

# URBAN INNOVATOR AWARD



## 2010

December 15, 2010

Honoring:

## Michelle Rhee

*Chancellor, District of Columbia Public Schools (2007-10)  
Founder & CEO, Students First*

University Club, New York City

Introductory Remarks:

## Dr. Frank J. Macchiarola

*Chancellor, St. Francis College*



MANHATTAN INSTITUTE FOR POLICY RESEARCH



## URBAN INNOVATOR AWARD

As part of its effort to promote effective approaches to improving life in America's cities, the Manhattan Institute's Center for State and Local Leadership annually presents its Urban Innovator Award. This nonpartisan prize has been awarded since 2000 and is based in the Institute's view that effective government is key to the safety and prosperity of our cities, historically the engines of the U.S. economy and the vehicles for upward mobility for their residents. The award has gone to Indiana governor Mitch Daniels for his use of private financing to improve public infrastructure; to Miami mayor Manuel Diaz for securing the city's finances and for crime reduction; to Philadelphia (now New Orleans) school superintendent Paul Vallas and to Chicago mayor Richard Daley for the dramatic improvement in the performance of their respective cities' public schools; and to Florida governor Jeb Bush for initiatives ranging from disaster preparedness to the use of vouchers for special education services. We seek not to reward those whose approaches fit some preconceived notion of what makes cities work. Instead, we look for "what works"—and try to spread the good news.

---

FRANK J. MACCHIAROLA, MICHELLE A. RHEE & HOWARD HUSOCK

---

**Michelle A. Rhee** is the founder and CEO of Students First, a national organization that seeks to defend the interests of children in public education. Rhee served as chancellor of the District of Columbia Public Schools system of Washington, D.C., from 2007-2010 under Mayor Adrian Fenty. In 1997 she founded The New Teacher Project, which in ten years recruited 10,000 teachers in twenty states. She currently serves on the Advisory Boards for the National Council on Teacher Quality, the National Center for Alternative Certification, and Project REACH of the University of Phoenix's School of Education. Rhee holds a bachelor's degree in government from Cornell University and a master's in public policy from Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government.

**Frank J. Macchiarola** is the chancellor of St. Francis College in Brooklyn, NY. A 1962 graduate of St. Francis, he served as the College's president from 1996 to 2008. Macchiarola served as chancellor of the New York City Public School system, as dean and professor of law at the Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law of Yeshiva University, and as president and chief executive officer of the New York City Partnership, Inc.

**Howard Husock** is vice president for policy research at the Manhattan Institute, where he is also director of its social entrepreneurship initiative. He is a *City Journal* contributing editor. From 1987 through 2006, Husock served as director of case studies in public policy and management at Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government, where he was also a fellow at the Hauser Center on Nonprofit Organizations. Husock is a former broadcast journalist and documentary filmmaker whose work at WGBH-TV in Boston won three Emmy awards. He is a graduate of the Boston University School of Public Communication and was a 1981–82 mid-career fellow at Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs.



---

## URBAN INNOVATOR AWARD 2010

---

**HOWARD HUSOCK:** On behalf of the Manhattan Institute and our Center for State and Local Leadership, welcome to the annual presentation of the Institute's Urban Innovator Award. It's a privilege for us to present our award this year to the former chancellor of the District of Columbia Public Schools system, Michelle Rhee.

This nonpartisan award is just one of the many programs of the Institute's Center for State and Local Leadership, which is dedicated to the belief that state and local governments remain the laboratories of American democracy, where elected as well as appointed officials can and do lead the way toward effective reforms. Past winners of the award include Chicago mayor Richard Daley, Indiana governor Mitch Daniels, Atlanta Public Housing Authority director Renée Glover, and Los Angeles and former New York City police commissioner William Bratton.

The approaches of these urban innovators don't fit a preconceived ideological notion of how government should operate. Instead, we recognize exceptional officials who have shown "what works." We hope that our recognition will help spread the word about what they've accomplished. With that in mind, our Center for State and Local Leadership this week inaugurated its latest project, a website called Public Sector, Inc., which highlights the special financial challenges that state and local governments face today, as well as constructive reforms—those that have been proposed and those that have already been instituted.



