

#106 School Rankings, Ratings, and Wrongdoing

Jennifer Berkshire Welcome to Have You Heard, I'm Jennifer Berkshire.

Jack Schneider And I'm Jack Schneider.

Berkshire And Jack, how are you doing today?

Schneider This is a trick and I'm not playing.

Berkshire Just answer the question, Jack. How are you doing today?

Schneider It's a pandemic, Jennifer. Nobody's good. I teach on a laptop. My kid is upstairs sitting in front of a computer for like hour three in a row. But I guess in spite of all that we're doing okay.

Berkshire So how would you rank this day compared to other days?

Schneider Oh, I see where we're going with this. This is a bottom of the barrel low tier day. This is not an elite. This is not an Ivy league day. Yeah, I see where you're going.

Berkshire Well, the irony is that I'm already predicting that this is going to end up being one of our highest ranking episodes.

Schneider It could be, it could be. I feel like, you know, anytime we take on one of these sacred cows our, our listeners really react well and there is no cow more sacred in this country than the ratings and rankings that are done to our K-12 schools, but particularly to our colleges and universities. We really line up to by U.S. News & World Report, or actually we don't, since it's no longer a magazine we just, you know, go to their website.

Berkshire Well, before we meet our guest, just a little context on what inspired this episode, that would be a recent thread of outrage on Twitter, courtesy of my cohost. Any idea what I'm referring to Jack?

Schneider I think that what you're referencing, Jennifer, is the annual release of the Boston Magazine, best of greater Boston... I think they only do high schools on this list. I wouldn't be surprised if they worked their way down to pre-K eventually there's just so much wrong with what they're doing, you know, starting with simply the premise, right? The premise that it is a useful contribution to rank schools against each other. As if there are clear differences as if there are measurable differences between, you know, number one and number two, or even number two and number 100 there you know, there may be statistical differences according to whatever their model is, but those statistical differences may not actually be observable in reality or felt differences. So from that rate of problems, with the premise all the way down to the

methodology which would be the components of these algorithms are essentially garbage in terms of validity, right?

So the measurement validity of these instruments is basically nil because they're not measuring what they purport to measure. Now, if they said we are going to try to find the most privileged kids in greater Boston and here's how we're going to do it, right? We're going to start with income. And then we're going to include things like, you know, their standardized test scores in math and English, which we know correlate pretty strongly with a number of variables. They may not be able to get data for, in terms of student demography. Then it would have higher validity as an algorithm, right, as a rankings methodology, but I have all sorts of problems. And my hope was that we could begin to unpack these in a more systematic way so that every time a newspaper or magazine or website does this, we can just point people to this episode of the podcast,

Berkshire Which brings us to our very special guest for this episode. He is someone who has long intrigued me. His name is Akil Bello and he is the Senior Director of Advocacy and Advancement at FairTest. He's also one of my favorite Twitter personalities, offering lively commentary on education policy and politics. And after Jack tweeted his outraged commentary on the latest Massachusetts high school rankings, Akil weighed in with some insights of his own.

Akil Bello I have probably several Twitter threads on the ridiculousness of rankings. I usually focus on the higher ed rankings and the college rankings, but you can take your pick. They're essentially the same thing. So many of the rankings are let's re let's measure by the same means. They use to select the students like many of these institutions select students based on scores. And I think one of the things that started the recent Twitter thread was specialized schools and Boston exam schools. I've been looking at exam schools of late and exam schools make me laugh because essentially their factories for bragging about not breaking students, right? That's essentially what they're hanging their hats on. We've admitted high test takers, and they've graduated as good as test takers. Let's rank ourselves based on their test scores. It's like you're selected by the same means that you've measured. And then you're saying you've done a good job at not hurting that skill that you knew they had walking in sorts of very, very strange things in the rankings buying into this and ranking because of that is a very, very bizarre phenomenon that we've bought into

Berkshire When ranking season arrives Akil is often put in mind of one of his favorite quotes from Albert Binet who referred to IQ measurements as brutal pessimism. That's because the rankings give the appearance of certainty that's based on, well, here I'll let Akil explain it.

Bello Testing and rankings and all of these numerical measures we attempt to use that aren't what they purport to be. There isn't the fine grain distinctions that calling someone at school one versus school seven actually suggests to the public. And it happens all throughout education in this country. It's just the notion of these things as objective measures is problematic, right? They are the personal opinion of particular people justified with numbers and formulas.

