



CONSORTIUM of SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

1701 K Street NW, Suite 1150 • Washington, DC 20006 • Phone: (202) 842-3525 • Email: [wnaus@coffa.org](mailto:wnaus@coffa.org) • [www.coffa.org](http://www.coffa.org)

## Analysis of the FY 2016 OMNIBUS APPROPRIATIONS BILL and Implications for Social and Behavioral Science Research

December 17, 2015

On December 15, House and Senate negotiators unveiled their final fiscal year (FY) 2016 omnibus appropriations bill, the *Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2016* (H.R. 2029), which includes all 12 of the individual appropriations bills and totals \$1.15 trillion.

Congress passed another short term continuing resolution (CR) on Wednesday to allow enough time for the House and Senate to pass the massive spending bill and for the President to sign it, which he has indicated he would. Policymakers now have until December 22 to achieve final passage. Assuming the House can pass the bill on Friday—which will require the support of several Democrats since many conservative Republicans oppose the final agreement—the FY 2016 process could wrap up by the end of the week, at which time Members of Congress and staff will head home for the holidays, drawing to a close the first session of the 114<sup>th</sup> Congress. However, at the time of this writing, passage is not assured.

Should the bill pass, the final result for social and behavioral science funding in FY 2016 is positive. Compared to where we were just a few months ago—with major cuts proposed for social science accounts at several agencies—we are closing out the year in a better situation than many anticipated. This outcome can be largely attributed to the [bipartisan budget deal](#) that was brokered earlier in the fall, which provided much needed relief from sequestration and the tight discretionary spending caps. In addition, our champions on the Hill worked tirelessly on our behalf during these final negotiations to stave off devastating cuts to many of our programs.

The following pages include analysis of the final bill and accompanying report language as they pertain to social and behavioral science research.

The text of the bill and explanatory statement can be viewed on the House Rules Committee [website](#).

### Contents:

Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality .....	2
Bureau of Labor Statistics .....	2
Census Bureau .....	3
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.....	3
Department of Agriculture .....	4
Department of Education .....	5
Department of Justice .....	5
National Institutes of Health .....	6
National Science Foundation .....	8
Appendix A: NIH Funding by Institute and Center .....	9
Appendix B: Funding for Other Agencies Relevant to Social and Behavioral Science Research .....	10

## Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality

The Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) receives a total of \$334 million under the agreement. Although this is \$29.7 million below FY 2015 (about 8 percent), the final number is much improved from the House and Senate bills. As [previously reported](#), the Senate proposed to cut the agency by 35 percent, while the House bill would have eliminated AHRQ entirely.

AHRQ’s portfolios that take the biggest hit in the bill are Health Information Technology, which receives a 23.8 percent cut, and Crosscutting Activities, which receives a 20.3 percent cut.

The agreement actually provides a small increase (\$1.5 million) for investigator-initiated research grants (\$47.4 million in total). The Medical Expenditure Panel Survey (MEPS) also receives an increase (to \$66 million), though this amount falls short of the Administration’s requested \$68.9 million.

As in previous years, language in the explanatory statement directs AHRQ to focus on its “traditional mission,” perhaps indicating Congressional concern about perceived overreach by the agency. The agreement also maintains a prohibition on directing grant funding to particular fields of research (such as health economics, which had been proposed in the past):

*“Investigator-initiated research should not be targeted to any specific area of health services research so as to generate the best unsolicited ideas from the research community about a wide variety of topics.”*

The omnibus allocates \$10 million within AHRQ’s Patient Safety research activities to the Administration’s Combatting Antibiotic-Resistant Bacteria (CARB) initiative and directs AHRQ to work closely with other agencies. It stipulates that CARB activities should have “coordinated goals and measurable objectives to best leverage the funds provided” and requests an update in the FY 2017 budget request.