Our topic today is public education. And to introduce our 2011 Urban Innovator, it's my pleasure to introduce someone deeply versed and experienced in public education in New York, Frank Macchiarola. In his distinguished career, Dr. Macchiarola, a native of the Flatbush section of Brooklyn, has played a series of key public roles in New York, most recently as president of St. Francis College and chair of the New York City Charter Revision Commission. He was a member of the New York State Commission on Education Reform, and, most important for our purposes today, he was chancellor of the New York City Public Schools from 1978 through 1983.



**FRANK MACCHIAROLA:** The appointment of Cathie Black as the new schools chancellor in New York City came at about the same time as the departure of Michelle Rhee as chancellor of the District of Columbia Public Schools. The loss of Michelle Rhee's service to the children in the District came with universal regret. While in most enterprises, leaders are replaced because of their lack of success, our speaker today was encouraged to resign her position precisely because of her considerable success, which placed her in a lonely group of distinguished school system leaders.

The list of Rhee's successes as head of the D.C. public schools is impressive: closing nonperforming schools, cutting central administration staff by half to support the classroom, leading D.C. schools from last place to first in national assessment scores for reading and math in fourth and eighth grades, increasing enrollment in schools, and increasing choice for D.C. parents so that there is an increase in the number of students in attendance—for the first time in four decades.

Rhee's agenda has always been clear: student success comes first. And obstacles to student success—whether entrenched collective bargaining benefits or administrators who fail their students—cannot be tolerated. She believes that all children of all backgrounds can learn, and her many successes, from her beginnings as an AmeriCorps teacher in Baltimore, to her chancellorship in the nation's capital, prove that all children can learn.

In 1997, Rhee founded The New Teacher Project (TNTP). As that organization's chief executive officer and president, she partnered with school districts, state educational agencies, nonprofit organizations, and unions to transform the way that schools and other organizations recruit, select, and train highly qualified teachers in difficult-to-staff schools. Her improvements have been put into place in Atlanta, Baltimore, Chicago, Miami, New York, Cleveland, and



Philadelphia. TNTP placed 23,000 new highly qualified teachers in schools across the country.

In 2007, D.C. mayor Adrian Fenty appointed Rhee head of the floundering D.C. Public Schools system, which comprises 123 schools and 47,000 students. Under her leadership, the worst-performing urban school district in the country became the only major city system to see double-digit growth in its state reading and math scores in seventh, eighth, and ninth grades over three years. In Rhee's first year as chancellor, every eligible D.C. public school attracted applicants, and in her last year as chancellor, every eligible D.C. public school attracted applicants for the annual K–12 out-of-boundary preschool and prekindergarten lotteries. Fourteen schools had waiting lists for the first time. A record high of 5,129 families, representing an increase of 50 percent over less than a decade, expressed interest in D.C. public school programs, located in every one of the eight wards in the district.

The defeat of Mayor Fenty in November ended all that. For eighteen years, Michelle Rhee has been at the forefront of student success and now leaves for a new mission as founder and CEO of Students First. She has earned our respect and thus the Manhattan Institute's Urban Innovator Award. She deserves our support as she engages in a mission that is the only hope to secure our democracy: educating and preparing youngsters for what is theirs to come.



**MICHELLE RHEE:** I feel like a bit of a sham because when I look at this Urban Innovator Award, it seems as if I've figured something out. I have not yet figured out how we are going to turn around this nation's schools, but I have figured out a whole lot of things that don't work.

Let me give you some background. After I graduated from Cornell University in 1992, I joined the Teach for America program. I was placed in Baltimore in an inner-city school, one of the lowest-performing, highest-poverty schools in the city. I taught there for three years, and my second and third year "looped" with a group of kids, which means that I taught them for two years. I team-taught with another teacher. We took a group of kids who were scoring at the absolute bottom on standardized tests, and within a two-year period, moved them to the top. Through that experience, I saw that it was not the children's home lives that were holding them back, because their parents didn't change. And their diets and the violence in the community did not change; the only thing that changed were the adults who were in front of them, the expectations that we adults had



of them, and the work ethic that we instilled in them: that was what made the difference. Coming out of that experience, I thought that if we were going to change public education in this country, it was all about recruiting the right people to become teachers.