Schneider Well, it isn't just that the fine distinction, the fine sorts of statistical distinctions between school one and the school seven are taken seriously, despite the fact that they shouldn't be it's even worse than that, right? That there is somehow a distinction between school one and school 70 or school 70 and school 700 that if you're talking about a system in which the schools are legitimate there actually should be very small differences in terms of what they're actually doing for students, right? If you're talking about, and I'm not saying that we have a, you know, fully funded you know, open integrated system either at the K-12 level or in higher ed. But we can think through that as a sort of theoretical baseline and say, gosh, in such a system, it would really be a kind of meaningless exercise to rank schools.

And I'm no expert in Canada. But some of my friends from the great North have talked about Canada as being a case where actually rankings of schools would be a nonsensical exercise because the schools in higher ed are really designed to be more or less equal with each other that you shouldn't have to travel too far to go to a highly reputable Canadian university. And I think this is a useful starting point for talking about rankings and for sort of upending this assumption that there are great schools, there are good schools, there are mediocre schools and there are bad schools. And that, you know, there is every gradient in between there

Bello Looking back historically, and that's one of the things that really fascinated me about listening to the podcast is just the history of all of this. The rankings, especially in higher ed right now is there is a ranking of historical privilege of the Ivy league started with admitting kids of the aristocracy, et cetera. Essentially the first U.S. News Ranking was entirely reputational. Schools that are ranked in the top 50 or whatever, essentially don't change. They move a little bit, but they don't change. So they started out by saying which institutions have the most privilege, the most reputation. And they asked college presidents. And that was the sole measure of the quality of the institution. What the person in a position of power who probably got there through his privilege and connection had to say about his peers.

Schneider One of the things that you were just talking about Akil is I think really important and not obvious to people. And it has to do with, you know, testing the validity of your measurement tools. So if what you start with is a reputational ranking, and then you say, well, we want to include some other kinds of measures in our algorithm here. You want to know that those measures are valid and reliable and that they can be used from year to year. And one way to test the validity then is to look at well, how do the rankings compare when we add in this component to the methodology, it's an exercise that is essentially designed to not challenge whatever the original purportedly valid measure is, right? So if the original valid measure is this reputational ranking, and then you're including other measures and using that original reputational ranking as your baseline measure of validity against which you will compare everything, right.

You will only include measures that don't really disrupt that original reputational based ranking. And so we can see here as you know, many have observed that the best way to improve your ranking, the best way to rank highly on these is to be founded sometime in the 18th century, a little difficult for some schools. But we can see that schools like Harvard took that to mind and

founded themselves in the 17th century. And they've gone ahead and taken care of staying in the top 10 forever as a result of that one observation that I make from time to time and talking about rankings in higher ed, is that they are an essential component of a privilege laundering machine, right? So if what you want is to launder your privilege and the basic idea here is that, you know, you don't want to say, well, I have him inherited my status.

That explains my current social and economic standing. But rather to say, this is the product of hard work and natural ability, the first thing that you need as a kind of ideology of merit, right? A belief in a meritocracy. And we certainly have that in this country, but then you're also going to need some way of signaling your distinction. Now we use grades and test scores for the individual component there, but you also want to be able to say, I went to the best school and we can see that this plays out in really powerful when people will use language to describe somebody's intelligence by simply referring to the school that they went to. Right. He's really smart. He went to Yale, Oh, she went to a bad school. Right? How smart could she really be?

Berkshire One of the things I was thinking about as Jack was talking is about how these rankings end up entrenching privilege. And then another way that they've really ended up doing that is that as all of these schools, furiously compete to move up the rankings, they are looking for students who can bring those scores with them. And so, for example, in Massachusetts, as the state has retreated from its commitment to funding public higher ed. The percentage of students from other States is increasing, right? Like schools are looking for students who can pay their own way or pay the more expensive rate from being from out of state. And so it's just a perfect example of the kind of perverse feedback loop that these ranking systems create.