<i>(in millions)</i>	Enacted FY 2015	Proposed FY 2016	FY 2016 House	FY 2016 Senate	FY 2016 Final	2016 vs. 2015
<b>Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality</b>	<b>363.7</b>	<b>363.7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>334.0</b>	<b>-8.2%</b>
Patient Safety	76.6	76	0	65.1	74.3	-3.0%
Crosscutting Activities Related to Quality, Effectiveness and Efficiency Research*	112.2	112.3	0	58	89.4	-20.3%
Health Information Technology	28.2	22.9	0	19.7	21.5	-23.8%
Prevention/Care Management	11.6	11.6	0	8.1	11.6	0.0%

## Bureau of Labor Statistics

The agreement provides \$609 million to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), a \$16.8 million increase from FY 2015, though \$23.9 million below the amount requested by the President. The final allocation is level with what was proposed in the House. The Senate bill included a \$20 million cut to the agency compared to FY 2015. The explanatory statement includes the following language:

*“The Bureau of Labor Statistics shall submit a report to Congress within one year of enactment of this Act on the Bureau’s efforts to account for and report on all forms of employment in the current economy, including those working in small businesses, part-time or temporary workers, those with fluctuating schedules, and the self-employed.”*

---

\* This line was called “Health Services Research, Data, and Dissemination” in the President’s Budget Request and the Senate draft.

<i>(in millions)</i>	Enacted FY 2015	Proposed FY 2016	FY 2016 House	FY 2016 Senate	FY 2016 Final	2016 vs. 2015
<b>Bureau of Labor Statistics</b>	<b>592.2</b>	<b>632.7</b>	<b>609</b>	<b>579.2</b>	<b>609.0</b>	<b>2.8%</b>

## Census Bureau

The omnibus provides a total of \$1.37 billion to the Census Bureau, an increase of \$282 million over the FY 2015 level. While this is \$130 million below the amount requested, it is higher than what was approved earlier this year in both the House and Senate bills. The Bureau's two main accounts, Current Surveys and Programs (CSP) and Periodic Censuses and Programs (PCP), are both increased over the FY 2015, House and Senate levels. CSP is funded at \$270 million and PCP at \$1.1 billion. The bill does not stipulate amounts of funding for the various activities within these two accounts, providing the Bureau with much needed flexibility. However, with respect to PCP, the agreement directs the Bureau to "prioritize increases in spending on activities that have the greatest potential to reduce cost and risk for the 2020 Census, as well as activities to reduce survey respondent burden."

Of particular note, the omnibus removes language previously passed by the House that would have made the American Community Survey (ACS) voluntary. This is a significant win for the research and statistical communities, especially given the many challenges to the ACS this year.

<i>(in millions)</i>	Enacted FY 2015	Proposed FY 2016	FY 2016 House	FY 2016 Senate	FY 2016 Final	2016 vs. 2015
<b>Bureau of the Census</b>	<b>1088.0</b>	<b>1500.0</b>	<b>1113.0</b>	<b>1128.0</b>	<b>1370.0</b>	<b>25.9%</b>
Current Surveys and Programs*	268.6	277.9	265.0	266.0	270.0	0.5%
Periodic Censuses and Programs	819.4	1222.1	848.0	862.0	1100.0	34.3%

## Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

The bill provides a 5.1 percent increase over FY 2015 in discretionary funding for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), a total of \$6.3 billion, \$174.9 million more than the President's request.

The National Center for Health Statistics receives \$160.4 million, consistent with the President's request and \$5 million over FY 2015.

The biggest increase goes to the CDC's National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, which receives an additional 38.5 percent or \$65.7 million over FY 2015. Most of the increase goes to activities related to opioid abuse. CDC is instructed to distribute funds through competitive mechanisms that account for the "population-adjusted burden of disease." Funding is also provided for CDC to expand its surveillance of heroin-related deaths.

The omnibus agreement maintains the longstanding prohibition on funding research on preventing gun violence, and as such, fails to include the \$10 million requested by the President for such research.

The agreement provides a \$4.7 million increase to the National Violent Death Reporting System (NVDRS) to support states not previously covered. However, the amount is well below what was requested by the Administration and language in the explanatory statement directs the CDC to "ensure the activities continue to comply with funding restrictions." This likely refers to the aforementioned gun violence prevention research ban, which was made more explicit in the House report—language that stands as it was not superseded by the explanatory statement (see [COSSA's previous analysis](#) for the full report language).