So I started a national organization called The New Teacher Project. At the time (1997), the common wisdom was that if we could just recruit the best and the brightest to come into education, that would solve all our problems. The U.S. Department of Education claimed that we were going to need 2 million new teachers over the next ten years, so that's where my focus was: recruiting good teachers.

After starting that organization, and seeing the success of other alternate-route programs across the country, such as the New York City Teaching Fellows and the Massachusetts State Signing Bonus Program, we quickly realized that this was not a recruitment problem; in fact, in every city we went to, we could find plenty of great people who wanted to change careers and come into education. The problem was that they couldn't get hired by the school system because of an incredibly dysfunctional human resources system.

So we shifted our focus from recruitment to working with these H.R. departments. We documented all the barriers that existed in these H.R. departments—all the rules, regulations, and time frames—and thought that if we could solve this problem, we would be in good shape. After doing that work for a few years, I came to realize that the H.R. departments were not the main problem—because we created great H.R. departments, but they couldn't operate as islands of excellence in a sea of dysfunction in the rest of the school system. A school system would be making ridiculous decisions, which negatively affected whether H.R. could do its job in a timely and effective manner. Around this time I was introduced to Mayor Adrian Fenty, who had just won control of the Washington, D.C., public schools. He was the only person in the country who thought that it might be a good idea to hire me to run the schools.

So, I thought, here is the answer. It's not just about recruitment and not just about H.R.: it's about fixing an entire district. And what better opportunity to fix a district than to go into the lowest-performing, most dysfunctional one? If we could fix that, it would put all the naysayers to bed. People would see that progress was possible, and they would want the progress to continue.

What we did in D.C. in a very short period of time was to take a dysfunctional environment and make it functional. As former chancellor Macchiarola said, we



managed to take what was, at the time, the lowest-performing school district in the country, where we were last on the NAEP examination (the national exam)—and within a two-year period, we led the nation in gains in reading and math at the fourth- and eighth-grade level. We were the only jurisdiction in which every subgroup of children was progressing academically.

But the idea that when people saw the results, they would want more of it, was absolutely wrong. I spent time, as many education reformers across the country do, talking to politicians, trying to appeal to their sense of what is good and right for children. But interest groups such as the teachers' union are funding their campaigns. And if you're a politician, are you going to go with the nice little lady over here who says you can do good for kids? Or are you going to go with the people who are going to get you reelected? I have now decided—but don't be surprised if I come back in three years to say that I was wrong again—that we have been playing the wrong game and that we have to start playing the right game. For the last three decades, the U.S. has fallen further and further behind, partly because its educational agenda has been driven by special interests.

There are folks with millions of dollars, and millions of people who are getting the politicians they want elected, the laws that they want passed, and the laws that they don't want blocked; but the biggest issue is that there is no organized interest group advocating on behalf of children. We end up with a lopsided landscape and lopsided policies. We need a national organization that has the national heft to bring balance to the equation.

So I have started Students First. It is a membership organization, but also a national movement that will defend and promote the best interests of children. It will pursue an aggressive agenda of reform that will make America's schools number one in the world again. Here is an example of the kind of issue that we would take on with Students First. People underestimate the power of quality educators in our schools. If you have a great teacher, it can make all the difference for kids. But all the policies that exist right now conspire against our children having the best educators in the classroom. One example of this—and it's particularly relevant today in this time of contracting budgets—is the way we lay teachers off in school districts.

In public school districts today, if we have a budget crisis, we have to lay a teacher off, or a group of teachers off, and we do it by seniority—last in, first out. The *Los Angeles Times* did a study with a lot of value-added student achievement data. The story they ran highlights a middle school that was one of the worst middle schools



in L.A. They decided to do a massive turnaround at the school, so they brought in a brand-new principal, who brought in a brand-new staff—some veteran teachers and some brand-new rookie teachers. Over a two-year period, this school went from being at the absolute bottom to leading the district in gains in math.

