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Four Questions

- What is the broader budgetary context?
- Does it matter?
- What can we do about it?
- How do we make the most of our opportunities?
Context Matters

- There are often obstacles to growth
- These vary over time
- They are not impervious to change
- “Fortune favors the prepared mind”
  
  Louis Pasteur, 1854
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Context Still Matters

- Fiscal climate has an effect
- Effect may not be proportionate to the cause
  - Budget resolutions
  - Attitudes toward public investment
Would you be willing to pay $1 more in taxes for more health research?

Research!America
Persistence Pays Off

- Relationships are built
- Attitudes change
- Opportunities emerge
Congressional staffers are more familiar with NIH and feel more favorably towards NIH compared to voters.

AAMC DC Congressional Omnibus Survey – Congressional Staffers – June 2004

AAMC Compendium of Opinion Research
Medical Research/Federal Funding – October 2011
What Arguments Work Best?

- Economic benefit
- Foreign competition
- Threats to security
- Genuine desire to push frontiers of knowledge
Most convincing reason to FAVOR increasing the NIH budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DC Congressional Survey – Congressional Staffers – February 2006</th>
<th>1st Choice</th>
<th>1st/2nd Choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Find new treatments and cures for diseases</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the quality of life and save lives</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce health care costs by developing new cost-efficient treatments that help reduce hospital stays</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay competitive globally</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generate regional and local economic growth</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevent the loss of a generation of medical researchers to other careers</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to an aging population with chronic diseases</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AAMC Compendium of Opinion Research
Medical Research/Federal Funding – October 2011
Reasons to Support Medical Research:

- The most compelling message was one of hope and the need to invest for our future.
- Benefit to the local community was less compelling.
- Less compelling were arguments based on economic/global competition.
- Least effective:
  - Job creation
  - Failure to keep pace with inflation
Going Forward

- Fight against arbitrary budget caps on investment
- Redouble efforts to compete for existing resources
- Keep up the pressure
- Use a variety of arguments
- Lead with our strength: science brings progress
Thank You