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An Exercise in Hard Choices

Background

• Since 1983, the non-profit Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget (CRFB, [www.crfb.org](http://www.crfb.org)) has administered An Exercise in Hard Choices℠ to the public in a face-to-face format as a bi-partisan public education program.

Carol Cox Wait, Former President and Founder

Leon Panetta, Bill Frenzel, Co-chairs
Aims of the Exercise

1. Educates the public about the choices involved in achieving and maintaining a responsible budget.

2. Allows participants a chance to grapple with the same hard choices faced by the President and Congress in the annual budgeting process.
   - Small groups decide on a goal and then make individual spending and revenue decisions.
   - “You will feel frustrated. You will say there is not enough time; you will complain you need more information; and in these respects you will be just like Congress.”

3. Gives legislators feedback from constituents about how national priorities should be reflected in the federal budget.
Traditional Face-to-face Delivery

- Participants meet face-to-face for 3-4 hours.
- An onsite moderator introduces the Exercise and assists during deliberations.
- A demographic questionnaire optimizes group diversity.
- Groups negotiate to consensus, guided by a group chair.
- A pencil-and-paper scorecard requires complex calculations, including effect of decisions on interest resulting from the federal debt.
The Need for Electronic Enhancement

- Since 1983, more than 16,000 have completed the traditional *Exercise*.
- Electronic delivery could extend the *Exercise* to diverse populations and educational settings without the need for an onsite content expert.
- The development of an online electronic scorecard could facilitate calculations, allowing small groups to engage in more “what if” scenarios as they worked on specific decisions.
U.S. Dept. of Education Funding

- In 2002, 2003, and 2004, the U.S. Dept. of Education funded a congressional-directed grant to UA to design, develop, and pilot electronic versions of An Exercise in Hard Choices SM for the CRFB.
  - Cycle 1 was dedicated to development of three delivery methods and an electronic scorecard. The pilots were accomplished at The University of Akron, largely with university students.
  - Cycle 2 focused on controlled pilots with university students using updated content.
  - Cycle 3 was dedicated to high school outreach over Internet2.
# A Comparison of Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Deliberate in groups</th>
<th>Participate in real time</th>
<th>Participate Face-to-face</th>
<th>Moderator in the same location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional face-to-face</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polycom site-to-site</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FlashCom PC-to-PC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMS asynchronous</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Polycom Site-to-site Delivery

- Individuals meet at a common place and time.
- Moderator is off-site with facilitators assisting at individual locations.
- Enabled by Polycom video-teleconferencing over I2.
- Participants maintain video and audio contact with the moderator and, if more than one site participates, with each other.
Polycom Site-to-site Delivery

Top left: Ohio. Top right: Michigan. Bottom: moderator at UA.
Polycom Site-to-site Delivery

A pre-recorded speaker broadcast from one site (Sen. Carl Levin) can be viewed by all.
Polycom Site-to-site Delivery

A suburban Ohio high school participates. The off-site moderator displays a recent headline over the document camera.
Polycom Site-to-site Delivery

An urban Ohio high school participates in discussion at the end of the Exercise.
FlashCom PC-to-PC Delivery

- Individuals meet at a common time but not in a common location. Students here are from Beachwood H.S. in OH.
- Delivery is enabled by Macromedia Flash Communications server.
- Synchronous video, audio, and written communication is possible through webcams, headsets, and keyboards.
- Enables delivery to individuals from disparate backgrounds.
FlashCom PC-to-PC Delivery

- The moderator addresses all participants in the virtual Common Hall and directs them to individual virtual Group Rooms for deliberations.
FlashCom PC-to-PC Delivery

- Students at three different sites (Beachwood OH; Canton OH; Port Huron MI) deliberated in different “rooms” to achieve consensus.
• Moderators can “drop in” to each room to check on progress or answer questions.

• Below, John Kelley of UA visits the same group.
A different room also combines students from the same three high schools.

Two moderators have dropped in here.
LMS Asynchronous Delivery

• Delivery is through a Learning Management System (LMS).

• Introductory videos and all readings are uploaded into the LMS, and class instructors divide students into small groups and share a timeline for completing deliberations.

• Students share individual decisions by posting to threaded discussion. The chair is then responsible for reporting the result or requesting further deliberations to achieve consensus.

• Progress can be easily monitored.

• This method has been used at UA as part of the course curriculum (English, political science) and also an extra credit assignment (economics).
LMS Asynchronous Delivery

- Participants have more time to read, reflect, and research issues involved in each of their decisions.
- Groups negotiate decisions by posting to threaded discussion.
- Provides an equal playing ground for shy participants.