When the district had to conduct layoffs, this school suffered significant layoffs. Because the school had seen so much success, the teachers didn't want that success to end. The first thing the teachers did was to go to the teachers' union and ask, "What can you do to stop this from happening? We don't want to lose our jobs. We can't lose this momentum." And the teachers' union said, "We think that seniority-based layoffs are the only fair way to do this."

If you have been in the system longer, you get more rights and privileges. Which, if you are looking at it from an adult perspective and the union's perspective, is absolutely right. The problem is what happens in the children's perspective, the students' perspective: by laying teachers off by seniority, the district was firing many of the most effective teachers. In this school, a significant portion of the teachers who were laid off were in the top 20 percent of middle school teachers in the city.

Because they laid teachers off by seniority, they laid off the newest teachers, who also happened to be the cheapest teachers. So they actually had to lay more people off to fill the budget hole. Analysis showed that had they laid people off by quality instead of seniority, many fewer jobs would have been lost because it would have allowed them to remove some ineffective veteran teachers. From an adult perspective, it's all the same thing, the amount of money that you cut. But if more classrooms are losing their teachers, it is not beneficial for the children.

When budget cuts like this happen and we have systemwide layoffs by seniority, the higher-performing schools in the more affluent parts of town have more stable staffs. Their staffs have been there for a long time because those schools are great places to work. Those folks are basically untouched by budget cuts. Meanwhile, struggling schools such as the one highlighted in the *Times* that see massive teacher turnover every year are decimated by the budget cuts. So you have a differential impact on the kids who actually need the help the most.

So this policy of layoffs by seniority has negative impacts on kids. That is exactly the kind of policy that we will take on at Students First—at the district, state, and national levels, and wherever we need to in order to change laws, regulations, and policies that do not benefit and put children at the forefront.



When I announced that I was going to start Students First—if you saw the cover of *Newsweek* last week, the tag line was something like, “I’m not done fighting”—I got lots of reactions from people saying, there she goes again, she’s so belligerent, we wish she would just cooperate a little more and have a collaborative spirit.

When I was in D.C. as chancellor, about a year into my tenure, I gave a speech at a conference in New York. A high-ranking official from the Democratic Party approached me afterward and said, “I have some unsolicited advice for you.” And I said, “Okay. Let her rip.” And he said, “You need to soften up. You are so hard-core all the time, and you talk about how bad the situation is, and you tell people data such as only eight percent of the kids are on grade level. When you talk about bad things, it makes people feel bad, and people don’t want to feel bad; people want to feel good. If you would just soften up a bit, you could get many more people behind you.”

I looked at him and said, “I totally disagree with you. Part of the problem in public education is that we have been so busy talking about the good things and being unwilling to talk about the bad things that there is a sense of complacency. If by talking about the bad things, we make the adults feel uncomfortable, but at the same time give them a sense of urgency about needing to significantly transform the system, then I am okay with that.”

About a year later, a *Washington Post* columnist wrote a piece on me and said, “I wish Michelle Rhee would be nicer. I like her, and I like the gains that we are seeing as a city. These decisions that she is making are long overdue, but she needs to be a little nicer.” I called him and asked, “What’s this all about?” He replied, “I want you to stay around for a really long time, and I’m terrified that if you don’t start being a little nicer to people that you won’t be here for very long.”

And I said, “You need to decide what you think are the most important characteristics for a school chancellor. If you think friendly, collaborative, and cooperative are the most important things, you should be advocating for my ouster. Because if you want warm and fuzzy, I am not your girl. However, if you like the results and you think they need to continue, what you should be talking about in your column is not about how I should become nice, but how we, as adults, should get over ourselves and our hurt feelings and put our focus on the kids.”

