Current U.S. University-Industry Partnerships: Realignment & Opportunity
July 2025

Kenneth A. Olliff, MBA, DMin; Jasmin Patel, MBA, PhD

This paper was commissioned for the “Reimagining STEMM Graduate Education and Postdoctoral Career Development” Summit. Opinions and statements included in the paper are solely those of the individual authors, and are not necessarily adopted, endorsed, or verified as accurate by the Summit planning committee or the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Universities and industry in the United States represent major components of the U.S. research and development ecosystem whose priorities overlap in fundamental but frequently conflicting ways. Given their differing cultures and incentives, there are inherent tensions in relationships between universities and industry. University and industry in the U.S. have a long history of both working together productively and also misunderstanding and failing to capitalize on each others' assets and potential value.

The current moment has the potential to be a major turning point in university-industry interactions, building on long-standing trends as well as acute dynamics stemming from recent federal actions. Universities today are under immense financial and political pressure due to rising operating, research, and compliance costs; decreasing tuition revenue; recent and proposed cuts to federal research funding, scholarship aid, and other sources of government support; increasing federal and state oversight; and diminished public trust (Association of American Universities, 2025; Association of American Universities, 2024; Association of American Universities, 2023). Over the past decades, industry has both outsourced aspects of its R&D to universities, especially basic research (Popp Berman, 2012), as well as massively scaled its own internal R&D investments (Mervis, 2017; National Science Board, 2024a; Santacreu & Zhu, 2018). Industry relies on universities for the majority of its talent but increasingly is finding the education offered to be lacking in key capabilities and unable to keep up with their rapidly shifting workforce needs (Claydon et al., 2021; Donovan, Bradley, & Collins, 2022; National Institutes of Health, Office of Strategic Coordination, 2024).

This paper argues that the current foment offers a significant opportunity to reinvent how universities and industry work together and relate to each other, potentially in ways that move past long-standing obstacles and misalignment. While substantial university-industry partnerships have been a "nice to have" for each side, we are entering a time where they are becoming essential – for universities, to stay relevant, trusted, solvent, and at the cutting edge in talent, research, and innovation; for industry, to maintain a competitive edge by accessing top talent, research that drives new knowledge, and innovative discoveries that translate into practical products and solutions. For the U.S., a substantially reinvigorated and robust university-industry realignment is essential for global competitiveness in science and technology (Council on Competitiveness, 2025).

The first part of this paper gives an overview of the evolution of the current university-industry landscape; sketches out major modes of university-industry interactions along with obstacles; and explores the potential impact of current federal actions. The second part outlines new and emergent models that seek to seize opportunities and overcome existing obstacles; addresses the changing role of STEMM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics, and Medicine) doctoral students specifically; and then concludes with elements essential to successful university-industry partnerships moving forward. Current examples are included throughout.[1]

Evolution of the Landscape

In the early 20th century, universities and industry interacted primarily around personnel exchange and applied research in agriculture, engineering, and public health—fields driven by societal needs (Geiger, 1993; Mowery & Rosenberg, 1998). This began to change during and after World War II, when the success of large-scale scientific efforts like the Manhattan Project demonstrated the strategic importance of science and technology for national defense and economic competitiveness. Vannevar Bush's landmark 1945 report, *Science, the Endless Frontier*, laid the intellectual foundation for a new research system—one in which federally funded university research would serve as an engine for innovation, health, and security (Bush, 1945). Bush argued that basic science is essential for the nation's technological innovation and progress, and thought universities should avoid getting directly involved in patenting and licensing (Mowery & Rosenberg, 1998).

What followed was the rapid growth of federal investment in academic science. The creation of agencies like the National Science Foundation (1958), Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (1958), National Aeronautics and Space Administration (1958), and the Department of Energy's Office of Science (1977) funneled public funds into university labs at unprecedented scale. In response, universities adapted structurally and culturally—optimizing for competitive grant acquisition, peer-reviewed publishing, and fundamental science. This period, often referred to as the Golden Age of U.S. science, firmly established universities as central players in the national R&D ecosystem (Geiger, 1993). It also led research universities to prioritize the pursuit of federal funding over industry collaborations.