"With postings instead of live discussion, everyone can think out exactly what they want to post and articulate it accordingly…Hard Choices was a way not only of learning about politics, but also living them." --L.H.
LMS Asynchronous Delivery

- Asynchronous delivery is time-consuming.
- It is most effective when students are highly motivated to complete the *Exercise*, e.g. by grades.
- Since students are not sharing their decisions in real time, each group chair must take responsibility in ensuring consensus; the role can be rotated for different decisions.
- Use of this system was in fact hybrid rather than purely asynchronous since instructors used class time to introduce it and for discussion.
- It has not been tested at the high school level.
Electronic Scorecard

An Exercise in Hard Choices
Scorecard for Group 1

Spending Decisions - Health Insurance Expansion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>$ in Billions 2009</th>
<th>$ in Billions 2014</th>
<th>% of GDP 2014</th>
<th>% of GDP 2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Exercise Baseline</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Expand Medicaid eligibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tax credits instead of tax exclusion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pay or Play</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fully tax financed</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projects effect of the decisions through 2040.
Built with ColdFusion, HTML, and SQL server.
Participants input decisions online; calculations are automatic.
Participants can view the impact of their decisions on the federal budget and the federal debt at any time.
Sample Completed Scorecard

Goal and Spending

An Exercise in Hard Choices™
Scorecard for Group 1

Goal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Items</th>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>$ in Billions 2009</th>
<th>$ in Billions 2014</th>
<th>% of GDP 2014</th>
<th>% of GDP 2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Framework (Target Deficits or Surpluses)</td>
<td>Goal A: Cut the deficit in half by 2009; balance the unified budget in 2014 and after</td>
<td>-287</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-12.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spending Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Items</th>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>$ in Billions 2009</th>
<th>$ in Billions 2014</th>
<th>% of GDP 2014</th>
<th>% of GDP 2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Security: Baseline Budget</td>
<td>Freeze at the 2004 level; Add funds for Iraq, Afghanistan &amp; global war on terror</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-85</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Security</td>
<td>Target subsidies and reduce costs</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Government:</td>
<td>Increase grants for elementary and secondary education; Increase highways &amp; other surface transportation; Double grants for clean air &amp; water &amp; alternative energy; Reform the student loan program; End funds to some Dept. of Energy applied research; Cut federal travel by 40%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security</td>
<td>Personal Security Accounts</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>Block grants for medical education</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid and SCHIP</td>
<td>Reduce funding for Medicaid admin costs</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Insurance Expansion</td>
<td>Expand Medicaid eligibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your Changes to Spending | 79 | 66 | 0.4 | -0.9 |

This group’s goal was to balance the budget by 2014.
The group instead increased spending in 2014 by $66 billion as compared with the CBO-derived baseline.
The group increased revenue in 2014 by $23 billion, thus…

...increasing the baseline deficit by $43 billion…

...increasing interest spending on the debt by $21 billion…

...reducing the projected surplus in 2014 to 74 billion… (less than the projected baseline; more than its goal).
Procedures for Running the Exercise

• Distribute demographic questionnaire in advance.
• Assign participants to small groups, ensuring diversity.
• Engage students: Friday night at the Movies.
• Review Budget Facts; weave in current events.
• Explain decisions: goal; spending; revenue.
• Let them loose to deliberate; moderate as needed.
• Administer survey.
• Final roundup to review results and invite reflection and comments.
Summary of Cycle 2 Research
Controlled Study with Univ. Students

• All groups who experience the Exercise demonstrate significantly more **knowledge** of the budget and budget process.

• All groups who experience the Exercise demonstrate significantly more **interest** in the budget process and politics.

• Participants also express satisfaction with the use of the **technology**.
Examples of Significant Results

When negotiating with others to reach a final decision, I avoid confrontations about differences of opinions.

I find politics dull

I have little interest in the economy.
Cycle 3: 2004-7

- We demonstrated how the *Exercise* aligns with national education standards in:
  - Social Studies
  - Language Arts
  - Mathematics
  - Technology
    - Students
    - Teachers
    - Administrators
Cycle 3: 2004-7

• To elicit greater buy-in from high school partners, we demonstrated how the Exercise aligns with national education standards.

• We provided Internet2 access to two high schools in Ohio.