Bello It's a huge issue because, and that's, I guess the less evil part of the whole thing, and as scary as that is, that's actually the less evil part of it. Right? You understand there's a financial reality to running an institution, admitting students who can pay a higher way is a financial reality of some institutions, especially as States stop funding, public higher ed. Then there's the intentional machinations that are part of that. There was a really good writeup on, I believe it's university of Florida in the Chronicle of higher ed on their 10 year mission to creep up the rankings and get into the top 10 or something like that, or top 20, whatever it was. But there was a very specific intentionality to playing statistical games, increasing these class sizes, decreasing those class sizes so that the average works out so that they will creep up in the rankings. And that has real consequences. And I found that beyond the impact to the public, there's a real financial implication Moody's which rates low, which gives the credit rating for institutions uses rankings. I believe they use Barron's and Barron's rankings, as far as I can tell their entire methodology is test scores, selectivity and GPA, which is in and of itself sort of cyclical because like activity is that a lot of ways driven by looking at higher GPA and test scores,

Berkshire Akil's reference to how credit ratings can affect school rankings intrigued me. I wanted to know more.

Bello From my understanding the better the bond rating for a particular institution, the better the credit rating, therefore the same thing as credit rating for us, we can, we can get more loans, therefore we can fund more things, et cetera, et cetera. Our reputation increases potentially we attract more students. So again, it's this whole strange cycle of reaping the benefits of privilege. It's really strange to think that the credit worthiness of an institution is not driven by, I don't know how much money they have in the bank, whether they're in a state that funds higher ed really well, but is in some way driven by their SAT scores.

Schneider One of the things that we've seen over the past, oh, you know, it's been really about 20 years, but not really until the last 10 years that we have seen the rankings trickled down from higher ed to the secondary level. And we can now see online niche.com or great schools.org, you know, your local newspaper, your regional city magazine, right? So in our area would be *Boston Magazine*, all have rankings of high schools. And I'm wondering to what extent are they simply reproducing what is done in higher education at a lower level? And what are they doing differently here? And, you know, is anything better? Is anything worse?

Bello I think it is more blatantly tied to test scores rather than directly tied to wealth indicators as higher ed ranking seem to be, because my work has been around test scores so much. I think that's why my default is it's worse, but I don't really know. I guess it depends on your position on those things. But the Niche.com ranking, if you look at that, 60% of their ranking is what they call academics grade. And academics means state assessment tests, SAT scores, and a survey on academics. So like, I'm not sure what that means, right? And then there's more fun. 10% is from the teacher grade. But as part of the teacher grade? State test results. So we've got test results counted in all different portions of this ranking multiple times. I

Schneider I'll join you on the more dangerous side of the scale here. And I've got two additional reasons. One is that people generally aren't picking up their households and moving in response to U.S. News & World Report rankings of colleges and universities, you continue to live where you live and you ship your kid off to school, as opposed to some of these other ratings and rankings, people will literally move in response to them. And so, you know, uh, for thinking about the way that let's say great schools.org has its scores tied into real estate websites like Zillow and Trulia. You can see a kind of natural path for somebody who's shopping for a home wherein they would use the great schools.org scores that are built into that real estate website. I think Redfin builds them into, and you would sort and filter by their grade schools.org scores and literally choose where you live.

Now, if what we see is that the ratings correlate with race or family income, there's going to be a segregate, segregate, Tory impact there. You know, if affluent folks are choosing schools, which they may not know it, right? They may think it's a rating of actual school quality, but which are really schools attended by affluent kids. You are driving segregation by building these readings into these real estate systems. And then the other piece that I would include here is that there is so much autonomy in higher education, uh, in terms of the way that instructors design and teach their classes that I think it's very hard to imagine a world in which pedagogy in higher education is affected by us news and world reports, rankings, or Princeton reviews, or, you know,

whoever's as opposed to at the K-12 level, it is easy to imagine this happening because we know it already does happen.

The fact that state standardized test scores are the chief basis for accountability. Determinations means that we already see, uh, schools and educators responding by trying to gain those scores and adding more stakes to those. And for many school and district leaders, actually it's these other more accessible ratings and rankings that create more fire under their feet because they get more calls from parents who have looked@thelocalgradeschools.org rating, then who have gone on to the state database to sort of muck through that and figure out what the accountability determination was that you're just exacerbating a problematic consequence that we've already seen.

Bello You've sold me. I'm now fully team K-12 the reliance on test scores as an out-weighted indicator is hugely problematic and it wouldn't be as problematic if they was used for good, right? But no one's ever looked at a test score and said, 'Oh, we need to give those people more money.' Which, which I would, I would be onboard if with all the testing forever, if it meant find the lowest performers and shower them with money, but that's not the way we've been using it. So in every instance, test scores are used to segregate, to penalize, to stigmatize around really narrow measures and to create these rankings, that purport to speak to intelligence, ability, aptitude, all these other things that it just does it. And that's, you know, that's the huge failing of American policy.

