IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME)
e-ISSN: 2320–7388, p- ISSN: 2320-737x Volume 15, Issue 3 Ser. 6 (May. – June. 2025), PP 13-17
www.iosrjournals.org

The Research Funding Cliff: Why Universities Must Rethink Their Research and Development Business Model

Jason A. Hubbart[1,2]
[1]*Division for Land-Grant Engagement, Davis College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, School of Natural Resources and the Environment, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV 26506, USA; jason.hubbart@mail.wvu.edu.*
[2]*West Virginia Agriculture and Forestry Experiment Station, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV 26506, USA; jason.hubbart@mail.wvu.edu.*

Abstract:
Research universities in the United States of America (USA) and other Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) nations are experiencing a significant structural decline in public funding, referred to as a research funding cliff. This term is defined here as a systemic and sustained decrease in public research and development (R&D) investment that challenges the historic financial stability and innovation capacity of higher education institutions. The purpose of this article is to examine the historical trajectory and contemporary implications of declining funding, alongside rising operational costs, regulatory complexity, and stagnant capacity grants. Utilizing a mixed-methods approach that combines policy analysis, comparative institutional case studies, and organizational change theory, the article identifies emerging institutional responses, including commercialization platforms, strategic philanthropy, and industry-integrated innovation models. Examples are provided that demonstrate scalable models for research translation and revenue diversification. However, widespread adoption of these alternatives is still hindered by structural inertia, leadership capacity gaps, and misaligned incentives. To address these challenges, a framework for strategic change is presented, grounded in the models of Lewin, Kotter, and Kezar, which advocate for entrepreneurial leadership, portfolio-based research planning, and cross-functional institutional integration. The findings underscore the need for universities to reassess their innovation and R&D business models to achieve long-term resilience, relevance, and alignment with their mission in an unpredictable global funding environment.

Key Words*: Research Funding Cliff; Innovation Business Models; Organizational Change; Entrepreneurial Leadership; Revenue Diversification; Strategic Philanthropy; Cross-sector Integration.*

Date of Submission: 13-06-2025 Date of Acceptance: 26-06-2025

I. Introduction

Research universities have historically served as critical engines of discovery, innovation, and socioeconomic development. Their roles in advancing scientific knowledge, training highly skilled labor, and fostering technological progress have positioned them as cornerstones of national and global innovation systems [1,2]. In the United States of America (USA) and other Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) nations, these institutions have long relied on robust public investments to sustain research infrastructure, support faculty-led research, and ensure continuity in the discovery-to-application pipeline. However, the fiscal foundation of this model is undergoing a significant and potentially irreversible shift, particularly in the USA [3,4]. Over the past five decades, the share of United States federal research and development (R&D) funding as a percentage of gross domestic product (GDP) has declined substantially, from approximately 1.2% in the 1970s to less than 0.7% in 2023 [5,6]. This downward trend is echoed in many OECD member countries, where flat or declining public R&D investments have placed increasing pressure on universities to seek alternative sources of support [7,8]. At the same time, universities face rising costs related to labor, compliance, infrastructure, and technological demands, further straining legacy funding models.

This structural decline in public funding, hereafter referred to as the "research funding cliff," translates into a financial crisis for some research institutions and an existential challenge to the university research enterprise at large. Many institutions continue to operate with organizational assumptions grounded in past eras of growth such as central subsidies, discipline-specific silos, and tenure-driven autonomy, despite today's more volatile, competitive, and market-influenced research environment [9-11]. To remain viable and impactful, universities must rethink their innovation and R&D business models.

This article explores the scope of the funding cliff, briefly outlines institutional responses, and presents leadership and organizational strategies for sustainable transformation. A mixed qualitative approach is applied that integrates policy analysis, comparative case study review, and theoretical synthesis from the organizational change and higher education innovation literature. Primary sources include R&D funding trends, planning documents, and reforms selected for research intensity, funding innovation, and governance diversity. Theoretical frameworks guiding interpretation were drawn from established models of organizational change [12-14]. The goal of the approach is to bridge empirical funding trends with actionable insights for institutional reform. The reader can locate many other methods, sources, and models in the literature that reflect the trends noted herein. The intent is that the current article will serve as a springboard for further inquiry and action.