• We linked to high school students in Ohio, Michigan, Maryland, and Pennsylvania to administer the Exercise.
  – Some traveled to a local university for Internet2 access.
Challenges of Field Implementation

• Communication and scheduling.
• Different class start times for groups participating together.
• High schools without I2
  – Transportation to partnering university sites; or
  – Delivery without I2.
• Sharing materials in advance.
• Getting surveys back.
• Lack of high school baseline group (used Cycle 2 university baseline).
Cycle 3: 2005-6 Budget Options

1. Goal: Set A Fiscal Framework

2. Outlays
   a. National Security
   b. Income Support
   c. General Government
   d. Social Security
   e. Medicare
   f. Medicaid and State Children’s Health Insurance Program
   g. Health Insurance Coverage

3. Revenues
Effect of *Exercise* Experience on Knowledge of Federal Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Mean (out of 21)</th>
<th>Probability of Diff. from Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polycom</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flashcom</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• All groups that experienced the *Exercise* traditionally or online demonstrate significantly more **knowledge** of the federal budget than the baseline control group.
### Knowledge of Federal Budget: Traditional vs. Online Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Mean (out of 21)</th>
<th>Probability of Diff. from Traditional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>p=.039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Groups that experienced the *Exercise* online Internet2 demonstrate significantly less **knowledge** of the federal budget than those that experienced it traditionally.
Knowledge of Federal Budget: Non-Internet2 Polycom Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Mean (out of 21)</th>
<th>Probability of Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-I2 Polycom</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>p=.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2 Polycom</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>p=.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The Non-I2 Polycom group demonstrates significantly more knowledge than the baseline group, but significantly less knowledge than the I2 Polycom group.
Effect of Exercise Experience on Interest and Intentions: Sig. Diffs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% who Agreed or Strongly Agreed</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When negotiating with others to reach a final decision, I think it is necessary to make some concessions to people with different opinions.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to make effective policies, I believe it is important to avoid having diverse opinions represented in the negotiations.</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Those that experienced the Exercise demonstrate significantly more willingness to entertain differences than the baseline group.
Effect of *Exercise* Experience on Interest and Intentions: Sig. Diffs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% who Agreed or Strongly Agreed</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I will encourage my friends not to vote for politicians who are unconcerned with the budget deficit.</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An effective Congressman never changes his or her position on issues.</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will not vote for a politician who promises more than she/he can deliver.</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Those that experienced the *Exercise* demonstrate significantly different expectations about politicians:
  - They expect greater concern about the deficit.
  - They tolerate changes in position.
Interest and Intentions: Traditional vs. Online Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% who Agreed or Strongly Agreed</th>
<th>Trad’l</th>
<th>Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in economic issues.</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in how the federal budgeting process works.</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to learn more about the federal budget.</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I plan to read up on the federal budget process.</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to find out more about how our govt. makes spending decisions.</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Those that experienced the *Exercise* online demonstrate significantly more interest in budgeting issues than the traditional group.
Interest and Intentions: Traditional vs. Online Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% who Agreed or Strongly Agreed</th>
<th>Trad’l</th>
<th>Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When negotiating with others to reach a final decision, I think it is necessary to make some concessions to people with different opinions.</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to discuss political issues with friends.</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Those that experienced the Exercise online demonstrate significant differences related to discourse.
  - They are more willing to make concessions.
  - They are more likely to discuss politics.
**Interest and Intentions: Traditional vs. Online Delivery**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% who Agreed or Strongly Agreed</th>
<th>Trad’l</th>
<th>Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This exercise has motivated me to find out more about the federal budget process.</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was NOT worthwhile for me to do this exercise.</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This exercise tried to cover too many details in the time we had.</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Those that experienced the *Exercise* online demonstrate a significantly more favorable response to the *Exercise* itself than the traditional group.
## Interest and Intentions: Non-I2 vs. I2 Polycom Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% who Agreed or Strongly Agreed</th>
<th>I2 Polycom</th>
<th>Non-I2 Polycom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In order to make effective policies, I believe it is important to avoid having diverse opinions represented in the negotiations.</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Those that experienced the *Exercise* through I2 Polycom were significantly more likely to tolerate diverse opinions in policy-making than those that experienced it through Non-I2 Polycom.
What they had to say

• I really liked this exercise. It was easier to learn about the budget working with it hands on instead of just reading about it.

• I liked this exercise. It really made me realize how difficult the budget process is and helped me to gain more respect for people involved in the budget process.

• I thought that the exercise has helped me understand to balance not only national budgets but to help any kind of budgets.
More of what they had to say

- I enjoyed seeing all of the items the budget was contributed to, yet I didn't like how difficult it was to find a good solution.
- It was good to find out what all you have to consider while doing the budget. Being in a group you see different ideas and viewpoints that you might not realize otherwise.
- I felt that it was beneficial to learn about the federal budget. It will influence me to become more involved.
- LOTS OF FUN.
Effect of Exercise Experience

• Knowledge
  – Participants in all groups demonstrate increased knowledge of the federal budget.

• Attitudes and Interest
  – Participants in all groups appear to acknowledge the complexity of the budgeting process
    • They understand the importance of compromise.
    • The recognize how diversity contributes to the decision-making process.
Effect of Online Delivery

• Knowledge
  – Online participants demonstrate higher knowledge than the baseline group, but less than the traditional group.