There is an opportunity right now in this country because the general public is becoming more attuned to the problems in public education. There is more sunlight and sunshine on the insane practices that are happening. If our focus is on how we



can all hug and collaborate on a solution, we are not going to move the ball forward much. We cannot shy away from a little conflict and controversy. I don't say this because I want to poke people in the eye. I am not going to be belligerent and I'm not going to get into fights just for the sake of getting into a fight.

But I also do not think that we can avoid controversy at all costs so that we adults can feel good about getting along with one another. If you look at public education today, people are conflict-averse, and because we don't want tension to exist, we've been doing a disservice to kids for many years. So let's get comfortable with a little fighting.

One thing that we should have a conversation about and will undoubtedly have a lot of disagreements about is the question about poverty and home environment versus what the school can do. In education reform, there are two very different camps: one says that nothing that a school can do can overcome what the parents will not do. What the home environment has created cannot be overcome by well-meaning people in the schools. But the other camp says that although those environmental factors are challenges, if we are doing what we should for kids, the school environment can make a huge dent in overcoming those challenges. The most important thing to keep in mind, as you have these debates, is what kids actually say. I have been asking kids this question for a very long time. I'm going to share some stories with you.

About a year ago, I went on an unannounced visit to one of the worst-performing high schools in Washington, D.C. I went first thing in the morning and went from class to class. In the first class, there were three kids present, at the second class there were nine, and in the third class there were five.

By the time I got to the fourth class, there were seven kids there. I thought, what on God's green earth is going on? I asked the teacher, "Where are all the kids?" She said, "Oh, it's Friday." I said, "Really? Is that the excuse? Because it's Friday, we're okay with kids not coming to school?" "No," she replied. And I said, "So, what else?", thinking that she was going to tell me that the kids were on a field trip or something like that. But she said, "It's raining, too." When we've gotten to the point that our expectations are such that we do not expect kids to come to school because it's the last day of the week and we have inclement weather, we have lost our way, folks.

I walked from classroom to classroom and, toward the end of my tour, I walked into a classroom full of children. There were more than thirty kids in there, and



not enough desks for all of them. Half of them were sitting on the radiators. What's going on here? This teacher is teaching a really solid lesson. I asked one of the students, "So, tell me about the teacher." He said, "This is my best teacher, absolutely." I said, "Really? Why?" He said, "Two reasons: because he teaches us something new every day, and when you don't understand something, he will explain it to you." I thought, my goodness, that is such a low bar for who our favorite teacher is. I watched the rest of the class and this very solid teacher. As I was leaving the building, that young man and two of his friends were walking out of the building in front of me.

This was at ten in the morning, so I asked, "Where are you going?" He replied, "The first-period teacher, the one you just saw, that's our best teacher, so we come to school for him. Our second-period teacher is awful, so we're going to roll." This is not the picture that the American public has of truants. We think of the kids who are in bed until noon and then get up and go to the streets, where they cause all kinds of problems. We are not thinking about children who are making the conscious decision to wake up early and come to school because the first-period teacher is an excellent one and then decide to leave after that because they're not going to get anything out of the next class. They are making decisions based on information about where their time is best spent, just as we do every day. Don't underestimate the kids.

Last week, I was at the Democracy Prep charter school up in Harlem that serves kids of color who come from very low-income backgrounds. I asked them, "So, a lot of people say you can't learn. What do you think?" They were giving me answers, first of all, all of them disagreed. But one kid has the most poignant answer: "You know what? At the end of the day, it doesn't matter where we're coming from so much as where we're going to every morning that will either make or break us." The children are telling us that they can do it, as long as we are doing our jobs. We should follow suit.

Another topic that we need to have a serious conversation about in this country is that we have completely lost our competitive spirit, at every level at which we operate, starting with our children. We want all our kids to feel good, we want them all to have high self-esteem. We have created an environment where we've been so busy telling kids that they're great that they all now think that they're great even when they're not.