II. Research Funding Trends

The global research funding landscape is undergoing a structural transformation marked by declining public investment, shifting private-sector engagement, and intensifying financial pressures on academic institutions [15,16]. These fiscal constrictions collectively constitute what may be described as a "research funding cliff", a term denoting both the magnitude of the decline and its abrupt, systemic implications for research universities. Over the past several decades, public investment in research and development (R&D) has declined in both relative and absolute terms. In the United States, federal R&D expenditures as a share of GDP have fallen from 1.2% in the 1970s to just 0.65% in 2023. This trend has resulted in funding stagnation or outright cuts for key research-enabling programs. For example, the purchasing power of United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) capacity grants such as Hatch and McIntire-Stennis has significantly diminished due to inflation and flat-line appropriations [17]. Similarly, in OECD countries, core government support to higher education institutions for R&D has grown at a slower pace than private or applied sector R&D investments, leading to underfunded university research enterprises [18].

While private-sector investment in R&D has increased globally, its distribution is increasingly skewed toward proprietary in-house research or commercial partnerships outside traditional university structures. As of 2021, industry accounted for over 70% of total R&D spending in OECD countries, yet only a fraction of this flowed into university partnerships [18]. Companies are increasingly favoring direct investment in startups, internal innovation labs, and contract research organizations that offer more agile timelines and clearer intellectual property ownership [19]. Simultaneously, universities face escalating internal costs and growing accountability mandates. Labor costs, particularly for research faculty, graduate assistants, and compliance personnel, have increased significantly, while infrastructure maintenance backlogs have expanded at many public institutions. Additionally, the complexity of securing and managing external funding has intensified due to growing federal compliance regulations and indirect cost recovery limits [17]. These combined forces are pushing many institutions to a financial tipping point.

III. Institutional Adaptations: Emerging Models

In response to the growing pressures of the research funding cliff, some research-intensive universities have begun to experiment with alternative innovation and R&D business models that aim to diversify revenue streams, accelerate research translation, and align academic capacity with market-driven demand. These adaptations offer critical insights into how institutional structures can evolve to remain viable in an era of fiscal uncertainty. Institutions such as the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), Arizona State University (ASU), and the Technical University of Munich (TUM) have established research commercialization platforms that blend academic research with entrepreneurial and industry engagement. MIT's "The Engine" and ASU's "Skysong Innovations" serve as models of embedded accelerators that support early-stage technologies emerging from faculty labs, providing seed funding, mentorship, and external investment linkages [20,21]. These initiatives integrate university research with market pathways, leveraging institutional assets to incubate ventures while retaining academic integrity.

Universities are also redefining philanthropic capital not merely as supplemental funding but as a strategic tool for research and innovation investment. Stanford University's Biohub and Johns Hopkins' Bloomberg Distinguished Professorships represent mechanisms through which private donations are directed toward high-impact, interdisciplinary, and translational research [22]. This approach positions donors as risk-accepting investors in cutting-edge research infrastructure and interdisciplinary projects typically bypassed by traditional grant agencies. This approach aligns with emerging views of philanthropy as a catalyst for mission-aligned research entrepreneurship [23].

Another trend involves the strategic formation of long-term partnerships with private-sector entities. Rather than one-off sponsored projects, universities in the USA such as Purdue and Georgia Tech are entering into co-funded research labs and curriculum co-design efforts with industry partners. Purdue's collaboration with SkyWater Technology to establish a semiconductor fabrication facility is a prominent example of aligning institutional R&D with national strategic priorities while drawing substantial external investment. Similarly, Georgia Tech's "Living Labs" initiative engages companies in co-developing smart city technologies with faculty and students, enhancing both applied research output and workforce development pipelines [17,24]. Ultimately, the shift from dependency on public subsidy to strategic integration with private and philanthropic ecosystems may represent a sustainable path forward, provided that transparent principles, academic autonomy safeguards, and alignment with public good missions govern these methods.