\* This line was previously called "Salaries and Expenses."

The explanatory statement also includes the following language:

*“The agreement urges CDC and Center Directors to explore ways to review its programs and public health activities, where population adjusted burden of disease is not already being used as a significant factor to award funds, in order to determine how the programs can use or increase the use of burden of disease as significant criteria for awarding, tracking, and evaluating CDC supported activities.”*

The CDC is also instructed to provide advance notices to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees if “it does not follow the policy, funding source, and levels described in its budget request.”

<i>(in millions)</i>	Enacted FY 2015	Proposed FY 2016	FY 2016 House	FY 2016 Senate	FY 2016 Final	2016 vs. 2015
<b>Centers for Disease Control and Prevention</b>	<b>5968.1</b>	<b>6095.8</b>	<b>6095.8</b>	<b>5747.3</b>	<b>6270.7</b>	<b>5.1%</b>
HIV, Viral Hepatitis, STI, and TB Prevention	1117.6	1161.7	1117.6	1090.6	1122.3	0.4%
Chronic Disease Prevention, Health Promotion	1199.2	1058.1	1097.5	1052.9	1177.1	-1.8%
Environmental Health	179.4	178.5	160.6	145.3	182.3	1.6%
Health Statistics	155.4	160.4	160.4	145.4	160.4	3.2%
Injury Prevention and Control	170.4	257	211.3	187.9	236.1	38.5%
Occupational Safety and Health	334.9	283.4	341.1	305.9	339.1	1.3%
Global Health	416.5	448.1	426.9	411.8	427.1	2.5%
Public Health Preparedness and Response	1352.6	1381.8	1460.8	1340.1	1405.0	3.9%
Preventive Health & Health Services Block Grant	160	0	170	160	160.0	0.0%

## Department of Agriculture

The omnibus maintains flat funding of \$85.4 million for the Economic Research Service (ERS). The National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) receives a \$4 million cut, to \$168.4 million. Within those funds, \$42.2 million is provided for the Census of Agriculture. The agreement provides additional funds for NASS’s pollinator surveys and chemical use program, as well as funding to reinstate a vineyard production survey.

The National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) receives a total of \$1.3 billion, \$37 million above FY 2015, though \$177.1 million below the President’s request. The Agriculture and Food Research Initiative (AFRI), the Department’s main competitive grants program, sees a \$25 million increase to \$350 million, still \$100 million less than the Administration proposed. Language in the explanatory statement instructs USDA to:

*“...direct that not less than 15 percent of the competitive research grant funds be used for USDA’s agriculture research enhancement awards program, including USDA-EPSCoR.”*

<i>(in millions)</i>	Enacted FY 2015	Proposed FY 2016	FY 2016 House	FY 2016 Senate	FY 2016 Final	2016 vs. 2015
<b>Economic Research Service</b>	<b>85.4</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>78.4</b>	<b>85.4</b>	<b>85.4</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
<b>National Agricultural Statistics Service</b>	<b>172.4</b>	<b>180.3</b>	<b>161.2</b>	<b>168.1</b>	<b>168.4</b>	<b>-2.3%</b>
<b>National Institute of Food and Agriculture</b>	<b>1289.5</b>	<b>1503.1</b>	<b>1284.3</b>	<b>1293.7</b>	<b>1326.5</b>	<b>2.9%</b>
Agriculture and Food Research Initiative	325	450	335	325	350.0	7.7%
Hatch Act	243.7	243.7	243.7	243.7	243.7	0.0%

## Department of Education

Within the appropriation for the Department of Education, the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) receives \$618 million, an increase of \$44 million over the FY 2015 level and higher than the amounts included in the earlier House and Senate bills. Within the increase, the research, development and dissemination account and the statistics account (National Center for Education Statistics) are among the winners, with both seeing a more than 8 percent increase over FY 2015.