• Attitudes and Interest
  – Online participants demonstrate greater engagement with and interest in the budgeting process than the traditional group.
  – Use of technology appears to stimulate interest in content and motivate participants to pursue the topic on their own.
Effect of Internet2 Delivery

• Knowledge
  – I2 participants demonstrate more knowledge than Non-I2 online participants.

• Attitudes and Interest
  – There was only one significant difference: I2 participants were more tolerant of diverse opinions than non-I2 participants.
Partnership with Ohio Appalachian Center for Higher Education (OACHE)

- In Fall 05, students of Cindy Hykes, then a teacher at Portsmouth City Schools in southern OH, traveled to Shawnee State for delivery of the Exercise from UA.
- “Via Internet2, they were able to communicate directly with an instructor at the University of Akron about the process to ANALYZE and compare results with students in Michigan completing the project at the same time…To me this project fulfilled the promise of THE democratizing nature of technology.”
Then U.S. Rep. Ted Strickland (now Governor) met with the Portsmouth students after their experience and was quoted in *Ohio Schools* Magazine.

Many Appalachian OH high schools participated in 2005-6.
OACHE Professional Development

- April 4, 2006: grad outreach credit workshop in Teaching with Technology.
- OACHE area teachers introduced or reintroduced to the Exercise in different formats.
- Funded by OACHE and delivered over Internet2.

- April-May 2006: multiple Appalachian OH high schools participated over Internet2.
Budget Choices at OACHE Sites:
A Summary of 30 Small Groups

An Exercise in Hard Choices

April 20 - May 16, 2006
Fifteen of 30 groups opted for achieving a budget surplus of 38 billion by 2009.
18 of 30 groups wanted to freeze spending at the 2004 level; 22 of 30 opted to scale back in some way.

In a separate decision, only 9 of 30 groups supported a war supplemental.
Income Security

Ten of 30 groups favored lowering some subsidies and therefore reducing spending, but this does not represent a consensus. However, 19 groups favored reducing spending in some way.
General Government—a la carte choice

- Across-the-board freeze
- Increase IDEA funding
- Freeze high ed. funding
- Freeze transportation spending
- Increase clean air, water & alt. energy grants
- Freeze elementary & secondary ed. funding
- Freeze federal travel
- Increase fees for airport security screenings
- Charge for ATC services
- Freeze for some Dept. of Energy research
- Reform student loans
- Freeze higher ed. funding
- Freeze Pell Grants
- Freeze for Dept. of Energy, block grants
- Freeze for some Dept. of Energy, block grants
- Offset vet's disability benefits
- End Community Development block grants
- End Community Development block grants
- Cut COLAs for fed. Retirees
- Adjust fed. Pay
General Government—Analysis

• What they liked
  – 15 groups opted to double grants for clean air, clean water, and alternative energy.
  – 16 groups opted to adjust federal pay, thus achieving savings.
  – 17 groups opted to cut federal travel.
• What they didn’t like
  – No group voted for an across-the-board increase.
  – No group voted to reduce funding for higher education.
18 groups chose Modified Social Security, the most aggressive plan to control costs. It would reduce benefits and increase taxes for higher wage earners.
Little consensus. The highest agreement was on raising the eligibility age, thus achieving some savings. However, only 7 groups chose this option.
Little consensus. Nine groups opted for the Baseline, while 8 opted to lower costs by reducing payments to states for administration.
Nine groups opted for the Baseline; another 8 chose the option that would result in the lowest immediate increase in spending.
Revenues—a la carte choice

- 28 groups voted to raise cigarette taxes.
- 24 groups voted to raise alcohol taxes.
- 24 groups voted to close corporate tax loopholes.
The OACHE Schools: Results

- This exercise has made me realize the importance of compromise in the federal budget process.
- I enjoyed this exercise.
- I found this exercise beneficial.
- I am now more interested in political news than before.
More OACHE Schools Results

- I am now more interested in economic issues than before.
- I am now more likely to read news about the economy than before.
- I am now more interested in the federal budget than before.
- I am now better aware of my position on the federal budget.
Ralph Regula Student Congressional Council

- For five years UA has facilitated the Ralph Regula Student Congressional Council for talented high schools students in his congressional district.
- In 2008, the topic changed to Immigration with the Exercise procedures serving as a model.
The Future?

• We stretched our 2004 funding into 2007, but no further appropriations are likely.

• UA continues to receive requests for the Exercise, which has not been updated. Nevertheless, two universities arranged with the CRFB to use it this year in its current format.

• We hope for continued funding to allow us to reach more schools and universities.

• Some groups have expressed interest in similar budget exercises that could work at state, local, and university levels.

Maya MacGuineas, President, CRFB
crfb@newamerica.net
202.986.6599
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