IV. Organizational and Leadership Challenges

While some research universities are pioneering adaptive strategies in response to fiscal stress, widespread institutional transformation remains elusive. Many institutions face substantial internal barriers rooted in organizational inertia, outdated governance models, and misalignment of leadership capacity. These factors limit the agility required to navigate the structural challenges presented by the research funding cliff. A core barrier to adaptation lies in the enduring rigidity of university structures. Most research universities were designed during periods of expansion and operate under models predicated on centralized funding, disciplinary silos, and long-standing traditions of academic autonomy [25]. While historically functional, these characteristics are poorly suited for contemporary conditions that demand cross-sector integration, interdisciplinary research, and rapid deployment of applied knowledge. Kezar and Eckel [26] identified the *deep culture* of academia, including shared norms, reward systems, and decentralized decision-making, as a significant constraint on change. Siloed academic units often operate with little incentive to collaborate or to pursue external partnerships that do not align with traditional disciplinary metrics.

V. Deficiencies in Research Leadership Capacity

Another challenge is the limited preparation and support given to research leaders tasked with institutional transformation. Unlike corporate or nonprofit sectors, where leadership development is integral, higher education often promotes administrators based on scholarly accomplishments rather than strategic or operational competencies [27]. As a result, research deans, associate provosts, research directors, and other such positions often lack formal training in areas critical to the contemporary higher education environment, including financial modeling, negotiation, risk management, and external stakeholder engagement [28,29]. Bess*, et al.* [30] argued that higher education leadership must evolve to embrace more entrepreneurial, system-level thinking to sustain relevance and performance.

In addition, existing incentive systems within universities rarely reward the behaviors needed for transformation. Faculty often face limited recognition or advancement opportunities for activities such as commercialization, industry partnerships, or translational research, which are essential to diversified innovation ecosystems [31]. Improved institutional incentives and leadership preparation are crucial for universities to develop the organizational capacity needed to navigate external shocks and adapt to shifting resource landscapes.

VI. Frameworks for Change and Strategic Leadership

Effectively addressing the research funding cliff requires not only a recognition of structural deficits but also the intentional application of organizational change frameworks and the cultivation of strategic leadership capable of guiding transformation [32]. Traditional leadership approaches rooted in stewardship and incrementalism are insufficient in the face of systemic fiscal realignment. Universities must also embrace proactive, theory-informed strategies that enable adaptation, agility, and sustained innovation.

The field of organizational change [32] offers several well-established models that are directly applicable to the transformation of research universities. Kurt Lewin's (1951) classic "Unfreeze–Change–Refreeze" model provides a foundational lens for understanding institutional inertia and the need to destabilize the status quo before implementing new systems. This model emphasizes the importance of dismantling entrenched beliefs and processes (unfreezing), introducing new behaviors and structures (change), and institutionalizing them through culture and policy reinforcement (refreezing) [13]. Building upon this foundation, Kotter's eight-step model outlines a pragmatic approach to leading change in complex organizations. Key elements include establishing a sense of urgency, forming a guiding coalition, articulating a clear vision, removing obstacles, and achieving short-term wins to build momentum. Kotter's framework is beneficial for higher education leaders seeking to galvanize action across decentralized units [12]. Kezar [14] recently advanced theories of emergent and adaptive change specifically tailored to academic contexts. Her model emphasizes the importance of aligning individual agency

with institutional structures, leveraging networks of change agents, and integrating bottom-up innovation with top-down support. These approaches underscore that durable change in universities often emerges from ongoing negotiation and shared governance rather than purely administrative fiat.

In parallel with structural change frameworks, universities must also cultivate strategic leadership capable of navigating dynamic funding environments. This necessitates shifting the leadership paradigm from academic oversight to entrepreneurial strategy. Effective research leaders now require competencies in scenario planning, partnership development, financial risk management, and innovation systems thinking [33]. Institutions that invest in leadership development through executive education, coaching, or cross-sector immersion will be better positioned to reimagine their research enterprise in alignment with emerging opportunities. Moreover, strategic leadership must facilitate cultural change by modeling collaborative behavior, incentivizing interdisciplinary engagement, and realigning performance metrics to reward societal impact and innovation.