Report language accompanying the final bill directs and encourages IES to produce a number of reports, including one on the number of teachers who have taught students with disabilities, English learners, students in rural areas, low income students, and minority students without having obtained “full state certification.” That report is due by the end of calendar year 2016. The language also encourages IES to award grants studying “typically-developing infants and toddlers, as well as infants and toddlers with special needs, to help fill the existing gaps in the literature” and to evaluate the geographic distribution of IES grantees and “pursue efforts to expand, in particular, research on early learning programs and policies in rural and other parts of the country facing unique challenges where there is a shortage of current research.”

The Department’s International Education and Foreign Language programs receive a total of \$72.2 million in the omnibus, flat with last year. This includes flat funding at \$65.1 million for domestic programs (Title VI) and \$7.1 million for overseas programs (Fulbright-Hays). While flat-funding is not ideal, it is a better outcome than an earlier Senate proposal to cut these programs by 35 percent.

<i>(in millions)</i>	Enacted FY 2015	Proposed FY 2016	FY 2016 House	FY 2016 Senate	FY 2016 Final	2016 vs. 2015
<b>Institute of Education Sciences</b>	<b>573.9</b>	<b>675.9</b>	<b>410.0</b>	<b>563.0</b>	<b>618.0</b>	<b>7.7%</b>
Research, Development, and Dissemination	179.9	202.3	93.1	177.9	195.0	8.4%
Statistics (National Center for Education Statistics)	103.1	124.7	103.1	102.1	112.0	8.6%
Regional Education Laboratories	54.4	54.4	0.0	53.8	54.4	0.0%
Research in Special Education	54.0	54.0	36.0	48.0	54.0	0.0%
Special Education Studies and Evaluations	10.8	13.0	6.0	10.5	10.8	0.2%
Assessment	137.2	157.4	137.2	137.2	157.2	14.6%
StateWide Data Systems	34.5	70.0	34.5	33.5	34.5	0.1%
<b>International Education and Foreign Language Studies</b>	<b>72.2</b>	<b>76.2</b>	<b>72.2</b>	<b>46.9</b>	<b>72.2</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
Domestic Programs (Title VI)	65.1	67.1	65.1	43.4	65.1	0.0%
Overseas Programs (Fulbright-Hays)	7.1	9.1	7.1	3.5	7.1	-0.5%

## Department of Justice

The final agreement provides \$41 million for the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) and \$36 million for the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), the same amount appropriated in FY 2015. While not ideal, the flat funding for these agencies is a positive outcome given the proposal in the earlier House bill to eliminate the direct appropriations for BJS and NIJ and instead allow the Department of Justice (DOJ) to “set aside” funds for the agencies. The omnibus restores the funding to last year’s levels; however, it is still a far cry from the amounts requested by the Administration (\$61.4 million for BJS and \$52.5 million for NIJ).

The omnibus allows for two percent of funds appropriated to the DOJ Office of Justice Programs to be transferred to NIJ and BJS for research, evaluation and statistics activities, the same amount as last year.

Finally, the bill includes \$5 million in transfers from the Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) for research and evaluation on violence against women and an additional \$1 million for research on violence against Indian women.

<i>(in millions)</i>	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	FY 2016 House	FY 2016 Senate	FY 2016 Final	2016 vs. 2015
<b>Bureau of Justice Statistics</b>	<b>41.0</b>	<b>61.4</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>41.0</b>	<b>41.0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
<b>National Institute of Justice</b>	<b>36.0</b>	<b>52.5</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>36.0</b>	<b>36.0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

## National Institutes of Health

For the National Institutes of Health (NIH), the final bill provides \$32.1 billion, a \$2 billion increase over FY 2015. Also included in this sum are “earmarks” for specific areas of research: \$200 million fully funding the President’s Precision Medicine Initiative (PMI), including \$70 million to the National Cancer Institute and \$130 million to the NIH Common Fund; a \$350 million increase for Alzheimer’s disease research; \$150 million for the Brain Research through Application of Innovative Neurotechnologies (BRAIN) initiative, an increase of \$85 million above the FY 2015 funding level; and \$675.6 million to the Common Fund in the Office of the Director (including \$130 million for PMI and \$12.6 million for pediatric research authorized by the *Gabriella Miller Kids First Research Act*).