I'll use my own children as an example. I have two girls, ages eight and eleven. They play soccer because everybody in our neighborhood plays soccer. My kids



suck at soccer—they take after their mother in their athletic abilities. But if you were to go into their bedrooms, you would see them adorned with trophies, medals, and ribbons. You would think that I am raising the next Mia Hamm. But I am not. I try to tell them all the time, “You are not so good at soccer. In fact, you are bad. If you practice a little harder, you might be able to improve. But I can’t guarantee that you’ll ever be great, even if you practice really hard.” If we don’t communicate that to our kids, and they all grow up thinking that they’re the best when they’re actually not, it creates complacency. They will never be able to compete with their global counterparts.

As a Korean, I can tell you that in South Korea, starting from when children are in kindergarten, they get ranked, one through forty, in the class. You know exactly where you stand. There would be a rebellion in America if we did that—“You are hurting my child’s self-esteem” and all that sort of stuff. I’m not saying that ranking is the best thing, but what it creates in Korea is a constant sense of wanting to do better. Koreans are not worried about Singapore and China; they’re just competing within the country because the culture is such that you’re always trying to do better. So it starts with our children, and it moves up to where our teachers are.

When I came into the District of Columbia Public Schools, 8 percent of our eighth-graders were on grade level in mathematics—8 percent! But if you were to have looked at the performance evaluations of the adults in the system at the same time, you would have seen that 95 percent of our staff were being rated as doing an excellent job. How can you possibly have a system where all the adults are thinking that they’re doing great work, and what we’re producing for kids is 8 percent success? You can’t run an effective organization like that. But again, it was about making everybody feel good and being told, “You are doing a good job.” We have to begin to differentiate among teachers. There are some amazing teachers in this country who are doing great work—heroic, truly. And we have some not-so-good teachers in this country. But once you start talking about differentiation—who is great, who is not great—you get called all kinds of names. I have been called every one in the book. You are anti-teacher, you are scapegoating us, you are a union buster.

If you look at any other field, you don’t get the same reaction. Here is an analogy that I was using with a group of teachers recently. Say, for example, after I left my job as chancellor, I was looking at my options. My fiancé, Kevin Johnson, who is mayor of Sacramento, used to play in the NBA. So I think, that NBA life is a pretty good life. Dribble around a bit, get paid a whole lot of money, get to



travel—I am going to become a professional basketball player! So I practice, I play my first game—and I stink. I don't score any points, I can't defend, I can't do anything. The owners decide to cut me immediately. I would go to them and say, "You can't cut me from this team. I came to every practice. I shoot 100 free throws on my own time afterward. I'm trying hard. You can't cut me." They would say, "Are you kidding me? You are making the team lose. And if you make the team lose, you make us lose, and we have no room for that. You've got to go." Then maybe I would go to the Players' Association and say, "I'm a player, you're players, help me out." They would say the same thing: "Absolutely not. Having players like you is bad for the league. We don't want you in our ranks because you are not good." Then I might even go to my honey, who is supposed to help me out the most, and say, "Baby, can you do something about this?" He also probably would look at me and say, "I love you. Don't take this personally, but you are no good at basketball. This doesn't mean you're not a good person. We just need to find a job for you that you are good at and that you will add value to.' "

Everyone in this room would think that this would be a very reasonable set of events. We have to be able to take that reason and rationale to the teaching profession as well. Being a great teacher is not an easy thing. Not everyone is cut out for it, and not everyone is going to be great at it. But when we identify the people who are not good at it, we ought to be able to tell them that this is not the profession for them, without seeing it as an indictment of the entire profession or of them as individuals.

Despite the fact that we have a few voucher and charter programs here and there, public education is still a government-run monopoly in this country, and a government-run monopoly cannot produce a high-quality product. We have to think about how we open up the marketplace, how we bring competition in, and how we ensure that being in an excellent school is not a matter of luck for children—which is what it is right now—but a matter of fact. The only way that we can do that is to break this monopoly up and think about innovative solutions.

I had the interesting experience last summer of hearing the prime minister of Singapore speak. When the prime minister talked about Singapore's plan for being number one, its economic plan was rooted in education. They were going to make their education system the best because they knew that that would propel them to be number one in everything else. So education was the number-one strategy in their economic plan. We don't think about education that way in the United States. We see education as a social issue. What happens to a social issue in tough economic times? It gets swept aside; it gets budget cuts.



