



News, Views and Careers for All of Higher Education

Dec. 15 [Reality Check](#)

Paying for the Research Juggernaut

By [John V. Lombardi](#)

A recent flurry of concern about [new rules proposed](#) by the National Institutes of Health to limit the reimbursement for some costs universities incur when performing research for the federal government highlighted the remarkable financial structure of academic research. Universities, contrary to the beliefs of some external observers, spend large amounts of their own money to acquire research contracts.

Related stories

- [U.S. Support for Science Softens](#), Nov. 22
- [Basic Research and National Security](#), Oct. 31
- [Higher Ed Commission Gets to Work](#), Oct. 18
- [House Endorses Expanded U.S. Research on Stem Cells](#), May 25
- [Animal Rights and 'Eco-Terrorism'](#), May 19

Every time the federal government reduces the reimbursement for a cost of doing federal research, the universities have to spend more of their own money to perform the research required by federal grants.

Although university research is a money-losing enterprise in the business sense, a large number of academic institutions compete for federal dollars to support their research enterprises, and most research oriented campuses expect their faculty, especially in the sciences, to submit grant applications and win awards from the federal research establishment, whether NSF, NIH, or other agencies.

Indeed, for many academics, the success of a campus in acquiring federal funds serves as a primary indicator of quality and prestige. Many rankings systems, including the classifications developed by the author and colleagues published annually as *The Top American Research Universities*, rely heavily on a campus's federal research expenditures when distinguishing among institutions.

But those campuses in search of higher prestige among their peers must invest at an increasing rate to move up in the rankings, a process that may strain the budgets of institutions already challenged by reductions in state funding and growing resistance to increased student fees.

People often imagine that the large amounts of federal grants received by competitive research universities represent a profit or at least a break-even proposition for the institutions. Not so, in almost all cases. A federal grant of \$12.5 million will cost the university at least \$17.5 million (or an additional \$5 million) to do the research. Those who imagine that a college's acquisition of a federal grant produces a profit, as would a business's contract to supply the government with airplanes, may find the university's intense competition over money-losing grants perplexing. Let's look at the balance on this \$12.5 million grant, and let's assume that like many such grants it supports research over five years.

license agreements can generate a significant surplus for reinvestment in research.

Large enrollments or substantial tuition and fee payments may generate a surplus from instructional programs to support some part of the research environment usually related to the acquisition of high quality faculty. State legislatures that value the economic development significance of academic research provide special appropriations in support of construction, equipment, and salaries. Public and private institutions with large endowments often have special funds that pay the costs of nationally competitive faculty, graduate student stipends, construction of research space, and other elements in support of highly competitive research performance.

This research juggernaut has a self-reinforcing dynamic. Each research grant achieved requires a campus investment on the order of 20 to 30 percent. To justify that expense, institutions highlight the prestige and increased national prominence that comes from the successful acquisition of federally funded grants. In addition, a university can rarely subsidize just one grant.

To compete for life sciences research, for example, the campus must have buildings with the high-tech research space essential for modern life sciences research. Once constructed, the building must fill up with federally funded research, because even the partial overhead cost the federal government pays reduces some of the debt service on the building. Moreover, having built the research space, the institution must demonstrate the wisdom of its investment by encouraging the faculty to compete even more intensely for additional grants (which in turn require more institutional investment). Trustees, recognizing that research growth is a prime indicator of institutional competitiveness, ask for periodic reports on the increases in federally sponsored research expenditures, creating a strong incentive for campuses to increase their investment in research support, although in most cases the trustees do not ask what it cost the institution to acquire additional research.

Is all this a bad thing?

Certainly not for the federal government, which funds research, primarily in a financial partnership with institutions, that receives for the nation much more research benefit that it actually pays for. Certainly not for the nation, whose international competitiveness has rested in large part on the commercialization of campus-based research results. Certainly not for the states, whose investment in the research of land-grant institutions alone has sustained and advanced state economies since the second half of the nineteenth century. Certainly not for donors, whose pride in their gifts and endowments comes from having enabled remarkable advances in every area of academic study.

Certainly not for entrepreneurs, whose commercialization of patents and businesses based on licenses of university research creates great wealth. Certainly not for graduate students or postdocs, whose academic and research preparation benefits greatly from the opportunities to develop skills and abilities through the university research establishment. Certainly not for research faculty, whose compensation and support for their research programs receive continued and increasing investments. Undergraduates can benefit, too, if they find their way to an on-campus research opportunity or engage with the highly accomplished research faculty and graduate students.

Research quality, like all university quality, comes from an investment in people, facilities and support. Quality is scarce and highly sought after. Consequently, in the academic world as is true everywhere else, the cost of high quality continues to rise. Over the past generation, the competition for research quality has grown to encompass not only the traditional private and large public flagship institutions, but also second and third generation public institutions, as well as small elite private liberal arts colleges, all of which seek to acquire academic research faculty stars to grace their campuses.

The accelerating engine of academic research, as is true of the competition for the best students or the best collegiate athletes, requires ever increasing revenue to invest in the competition for quality that determines success. The more success in acquiring federal research, the more money the campus must generate from other sources to sustain that success. The result is an intense focus on private fund raising opportunities, state subsidies for research, corporate-university alliances, commercialization of intellectual property, and other revenue enhancing activities.

Like the arms race for high visibility intercollegiate sports programs, the research competition, among academic institutions large and small, drives budget priorities. This competition is a powerful motivator because like sports programs, science based research in particular offers a clear scorecard of results. For institutions with substantial research programs, this measure of success may be entirely appropriate, but for those seeking to enter the top

half of the research competition, the effort to compete may require the neglect of other, less easily measured parts of their academic enterprise. An effective research strategy should measure not only the won-loss record but also the cost to compete.

It's no wonder, given this process, that university representatives react with alarm at every attempt by government agencies to shift more of the cost of research from the government to the academic institutions.

John V. Lombardi, chancellor and a professor of history at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, writes *Reality Check* every two weeks.