Berkshire Okay. So if you've been listening along, like I have, maybe you're feeling a little downhearted at this point, school rankings are so much a part of our great meritocratic conveyor belt. Can it really be stopped or even slowed down?

Schneider I think one of the pieces to underscore here is the neo-liberal theory of change, uh, that, you know, consumers and individuals responding to information and acting in a market will produce better results than democratic politics will. Uh, and we can see here that this system in which individuals are viewing themselves as consumers in a free market and who are competing against each other to try to get their kids in education using this imperfect information often as the basis or sole basis for their decisions is far more problematic than if we all got together and jointly made decisions about how schools should be run funded, you know, how a student assignment should work, that neoliberalism in general and the degree to which it has shaped American life is a core problem. Uh, in addition to the rankings, right, that we can envision a society in which the rankings exist. Um, and don't have the same kinds of consequences that they have here.

Bello I think that's, that's so core to American life, right? This the notion of individualism and capitalism and competition, but we found the worst elements of all of it, right? I think that's, what's sort of happened, you know, the commodification of education, right? Testing doesn't actually have to be terrible rankings. Don't have to be terrible, but the way that we're doing it is terrible. Right. You know, you don't have to pretend that you can rank 13,000 high schools, U S news and world report and give them a score to the thousandth decimal place. There is no

world in which you could possibly have that level of detail and accuracy on 13,000 schools and pretend that that's meaningful and create an environment where somebody's trying to jump from school, you know, one 52 to a one 54, because it's going to be a better experience and better outcomes.

And so I think that everything that we're doing with rankings and, and the use of testing, which is again, problematic in its design implementation usage comes back to money, right? US news was sort of the big impetus for a lot of the problems created by rankings and, and perpetuated a lot of the other rankings that followed right. There were rankings going back to 1910, right? Those rankings were academics, comparing often graduate programs and, and trying to give insight into who was in that institution, U S news commodified. It they're like we're going to sell magazines. We're going to put a nice, easy brutally pessimistic number in front of people. So they go, Ooh, I want nine, not 10. And that ruined so much of the value story benefits of any rankings.

Berkshire So is there anything we can feel hopeful about?

Bello My Hope is the conversation around equity and diversity and diversification of thought will eventually lead to change? That's that's the greatest hope I have is that as employers change, as organizations shift their C-suite and you no longer have employers recruiting, according to rankings, you no longer have, you know, hiring managers believing that degree, X is somehow more valuable than a physics degree from Harvard is worth more than if it is degree from Hampton. Right. I think like once those things stop, right? I think that will start to shift that because I think that's what a lot of this is about. It's a lot of game play in hope that the end result is access to the hallowed halls that provide access to wealth, you know, through employment. And I think once those things shift, and I think part of that will be hiring. Part of that will be, uh, the sort of gig economy that's coming in and the programming and tech places where you can have a little bit more success as an individual working on your own without the need for a wall street bank to, to co-sign that yes, you were on the lacrosse team at Stanford and therefore you're hireable.

Schneider I completely agree. And think that Akil's approach here to think about, you know, what are the top down drivers is a really smart one though. I will also note that there is a body of sociological literature that tells us that when some employers are selecting Ivy league squash players, that it's not because they believe that athletes, you know, work harder and that, uh, Ivy league graduates are smarter it's because they are actually selecting a very particular kind of person. And it's quicker to use that as a proxy than it is to ask people to come in and spend a full day in an interview to figure out, you know, are you white shoe law firm material, AKA, you know, are you like us? So I have some skepticism there, although your point Akil about diversifying, you know, the workplace and particularly the C-suite I think is a really essential, uh, note that you make.

I'll say that I see some potential hope in changing the bottom up aspect of the rankings and ratings, because I think when people are educated about what the rankings actually measure,

they instantly become deflated in their eyes a bit, these ratings. Um, moreover I think that when you talk through with people, what is actually the same across schools, either at the K-12 level or in higher ed, they again will begin to see, you know, what, actually, there, there probably aren't real felt differences that are as large as the, you know, purported statistical differences here. So at the K-12 level, you know, within a state, for instance, uh, teacher licensure requirements, teacher training programs, state curricular standards, documents, state, curricular, uh, standards, aligned testing, you know, state funding formulas. These often promote a very high degree of sameness and it's something we often complain about, but there's actually something of a strength there to say, you know, actually the differences from place to place are not actually going to be as severe as you might imagine.

