issue when it comes to politically sensitive data.

And just to motivate that question and provide two examples, three of the

questioners from the press asked about the email, and you responded to the second one that our state email is a public record, responsive to the Public Information Act. That's not quite true in the way it sounds. Just motivate that.

In my district, we have -- it's a billion dollar school district, and they rotate the archive every 30 days. And the Public Information Act is 30 days.

MR. GALSTON: Sorry. I'm going to have to cut you off, sir.

MR. SNYDER: Okay.

MR. GALSTON: I think the governor has the gist of your question --

MR. SNYDER: Sure. Yeah, okay.

MR. GALSTON: -- and I'm sure he'll (Inaudible) --

(Simultaneous discussion)

MR. SNYDER: But the point is, you can't actually use the acts as email with such a situation. And this type of loophole is widespread in Maryland with a whole variety of databases.

GOVERNOR O'MALLEY: Well you know, and there's also -- I mean, how to answer that. Maryland was named a leader in the open data movement. I think we received some award from somebody that watches this (Laughter) and matches these things. I always looked at open data in the operations of our government as -- and the genies that needed to be released from the bottle.

And it was my hope that as much data as we could get out there and open up, that it would be very hard, once people started actually using it to see whether they might be like with a river keeper's organization or a PTA or advocates for whatever; more responsive policing -- that it would be very hard to put those genies back in the bottle.

So, we were a leader in that open data movement. I hope that my

successor has kept that going. And we also got better at arraying it, or putting it out there in ways that people -- that it wasn't so dizzying. In other words, making it easier for people to use it and manipulate it and create charts and graphs and those things. And all of that is still an evolution.

Back on the email stuff, yeah, we had a retention policy, but if there was a FOIA file, we held onto those and turned them over. We don't have an archiving requirement, and it is an open question of public policy all across our country, how long should governments retain. Ninety days? Two days? Three weeks? Who knows? Open and interesting question in the age of electronic information sharing.

I think the most important information, though, is really about the operations. And I thought that's where you were going with your question, because I've seen the look in the eyes of a lot of veteran mayors when they saw the CitiStat room, and when they saw that they were going to have to own their last five years of service (Laughter) by putting it all online, I could almost see the look in people's eyes as saying, we've got to get out of here (Laughter) and we're not doing this.

But the newly elected mayors really have fresh opportunities, and these men and women, when they first come in, I think are taking the bar to a constantly higher and higher level. And I think it's also why you're seeing people moving back to cities.

I mean, nobody wants to live in a place that's becoming more dirty and more dangerous, more violent. Conversely, when cities become more livable, when they become safer -- I mean, you're seeing younger people moving back to them and cities are starting to function, and people kind of vote with their feet. So, it's causal and not merely coincidental that people are returning to cities, particularly younger people, because they see that their governments there are being operated more open, transparent in personally responsive ways.

MR. GALSTON: Yes. The woman in the red dress, right there.

SPEAKER: Hi. I'm Miriam. I'm with the Data Quality Campaign, and we've talked a lot about crime and stuff like that. I'm focusing a little bit on education.

What kind of measures did you take to address high school graduation rates post secondary success, and just seeing you know, which high schools have the best outcomes? And did you have any success in raising graduation rates in Maryland during your time as governor?

GOVERNOR O'MALLEY: Yes, we did. And we had success in raising graduation rates in Maryland. We also had tremendous success in getting more of our students to take stem related AP exams and to pass them. In fact, I think a greater percentage skipped -- a greater percentage of students in Maryland take and pass AP exams -- stem related AP exams than any other state in the country.

A rendition of this can be found on a great online blog. It's called Letters to the People of Maryland. And you can find it on Tumblr, and there's a whole section in there (Laughter), that has the strategies that we pursued on education and the metrics that we looked at to drive up graduation rates, AP success. And on the post secondary piece of things, we increased, I think by 37 percent, the number of associate degrees that were awarded compared to the benchmark year 2006. And all of this is on there, as well.

I mean, how did we do it? We did it by a number of different strategies. Each of these goals, by the way, we developed a delivery plan for achieving those goals. And that delivery plan would lay out the leading actions that we needed to take in concert to drive towards those goals. So, in schools -- we greatly increased funding for schools. You know, elementary, but we also went four years in a row without a penny's increase to college tuition, and we did a better job than any state but Montana over those eight years at holding down the cost of in-state tuition.

We provided better training for a lot of our high school teachers, particularly in the stem field. We greatly increased the readiness of kids entering kindergarten to actually learn. But all of this is laid out in Letters to the People of Maryland. I wrote about four blog entries a day for the last 20 days of my service, and its 380 exciting pages (Laughter) for those of you who want to --

MR. GALSTON: Well, Governor, as I promised, I would reserve the last question for myself, and I would ask the audience, after Governor O'Malley has finished answering my question to remain seated while he is able to exit the room expeditiously. He has generously given us some extra minutes at the back end, for which we're grateful.

And Governor, let me just preface my question by repeating something that I told you when we were chatting before this meeting; namely, that I did work for about two and half years in Bill Clinton's White House. And in that connection, you know, a statement that you made a couple of weeks ago touches on your vision of leadership and many other things besides, and I'd like to give you a chance to comment on your comment.

You said triangulation is not a strategy that will move America forward. History celebrates profiles in courage, not profiles in convenience -- interesting choice of words under the circumstances. And so, let me just ask you very directly, is it your view that the country did not move forward during Bill Clinton's two terms?

GOVERNOR O'MALLEY: No. It's my view that our country can only move forward now on the power of our principles as a people. And whether you're talking about foreign policy leadership, we should always be leading with our principles rather than expediency.

When it comes to leadership here at home, when it comes to immigration, when it comes to the need for continued reform on Wall Street, instead of offering up

Dodd-Frank light, so as not to offend any Democratic party loyalists in Manhattan, I think we need to continue this job, and we need to do it on the principles that unite as a people. When those refugee kids risk starvation and all sorts of suffering to arrive at our doorsteps, we should stick to our principles and treat them with the -- as the generous and compassionate people that we are; a people whose enduring symbol is not a barb wire fence, but the Statue of Liberty.

And so, that's what I mean when I say that the triangulation will not allow us to solve our problems. Splitting the difference between the way things have always done and some extremist view of the way things might be is not going to move us forward. We have to be clear about our principles as a people. We have to have enough faith in the American people to speak the truth about the challenges we face and what needs to be done in order to overcome them. And that's what I meant by that.

MR. GALSTON: Thank you very much for that answer and for your appearance here at Brookings today.

GOVERNOR O'MALLEY: Thank you. Thank you all (Applause).

Thanks a lot.

* * * * *

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.

Carleton J. Anderson, III

(Signature and Seal on File)

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2016