

From: [Amy Porter](#)
To: [Cianciotto.Melanie](#)
Subject: Fwd: One more item for Friday's meeting
Date: Friday, April 30, 2021 10:59:56 AM
Attachments: [Matching Funds Responses.docx](#)

Begin forwarded message:

From: Amy Porter <aporter@mcknightbrf.org>
Date: April 28, 2021 at 5:29:47 PM EDT
To: Mike Dockery <Mike.Dockery@orthocarolina.com>, madhavtr71@gmail.com, J Lee Dockery <jld007@cox.net>, Patricia Boyle <Patricia_Boyle@rush.edu>, Melanie Cianciotto <Melanie.Cianciotto@suntrust.com>, Allison Brashear <abrashear@ucdavis.edu>, Robert Wah <1techdoc@gmail.com>, Richard Isaacson <rri9004@med.cornell.edu>, Sue Pekarske <slpekarske@me.com>, Gene Ryerson <gene.ryerson@gmail.com>
Cc: Elba L Morales Magana <elmorales@ucdavis.edu>, Valerie Patmintra <valerie627@gmail.com>, Hank Raattama <hank.raattama@akerman.com>
Subject: One more item for Friday's meeting

Hello, All. Last night I sent you an email with attachments entitled "Additional Material to Add to Your Meeting Packets".

In addition to those materials, I am sending you information forwarded by Odette van der Willik, our contact at AFAR. Please see her email and the attachment below for a discussion on Friday about the matching fund requirement with the mid-career award. Thank you!

Begin forwarded message:

From: Odette van der Willik <odette@afar.org>
Date: April 21, 2021 at 9:13:03 AM EDT
To: Amy Porter <aporter@mcknightbrf.org>, madhavtr71@gmail.com
Cc: Stephanie Lederman <stephanie@afar.org>
Subject: Matching funds

Hi Amy, Madhav,

Here are the anonymized responses we received when we asked several leaders in the field their perspectives on matching funds for the proposed initiative. Overall, there was great enthusiasm for a new initiative that provides funding for mid-career investigators.

I summarized what I thought were some of the key points re the matching funds:

- Mixed responses – some enthusiastic , others enthusiastic but with concerns
- This could create inequities – highly variable what departments are able to provide in matching funds or resources
- Preference for in-kind matching
- Consider other indicators of institutional commitment

Look forward to your thoughts.

Best,

Odette

Odette van der Willik

American Federation for Aging Research

55 West 39th Street 16th Floor

New York, NY 10018

212-703-9977 www.afar.org

Matching Funds Responses

Whether what is being proposed is feasible from a Department is going to be completely specific for the Department and timing. I would say this is overall not a good idea because it will create great inequities as to which departments/institutions could do this not. I could tell you if this was our department at the moment, we could not participate.

At that level of seniority, most faculty who would be competitive for this type of award would also be eligible for an NIH K award or R01 both of which provide more money to the institution without any cost-sharing. I much rather have my faculty writing an NIH grant than this type of foundation grant.

I think some cost-sharing is reasonable but this seems excessive. Of note, my Dean argues that any indirect rate less than the institution's negotiated rate with NIH is already substantial institutional cost sharing. Hope this helps.

Happy to talk about this anytime, but the answer is yes, I would gladly do it.

Especially for junior faculty who are just starting, all of them get a package that at least that size, so assuming Chairs and Deans can count that towards the match, they would love to see this kind of award.

One question is whether there is overhead (indirect costs) associated with this award.

I think this is possible as long as there is some flexibility in terms of what constitutes the match such as

- Protected time (e.g., some % FTE)
- Start-up lab support: space, equipment, research staff

Not all departments will have these kinds of resources, but some will ... and it will create some inequities because some organizations that already have robust research portfolios will be better able to support this kind of match than others.

In our case, for example, we could probably support 1 or 2 scholars like this right now ... but that depends a bit on the department's financial status at any given time.

I think that the devil will be in the details of how an in-kind match is operationalized. I think that a 1-1 match for \$750K would likely be not feasible in most cases, but I wonder if you might require some type of minimum cash match, with the balance being an in-kind match. The reason I say this is that some institutions will likely be more creative than others in terms of how they interpret an in-kind match.

An additional consideration would likely be the indirect cost rate. I assume that it would likely be very low, which would further reduce enthusiasm for a cash match from the institution.

XXXINSTITUTION for example won't give much...but could leverage mentor time, core support etc. maybe lower the bar and say 500k matching? that is a LOT of money 750/3 years and there will be huge interest.

I love the idea but it would be hard to operationalize this at XXXINSTITUTION for sure, and probably most academic institutions. There is just not enough cash laying around to make such a promise at most schools....and if there is its often used for recruitment or retention.

With respect to your question, the willingness of department chairs to provide a match for this award will be highly variable. Unless most or all of it could be considered in-kind matching, I suspect few would agree to do so. I wouldn't, for instance. I'd tell my faculty member to go get an NIH grant to support whatever the research was. Most departments will not have anywhere close to that much funding available and would have to go to a Dean to even consider matching the award. Deans would also be reluctant, I suspect, especially for faculty so early in their careers. Even those that have the funds may not be willing to commit to an award from which I presume they would not receive the full NIH level F&A. There is really very little upside for a chair to make this sort of commitment.

I think level of start-up and space are excellent indicators of commitment. Others might be administrative support that the investigator has. Note though, that these will vary a lot among institutions as well.