And in higher education, I think that one thing that has been a comfort to people has been the fact that the complete collapse of the job market in higher ed means that no matter what college or university you attend, you have like the rockstar recent graduates of PhD programs there, because, you know, you could be the most impressive recently, minted PhD, um, and just simply the odds of getting a tenure track job anywhere are pretty slim. Uh, so, you know, low rated schools, high rated schools, they all have pretty incredible, uh, professors, at least in terms of their research training, who knows if they can teach.

Berkshire Since we started out talking about higher education rankings, I couldn't let the episode end without asking a keel about that mythological creature blamed in every story about rising college costs: the lazy river. Has he seen one? Has he floated down one?

Bello I have not been in a lazy river on a college campus. I firmly believe that this is a myth of excess in higher ed. I think that there's one in the South, somewhere at a camp with a school, with a huge football team that I probably would never go to. So, but I've never seen one

Berkshire That was Akil Bello. He's the Senior Director of Advocacy and Advancement at FairTest - among other things. He tweets incisively about all things ranking related @akilbello. And Jack and I will be right back to discuss how to end the rankings rat race and to reveal the topic of this episode's In the Weed's segment for our Patreon subscribers. Here's a hint: what would it look like if we were to design a school system from the ground up? If that intrigues you, just head on over to [Patreon.com/haveyouheardpodcast](https://patreon.com/haveyouheardpodcast) and become a monthly supporter.

[Music]

Berkshire So Jack, I sort of laid out my particular bleak vision based in part on my experience with the students that I teach

Schneider And, and based also on your generally bleak outlook. Yeah,

Berkshire I am very sunny. Everyone knows that, but you, you want to push back a little bit. You actually think that my view on this is, is too bleak and that we could potentially slow down if not stop the conveyor belt if we just got people to recognize it.

Schneider Yeah. I think as with so many things, uh, as with so much of our culture, um, it's invisible to us because it's the water in which we swim, but as soon as we begin identifying it, as soon as we begin talking about it in a kind of concrete and clear way, um, as soon as we recognize, um, you know, I'm going to paraphrase David Foster Wallace, right? That this is water, this is water, this is water. Right. Um, I think that that begins to change the way we see the world. Uh, and so, you know, one of the things that I do is ask people why they have the name of their college or university on the back of their car. Um, like why I'm just curious, and I try not to do it in a hectoring way. Um, but it, that is a completely bizarre practice that we don't think about because so many people do it.

Right. Um, or I have just started asking people when they will say, you know, so-and-so is really smart. He or she went to a really good school, I'll say, how do you know that that's a good school. I'm so curious. Did you go there? What was your experience like who was your favorite professor, um, that beginning to talk about these sorts of things, uh, whether it's at the college level or at the K-12 level, right. Where people will share their beliefs about the quality of a school system that they have never set foot in, um, that if we can begin asking questions, very direct questions, you know, how do you know this? What's the source of your information? Why are you saying that, um, that suddenly it puts us all in a position where we need to turn our brains on and start thinking a little bit.

And I think that's the key, because as soon as we start thinking about these ratings and rankings, most of them are, you know, pretty outlandishly bad in terms of the, the data that goes into them. Um, and, uh, you know, pretty harmful in terms of the consequences. Um, I think Americans are generally pretty smart. I think that it's just that we have so many inducements to not think, um, you know, and it's not particular to us in this country. Um, but we have, you know, so many pressures on us to turn our brains off, um, whether it's to operate as consumers or just the pressures of culture to do that. So the more we can get each other to turn our brains on, the more hope I have.

Berkshire Well, that's kind of the motto for this show as well. I'm always reminding you to turn your brain back on. So I love the idea that you're now this sort of one man crusader to free us from the tyranny of merit. But I am curious, I'm curious about what kind of response you get from people when you ask them questions? Like why do they have that sticker on their car and do they ask in turn, like, why do you have your Stanvard sticker on your Prius?