The bill’s accompanying report once again includes an assortment of report language relevant to the social and behavioral sciences, in addition to directives included in the reports accompanying the House and Senate Committees-passed bills.

Per the House [21st Century Cures](#) bill passed in July, the bill reiterates Congress’ expectation that NIH “consider burden of disease when setting priorities and developing strategic plans across institutes and centers (ICs) to address conditions such as: Alzheimer’s disease, diabetes, heart disease, and cancer.” It also emphasizes that NIH is expected to “prioritize funds on medical research discovery over outreach and education” and “continue policies to distribute funding based on the merit of researchers’ ideas and productivity, and to ensure consistent application of scientific policies between extramural and intramural researchers.” The bill requests that NIH provide “an update in the fiscal year FY 2017 budget request on how it plans to use the [NIH five-year scientific strategic plan](#) as part of its resource allocation process to improve the health of the American population.”

### National Children’s Study Follow-on

NIH is commended for its activities surrounding the National Children’s Study Follow-on and is directed to submit a spending plan on the next phase of the study within 90 days of enactment of the omnibus. Further, Congress notes that NIH is expected to “continue to move forward based on the directions provided by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.”

### Science Education Partnership Awards

Notwithstanding Congress’ expectation that NIH prioritize funds on medical research discovery and outreach and education, NIH is directed to continue funding the Science Education Partnership Awards (SEPA) program at no less than last year’s level.

### National Academy of Sciences Study

The omnibus legislation directs NIH to fund a National Academy of Sciences study “as part of the studies conducted under section 489 of the PHS [Public Health Services] Act” on “policies affecting the next generation of researchers.”

### Certificates of Confidentiality

In an effort to strengthen privacy protections for human research participants, NIH is mandated to require funded investigators “receiving NIH funding for new and competing research projects designed to generate and analyze large volumes of data derived from human research participants to obtain a certificate of confidentiality.”

### **Capstone Awards**

The final bill notes that NIH is exploring the establishment of new grants called the Capstone Awards and that the grants “could promote partnership between senior and junior investigators or provide opportunities for acquiring skills needed for transitioning to a new role.” An update is requested in the FY 2017 budget request, “including NIH consultations with internal and external constituencies with a stake in this potential endeavor.”

### **Grant Review Process**

Addressing NIH’s grant review process, the bill directs NIH in its FY 2017 budget request to “provide an update on NIH policies and procedures to ensure appropriate review and approval for grants awarded” through the institutes and centers.

### **Duplication of Research**

The agency is also expected to provide Congress with an update in the FY 2017 budget request “on how NIH ICs and programs coordinate with the CDC [Centers for Disease Control and Prevention] Centers and programs on cross-cutting initiatives, ensuring they avoid duplication of effort.”

### **Basic Science**

NIH is requested to provide an update in its FY 2017 budget request on steps it “plans to take to ensure the traditional focus on basic science is preserved.” The bill emphasizes that “basic biomedical research must remain a key component of both the intramural and extramural research portfolio at the NIH.” NIH is expected to provide this data 60 days after enactment of this Act to populate the category before the end of FY 2016.

### **Child Abuse and Neglect**

NIH and the *Eunice Kennedy Shriver* National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) are commended for the agency’s Pediatric Trauma and Critical Illness Branch’s “new initiative to form CAPSTONE Centers for Multidisciplinary Research and Training in Child Abuse and Neglect.” All relevant NIH ICs are encouraged to “ensure reviewers with knowledge and expertise on the subject are included on appropriate peer review communities.”

### **Categorization of Disease**

The bill “reiterates the direction identified in the FY 2015 explanatory statement for NIH to make public, on an annual basis, enhanced Research, Condition, and Disease Categorization (RCDC) spending data with the number of Americans affected by each category of disease according to the CDC or other federally-sourced data.”

