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Kentucky State University

Addendum to Indirect Cost Recovery, Faculty Senate Item APC-13/14-05
Prepared by Mary Evans Sias, President, Kentucky State University
November 12, 2013

The distribution of “indirect cost” or “overhead” funds received by the University through extramural grant and contract awards is often one of the major issues of faculty confusion and discontent on many university campuses. As president of Kentucky State University, my goal is to help ensure that faculty who generate indirect cost recovery as a result of grants/contracts should also benefit by receiving a portion of the funds to which the University is entitled for indirect cost recovery. It is also important that The Office of Research and Sponsored Projects and the academic departments are able to better support adequately their research administration and facilities because of sufficient indirect costs filtering down to the level of the grant generating units.

The Indirect Cost Formula as approved at Kentucky State University should help ensure an equitable distribution of funds to the key stakeholder groups, especially faculty/principal investigators.

Given the need for transparency and to help ensure that faculty are able to clearly see that the indirect cost recovery funds are being appropriately distributed, I am proposing the following practice to be used at Kentucky State University in reporting on our allocations of indirect cost to the diverse stakeholders. Dr. Mary Spor, Associate Vice President for Research and Sponsored Projects and Mrs. Anita Lockridge, Vice President for Finance and Administration will work together to prepare a report that will be issued to Faculty and Administration preferably once a semester but absolutely no less than once a year, which outlines clearly the following information:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept. Name</th>
<th>Name of Grant</th>
<th>Name of PI</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>% ICR</th>
<th>Start/End Grant/Date</th>
<th>Last Draw Down</th>
<th>Date/Amt. Transferred To</th>
<th>Account Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(30%) Gen. Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(20%) PI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10% Dean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(30%) Sponsored Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10%) Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(30%) Gen. Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(20%) PI --</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10% Dean -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(30%) Sponsored Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10%) Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(30%) Gen. Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(20%) PI --</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10% Dean -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(30%) Sponsored Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10%) Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(30%) Gen. Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(20%) PI --</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10% Dean -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(30%) Sponsored Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10%) Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All monies earned as a result of indirect cost recovery must be used in the academic/fiscal year earned; no roll over of funds is permitted.
Principal investigator
From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

A principal investigator (PI) is the lead scientist or engineer for a particular well-defined science (or other research) project, such as a laboratory study or clinical trial. It is often used as a synonym for "head of the laboratory" or "research group leader ", not just for a particular study.

In the context of USA federal funding from agencies such as the NIH or the NSF, the PI is the person who takes direct responsibility for completion of a funded project, directing the research and reporting directly to the funding agency. For small projects (which might involve 1-5 people) the PI is typically the person who conceived of the investigation, but for larger projects the PI may be selected by a team to obtain the best strategic advantage for the project.

In the context of a clinical trial a PI may be an academic working with grants from NIH or other funding agencies, or may be effectively a contractor for a pharmaceutical company working on testing the safety and efficacy of new medicines.

Certification for principal investigator

The Association of Clinical Research Professionals (ACRP) provides a certification, specific to physician investigators/principal investigators (PIs).

In a study published by David Vulcano of Hospital Corporation of America, CPI certification has been shown to be a valid predictor of overall regulatory compliance based on comparing outcomes of FDA inspections between those that were CPI certified investigators to those that were not CPI certified. Specifically over the three year timeframe of the analysis, approximately 12% of FDA audits of investigators who were not CPI certified have resulted in an Official Action Indicated (OAI) classification, where there had been zero instances of OAI results among CPI certified investigators; this was statistically significant (p=<.001). Similarly, more than 50% of the inspections of CPI certified investigators yield No Action Indicated (NAI) results, compared to only 35% of investigators not certified by the Academy; this separation was also statistically significant (p=<.005). Other studies have had similar findings. Industry sponsors have considered CPI certification of investigators as an acceptable means of demonstrating competency in Good Clinical Practice.
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