Schneider Yeah, I don't for precisely that reason, because I realized at some point I had Haverford College where I graduated as an undergrad, um, stuck on the back of one of my cars and then one day realized that that was really weird. Um, and I think, you know, the thing that so many people will experience is embarrassment, uh, because it's, uh, it, you should be embarrassed. It's a really weird thing to do. And it's mostly bragging. And the thing you're bragging about actually may say nothing about you. Um, you know, like we have no idea what you learned at your high status college or university. Other than that, if you paid tuition, you've got a lot more money than I do. Um, so I think, you know, that's one reaction, another reaction is

just sort of befuddlement. Like, why are you asking this question? Um, but, uh, I think eventually what you get to is a kind of realization that, um, you know, I think is most common, uh, uh, for Wiley coyote, right? To, to look down and realize there's nothing underneath

Berkshire Well, Jack, I really enjoyed getting a chance to talk to Akil today. For me, one of the highlights of this strange and dreary time has been that I've, I'm getting to know a number of people who I only encountered on Twitter. And then, you know, whether it's interviewing them or just corresponding, it's actually making this time feel much better.

Schneider Yeah. I got asked to virtual coffee like nine months ago, uh, by somebody and thought that's, that's weird. I don't want to do that. But, uh, it actually has been one of the kind of saving graces, uh, of this pandemic is, um, meeting up with people who you would never meet up with in the real world, because they're too far away or, um, you know, it's, you're not friends enough to like merit meeting each other in person. That's a little weird, uh, but you know, the stakes are pretty low and the investment is pretty low to just jump on zoom with somebody and chat for a little while.

Berkshire Well, speaking of very exciting online lives, you and I have been running our really pretty exciting virtual book tour. We've been talking to all kinds of groups and we just did an event that I thought was really great, um, through the Shanker Institute. And we asked a conservative commentator named Andy Smarick to read the book and then, you know, ask us questions, sorts of questions that we might not get other places. And it was actually really interesting. You can see it for yourself. If you go to their website, that's Shanker institute.org. And Jack, I thought that one of the questions that Andy asked us that didn't come up during the event would be a great topic for our Patreon In the Weeds segment. And that is how would you or I design a school system from scratch? What would it actually look like? And I thought a lot about that in the days leading up to the event, and then the fact that we didn't get to discuss it. I feel like I have a lot of leftover insights and that the Weeds are the perfect place to trot them out. What do you think

Schneider Leftover insights may be the wrong word for either of us on this, but, um, yeah, I think this is a good topic, Andy, during his comments about our book mentioned that we spend so much time talking about what we don't like in terms of, uh, reforms to unmake public education, that we really don't have a lot of time to talk about what we do like. And I think, you know, you and I both are not conservative in the sense that, you know, we are not trying to defend the existing public education system from any change whatsoever. I think we're both pretty invested in preserving the values of that system, but recognize, you know, deep flaws and shortcomings in the system that, you know, we think as long as you preserve the system can be improved, but that we shouldn't pull the entire thing apart. Um, I'd love to talk a little bit about, Whoa, what would we do? Particularly if we had a blank slate,

Berkshire If this topic appeals to you, all you have to do is head over to Patreon.com/haveyouheardpodcast, and you'll see a list of the various extras you can get just by supporting us to the tune of a couple of dollars each month. And we're running a very

exciting, special right now. Jack's lighting up knowing what I'm going to say. If you sign up at the \$10 a month rate, we will send you a free copy of our new book, A Wolf at the Schoolhouse Door. Jack, doesn't that sound exciting?

Schneider It does. I keep waiting for you to pitch something new, like a homemade candle or something.

Berkshire People are really enjoying this. You should see how many times a week I go to the post office.

Schneider Well, you could still go to the post office to send candles. For those of you who want to keep your coins in your change purses, there are lots of ways to support the show. Uh, my favorite as regular listeners know is when you share the latest or your favorite episode with friends, colleagues, or strangers, if you want to, um, we love when you interact with the show's Twitter handle at, have you heard pod, we've gotten some great ideas about shows from you there, and it's just nice to get feedback. And then it helps when you go on and give us a rating, the more stars, the better. And I think that's about it. That's my spiel.

Berkshire And just make sure you don't have any change in your pockets if you use the privilege laundromat

Schneider That's right. It could crack the tempered glass.

Berkshire I knew that Jack Schneider is pretty much the only person in the world who would think that that was funny. Until next time, I'm Jennifer Berkshire.

Schneider And I'm Jack Schneider.

Berkshire This is Have You Heard.