Until we realize that we are never going to regain our position in a global marketplace until we fix our education system in this country, we will continue to fall further and further behind. Public education is supposed to be the great equalizer in our country. It is supposed to be the thing that ensures that it doesn't matter if you are black or white, rich or poor. We have a public education system so that every single child can have an equal chance in life. If you work hard and do the right thing, you can live the American dream.

But that is not the reality that our children in America face today. The reality that our children face today is that if you live in Anacostia versus if you live in Georgetown in Washington, D.C., you get a wildly different educational experience. The biggest social injustice imaginable is that we are still allowing the color of a child's skin and the zip code that the child lives in to dictate his educational attainment levels, and therefore his life chances and life outcomes. That goes against everything we believe in as a country, and it has to stop. That is what Students First is going to do. I hope that you will consider joining our ranks because we want to show that there is a groundswell of support for putting the children's interests before those of anyone else.

In announcing Students First last week on *The Oprah Winfrey Show*, I stated that we were going to raise a billion dollars for the effort and that we were going to have a million members within a year. People thought that I was insane, but within the first forty-eight hours of the *Oprah* airing, we had more than 100,000 members signed up. We were 10 percent of the way to our goal within forty-eight hours. We have over \$700,000 in contributions through the website, through small donations that come in every day. The average donation is \$63. I believe that we've tapped into a latent desire in this country to make our American schools the best again. People are ready to mobilize around this, and we need the heft of numbers. We need all of you in this room and all your friends to join this effort to show that the American people are willing to put children first.



## URBAN INNOVATOR AWARD

2009	<b>Renée Lewis Glover</b> CEO, Atlanta Housing Authority
2008	<b>Mitch Daniels</b> Governor, State of Indiana
2007	<b>Jeb Bush</b> Former Governor, State of Florida
2006	<b>Paul Vallas</b> Education Leader
2005	<b>Raymond Kelly</b> Commissioner, New York Police Department
2004	<b>Manuel Diaz</b> Mayor, Miami, FL
2003	<b>Anthony Williams</b> Mayor, Washington, D.C.
2002	<b>Martin O'Malley</b> Mayor, Baltimore, MD
2001	<b>Norm Coleman</b> Former Mayor, St. Paul, MN
	<b>Jerry Brown</b> Mayor, Oakland, CA
2000	<b>Richard Daley</b> Mayor, Chicago, IL

⊕⊕⊕⊕ ⊕⊕⊕⊕ ⊕⊕⊕⊕ ⊕⊕⊕⊕ ⊕⊕⊕⊕ ⊕⊕⊕⊕ ⊕⊕⊕⊕ ⊕⊕⊕⊕ ⊕⊕⊕⊕ ⊕⊕⊕⊕

## MANHATTAN INSTITUTE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

*Chairman*

Paul E. Singer

Peter M. Flanigan

Kenneth M. Garschina

Mark Gerson

*Chairmen Emeriti*

Dietrich Weismann

Kenneth B. Gilman

Roger Hertog\*

William B. Ginsberg

Charles H. Brunie

Maurice R. Greenberg

Richard Gilder

Fleur Harlan

John W. Holman, Jr.

*Vice Chairman*

Michael J. Fedak

William Kristol

Frank J. Macchiarola

Thomas F. McWilliams

*President*

Lawrence J. Mone

Jay Newman

Rodney W. Nichols

Robert Rosenkranz

*Trustees*

Clifford S. Asness

Nathan E. Saint-Amand, MD

Andrew Cader

Thomas W. Smith

Ann J. Charters

Donald G. Tober

Ravenel Curry

Byron R. Wien

Timothy G. Dalton, Jr.

Bruce G. Wilcox

Sean M. Fieler

Kathryn S. Wylde

\* *Former Trustee*







MANHATTAN INSTITUTE FOR POLICY RESEARCH  
52 Vanderbilt Avenue • New York • NY 10017  
[www.manhattan-institute.org](http://www.manhattan-institute.org)