VII. Designing a Resilient Innovation Business Model

Considering the funding challenges and organizational constraints presented above, research universities must fundamentally redesign their innovation business models to achieve resilience, competitiveness, and alignment with their mission in an increasingly complex operating environment. First, institutions must reduce their dependency on public funding by cultivating diverse sources of research investment, including philanthropic capital, industry partnerships, international consortia, and fee-for-service models such as contract research and consulting [34]. Diversification not only enhances fiscal stability but also aligns universities with broader innovation ecosystems. However, such expansion requires deliberate risk management strategies and clear policies on intellectual property, academic freedom, and mission alignment [9]. Second, universities must move from ad hoc or opportunistic research planning to a portfolio-based approach. This strategy involves managing research investments similarly to financial portfolios, balancing basic and applied research, short- and long-term initiatives, and strategic alignment with societal needs [28,35]. Metrics should track both scholarly impact and translational value, creating a framework that supports both discovery and deployment.

Ultimately, developing effective contemporary innovation models necessitates a more integrated approach across academic, administrative, and advancement units. This includes aligning research development offices with external relations, philanthropy, and government affairs to reduce duplication, accelerate opportunity capture, and improve responsiveness to funders [36].

VIII. Conclusions

The research funding cliff described in this article signifies a structural turning point for global research universities. It represents a fiscal pivot that challenges long-held assumptions and necessitates bold transformation. Traditional models of centralized public funding, isolated academic operations, and gradual adaptation are no longer sustainable in an era characterized by fiscal volatility, technological acceleration, and complex societal demands. To maintain relevance and impact, universities must rethink their innovation business models by focusing on diversification, strategic alignment, and organizational integration. This transformation will require more than mere policy reform; it will necessitate courageous, entrepreneurial leadership dedicated to creating a future-oriented research enterprise that is both resilient and mission-driven.

Funding

This work was supported by the USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture McIntire-Stennis accession number 7003934 and the West Virginia Agricultural and Forestry Experiment Station. The results presented may not reflect the sponsors' views, and no official endorsement should be inferred. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, the decision to publish, or the preparation of the manuscript.

Acknowledgements

The author is grateful to reviewers whose constructive comments improved the quality and scope of the article.

References

[1] Aghion, P.; Dewatripont, M.; Stein, J.C. Academic freedom, private-sector focus, and the process of innovation. *The RAND Journal of Economics* **2008**, *39*, 617–635, doi:10.1111/j.1756-2171.2008.00031.x.
[2] Salmi, J. *The challenge of establishing world-class universities*; World Bank Publications: 2009.
[3] Stephan, P.E. The Economics of Science. *Journal of Economic Literature* **1996**, *34*, 1199–1235.
[4] Frame, A.; Curyło, B. The European Universities Initiative and the 'Euro-internationalisation'of European Higher Education. **2025**.
[5] Mowery, D.C.; Sampat, B.N. Universities in National Innovation Systems. *Oxford Handbooks Online* **2006**, doi:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199286805.003.0008.
[6] Lane, J. Let's make science metrics more scientific. *Nature* **2010**, *464*, 488–489, doi:10.1038/464488a.

[7] Martínez, D.; Mora, J.G.; Vila, L.E. Entrepreneurs, the Self-employed and Employees amongst Young European Higher Education Graduates. *European Journal of Education* **2007**, *42*, 99–117, doi:10.1111/j.1465-3435.2007.00285.x.

[8] Babina, T.; He, A.X.; Howell, S.T.; Perlman, E.R.; Staudt, J. *The color of money: Federal vs. industry funding of university research*; National Bureau of Economic Research: 2020.

[9] Geiger, R.L.; Sá, C.M. *Tapping the riches of science: Universities and the promise of economic growth*; Harvard University Press: 2008.

[10] Powell, W.W.; Owen-Smith, J. The new world of knowledge production in the life sciences. *The future of the city of intellect: The changing American university* **2002**, 107–130.

[11] Rhoten, D.; Parker, A. Risks and Rewards of an Interdisciplinary Research Path. *Science* **2004**, *306*, 2046–2046, doi:10.1126/science.1103628.

[12] Kotter, J.P. *Leading Change*; Harvard Business Press: Harvard Business School, Brighton, Massachusetts, 2012.

[13] Lewin, C. *Field Theory in Social Science. Selected Theoretical Papers*; Cartwright, D., Ed.; Harper & Bros.: Departments of the University . Research Center for Group Dynamics, 1951.

[14] Kezar, A. *How colleges change: Understanding, leading, and enacting change*; Routledge: 2018.

[15] AbdulRafiu, A. Policy seduction and governance resistance? Examining public funding agencies and academic institutions on decarbonisation research. *Science and Public Policy* **2023**, *50*, 87–101.