### **Reproducibility and Rigor**

Expressing concern regarding the reproducibility of scientific methods, NIH is requested to provide an update in the FY 2017 budget request on how it is “measuring the effectiveness of each step NIH has taken to develop and implement best practice guidelines to better facilitate the conduct of replicable research and research transparency in the reporting of methods and findings.”

### **Alzheimer’s Disease**

The bill provides the National Institute on Aging (NIA) with \$936 million, an increase of \$350 million above the FY 2015 funding level for research on Alzheimer’s disease, “subject to the scientific opportunity presented in the peer review process.” NIA is encouraged to “continue addressing the research goals set forth in the National Plan to Address Alzheimer’s Disease, as well as the recommendations from the [Alzheimer’s Research Summit](#) in 2015.”

### **Research Centers on Minority Institutions**

A directive to the National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities (NIMHD) is included in the bill directing the Institute to provide “no less than \$56.75 million” and equal to the FY 2015 funding level along with “the proportional share of the general increase” provided to the Institute for its Research Centers on Minority Institutions (RCMIs).

### **Clinical and Translations Science Awards**

The Clinical and Translational Science Awards (CTSA) program located in the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences (NCATS) is provided \$500 million, an increase of \$25.3 million above the FY 2015 funding level to “implement the recommendations from the 2013 [Institute of Medicine report on CTSA](#).” The agreement particularly supports “the goal of using CTSA to build networking capacity and support for innovative collaborative projects.” It includes additional funding designed to allow the program “to retain its merit-based

CTSA funding to institutions while expanding the network capacity to conduct multi-site clinical studies and collaborative projects.”

## National Science Foundation

The final bill provides the National Science Foundation with a budget of \$7.46 billion, which is an increase of nearly \$120 million over FY 2015, though \$260 million less than the amount requested by the President. The final appropriation is higher than the amounts originally proposed by the House and Senate, which can be credited to the additional funds provided through the bipartisan budget agreement earlier this year. In addition, the bulk of the increase is given to the Research and Related Activities account, which funds NSF’s science directorates and external grants.

Most importantly, the omnibus removes language included in the House bill that targeted the Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences Directorate (SBE), as well as the Geosciences Directorate, for major cuts. Instead, the omnibus explanatory statement reads:

*“In lieu of House language regarding funding percentages for certain activities, the agreement provides that funds for Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences shall be up to the fiscal year 2015 level.”*

While flat funding is not ideal, it is a positive outcome given the impact the original House language could have had on SBE. The new language gives NSF the authority to determine how much to allocate to SBE in FY 2016, with a hard cap at the FY 2015 level, which was about \$272 million. Of additional note, the final agreement does not target any specific social science fields for cuts, such as the way political science was singled out a few years ago.

The omnibus goes on to direct NSF to “continue efforts to implement transparency processes, which includes requiring that public award abstracts articulate how the project serves the national interest...” Fortunately, the language falls short of stating what research qualifies as “serving the national interest,” leaving such a determination to be made by the agency. Other [legislation](#) originating in the House this year sought to codify a definition of “national interest” as it relates to federally-funded research, with an eye on singling out “wasteful” social science projects. The report also directs NSF to provide periodic updates on its efforts to improve replicability of scientific research.

The Education and Human Resources (EHR) Directorate, which is the only NSF directorate to receive a direct appropriation from Congress, is funded at \$880 million in the final agreement. This is \$14 million more than the FY 2015 level, but nearly \$83 million less than the President’s request. The bill earmarks \$35 million for the Historically Black Colleges and Universities program, \$46 million for the Louis Stokes Alliance for Minority Participation program, \$14 million for the Tribal Colleges and Universities Program, \$62.5 million for the Advanced Informal STEM Learning Program, and \$50 million for Cyber Corps: Scholarships for Service.