[16] Mo, Z.; Yujie, Z.; Jiasu, L.; Xiaowen, T. Early firm engagement, government research funding, and the privatization of public knowledge. *Scientometrics* **2022**, *127*, 4797–4826, doi:10.1007/s11192-022-04448-w.

[17] Pardey, P.G.; Chan-Kang, C.; Dehmer, S.P.; Beddow, J.M. Agricultural R&D is on the move. *Nature* **2016**, *537*, 301–303, doi:10.1038/537301a.

[18] Citaristi, I. Organisation For Economic Co-Operation And Development—OECD. Routledge: 2022; pp. 694–701.

[19] Etzkowitz, H.; Leydesdorff, L. The dynamics of innovation: from National Systems and "Mode 2" to a Triple Helix of university–industry–government relations. *Research Policy* **2000**, *29*, 109–123, doi:10.1016/s0048-7333(99)00055-4.

[20] Mascarenhas, C.; Ferreira, J.J.; Marques, C. University–industry cooperation: A systematic literature review and research agenda. *Science and Public Policy* **2018**, *45*, 708–718, doi:10.1093/scipol/scy003.

[21] Siegel, D.S.; Wright, M. Academic Entrepreneurship: Time for a Rethink? *British Journal of Management* **2015**, *26*, 582–595, doi:10.1111/1467-8551.12116.

[22] Shekhtman, L.M.; Gates, A.J.; Barabási, A.-L. Mapping philanthropic support of science. *Scientific Reports* **2024**, *14*, doi:10.1038/s41598-024-58367-2.

[23] Frumkin, P. *Strategic giving: The art and science of philanthropy*; University of Chicago Press: 2008.

[24] Lepori, B.; Benninghoff, M.; Jongbloed, B.; Salerno, C.; Slipersaeter, S. Changing patterns of higher education funding: evidence from CHINC countries. *Draft report* **2005**.

[25] Bleiklie, I.; Kogan, M. Organization and Governance of Universities. *Higher Education Policy* **2007**, *20*, 477–493, doi:10.1057/palgrave.hep.8300167.

[26] Kezar, A.; Eckel, P. Examining the institutional transformation process: The importance of sensemaking, interrelated strategies, and balance. *Research in Higher Education* **2002**, *43*, 295–328.

[27] Middlehurst, R. Changing Internal Governance: A Discussion of Leadership Roles and Management Structures in UK Universities. *Higher Education Quarterly* **2004**, *58*, 258–279, doi:10.1111/j.1468-2273.2004.00273.x.

[28] Hubbart, J.A. Maximizing Research Impact in Higher Education: An Approach to Identify Essential Stakeholders and Ensure Use-Inspired Outcomes. *Journal of Humanities and Education Development* **2024**, *6*, 43–50, doi:10.22161/jhed.6.1.6.

[29] Hubbart, J.A. The Importance of Stakeholder Engagement Across Market Domains. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurial Management* **2024**, *2*, 1–7, doi:10.59462/jgem.2.1.106.

[30] Bess, J.L.; Johnstone, D.B.; Dee, J.R. *Understanding college and university organization: Theories for effective policy and practice: Volume II—Dynamics of the system*; Routledge: 2023.

[31] Slaughter, S.; Rhoades, G. *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education*; Jhu press: 2004.

[32] Hubbart, J.A. A Primer for Organizational Change: Key Models, Theories, and Practices. *Austin Journal of Business Administration and Management* **2024**, *8*, 1068.

[33] Bolden, R.; Petrov, G.; Gosling, J. Distributed Leadership in Higher Education. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership* **2009**, *37*, 257–277, doi:10.1177/1741143208100301.

[34] Clark, B.R. *Creating entrepreneurial universities: organizational pathways of transformation. Issues in Higher Education*; ERIC: 1998.

[35] Coates, H. Trust and the Public Good: Examining the Cultural Conditions of Academic Work. *Quality Assurance in Education* **2009**, *17*, 430–431, doi:10.1108/qae.2009.17.4.430.1.

[36] Christensen, C.M.; Eyring, H.J. *The innovative university: Changing the DNA of higher education from the inside out*; John Wiley & Sons: 2011.