<i>(in millions)</i>	Enacted FY 2015	Proposed FY 2016	FY 2016 House	FY 2016 Senate	FY 2016 Final	2016 vs. 2015
<b>National Science Foundation</b>	<b>7344.2</b>	<b>7723.6</b>	<b>7394.2</b>	<b>7343.7</b>	<b>7463.5</b>	<b>1.6%</b>
Research and Related Activities	5933.6	6186.3	5983.6	5933.6	<b>6033.6</b>	1.7%
Education and Human Resources	866.0	962.6	866.0	866.0	<b>880.0</b>	1.6%
Major Research Equipment and Facilities Construction	200.8	200.3	200.0	200.3	<b>200.3</b>	-0.2%
Agency Operations and Award Management	325.0	354.8	325.0	325.0	<b>330.0</b>	1.5%
National Science Board	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	<b>4.4</b>	0.0%
Office of the Inspector General	14.4	15.2	15.2	14.5	<b>15.2</b>	5.1%



## Appendix A: NIH Funding by Institute and Center

<i>(in millions)</i>	Enacted FY 2015	Proposed FY 2016	FY 2016 House	FY 2016 Senate	FY 2016 Final	2016 vs. 2015
National Institutes of Health	30084	31084	31084	32084	32084	6.6%
John E. Fogarty International Center for Advanced Study in the Health Sciences	67.8	69.5	68.6	70.9	70.4	3.8%
National Cancer Institute	4950.4	5098.5	5081.8	5204.1	5214.7	5.3%
National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences	635.2	660.1	643.1	699.3	685.4	7.9%
National Center for Complementary and Integrative Health	124.7	127.5	127.6	130.2	130.8	4.9%
National Eye Institute	684.2	695.2	698.1	709.5	715.9	4.6%
National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute	2997.9	3071.9	3035.1	3135.5	3115.5	3.9%
National Human Genome Research Institute	499.4	515.5	505.6	526.2	519	3.9%
National Institute on Aging	1199.5	1267.1	1518.4	1548.5	1600.2	33.4%
National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism	447.4	459.8	456	469.4	467.7	4.5%
National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases	4358.8	4614.8	4512.9	4710.3	4629.9	6.2%
National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases	521.7	533.2	528.1	544.3	542.1	3.9%
National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering	330.2	337.3	338.4	344.3	346.8	5.0%
Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development	1286.6	1318.1	1305.6	1345.4	1339.8	4.1%
National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders	405.3	416.2	412.4	424.9	423	4.4%
National Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research	400	406.7	404.8	415.2	415.6	3.9%
National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases	1749.2	1788.1	1771.4	1825.2	1818.4	4.0%
National Institute on Drug Abuse	1028.6	1047.4	1050.9	1069.1	1077.5	4.8%
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences	687.5	681.8	675.8	695.9	693.7	0.9%
National Institute of General Medical Sciences	2371.5	2433.8	2439.4	2511.4	2512.1	5.9%
National Institute of Mental Health	1463	1489.4	1512.9	1520.3	1548.4	5.8%
National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities	269.2	281.5	272.5	287.4	279.7	3.9%
National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke	1605.2	1660.4	1656.3	1694.7	1696.2	5.7%
National Institute of Nursing Research	141	144.5	142.7	147.5	146.5	3.9%
National Library of Medicine	337	394.1	341.1	402.3	394.7	17.1%

## Appendix B: Funding for Other Agencies Relevant to Social and Behavioral Science Research

<i>(in millions)</i>	Enacted FY 2015	Proposed FY 2016	FY 2016 Final	2016 vs. 2015
Bureau of Economic Analysis	96	110	105	9.4%
Educational and Cultural Exchange Programs, Department of State	589.9	623.1	590.9	0.2%
Energy Information Administration	117	131	122	4.3%
National Archives and Records Administration	365	372.4	372.4	2.0%
National Endowment for the Humanities	146	147.9	147.9	1.3%
Office of Policy Development and Research, Department of Housing and Urban Development	72	50	85	18.1%
United States Institute of Peace	35.3	37	35.3	0.0%
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars	10.5	10.4	10.5	0.0%