A further turning point in university-industry interactions came with the passage of the Bayh-Dole Act in 1980. By allowing universities to retain intellectual property (IP) rights for inventions developed through federally funded research, Bayh-Dole created an explicit link between federally funded academic science and private sector commercialization (Mowery & Rosenberg, 1998). Universities responded by building internal infrastructure to support technology transfer: licensing offices, startup incubators, and industry engagement offices. This was a deliberate pivot toward economic impact, though still rooted in the discovery-oriented model funded by government.

At the same time, industry was building its own internal R&D capacity. By the 1990s, corporate labs—particularly in fields like pharmaceuticals, electronics, and materials—were investing heavily in applied research and fast-paced prototyping. With few incentives to partner with

[1] The authors wish to thank the many individuals from universities, companies, and national organizations who gave their time to be interviewed for this paper. In the interest of having timely conversations without needing approvals from employer organizations, a number of individuals asked to remain anonymous; for this reason, we have not included names of individuals interviewed.

universities given their focus on federally-funded research, many companies pursued innovation independently, favoring in-house capabilities over university collaborations (Mowery & Rosenberg, 1998; Rosenberg & Nelson, 1994). From 1980 to 2000, industry R&D investments grew from $40 billion to $180 billion (Wu, 2018). By 2019, industry R&D accounted for 72% of total U.S. R&D spending, far surpassing public investment (National Science Board, 2022).

The early 2000s saw the beginning of a rapprochement between universities and industry. Universities began to more overtly prioritize societal relevance and commercial impact, launching entrepreneurship programs, commercialization funds, and interdisciplinary centers aligned with industry needs (Perkmann et al., 2013). National initiatives like the National Science Foundation's Industry–University Cooperative Research Centers (IUCRC) program and the National Institutes of Health's Clinical and Translational Science Awards (CTSAs) reflected this trend. Yet these efforts often further contributed to a fragmented internal university landscape: separate offices managed career services and internships, IP, contracts, and corporate philanthropy, making it difficult for companies to engage efficiently. Long negotiation timelines, unclear costs, and uncertain outcomes created friction (Cohen et al., 2002a). Furthermore, misaligned time horizons—academic research operating on multi-year cycles versus industry's faster turnaround needs—compounded these challenges.

Not all barriers lay on the university side. Many companies faced internal constraints that inhibited effective collaboration. Corporate R&D budgets, especially outside of major technology and pharmaceutical firms, became more risk-averse and cost-conscious. Organizational silos within companies hindered collaboration–business units with limited visibility into university partnerships across R&D divisions; procurement or legal departments applied inflexible frameworks to academic collaborations, treating them like vendor contracts rather than strategic partnerships (Bruneel, D'Este, & Salter, 2010; Cohen et al., 1998; Council on Competitiveness, 2025; Perkmann et al., 2013).

Modes of Interaction

While many universities have been embedding industry relevance into their missions and programs over the past decades, structural and cultural differences persist.[2] Divergent cultures, priorities, and incentives remain a central challenge.

One of the most prevalent dynamics involves a fundamental tension between academic independence and commercial objectives. Universities operate on principles of open inquiry, peer review, and the broad dissemination of knowledge. In contrast, industry partners prioritize proprietary advantage, rapid commercialization, and competitive positioning. These competing priorities create persistent friction, particularly around publication rights, data sharing, and IP ownership. Universities and companies also differ in their decision-making processes, with universities operating through consensus-building and committee structures, which can extend

[2] Leading U.S. technical universities (MIT, Georgia Tech, Caltech) have maintained closer ties with industry over many decades and thus seem to have avoided the cultural misalignment that frequently exists between universities and industry.

timelines. University research tends to focus on discovery with more flexible time horizons compared to industry's market-driven deadlines. These structural differences lead to mismatched performance metrics and communication expectations—academic success is measured in publications and citations, while industry rewards return on investment and market impact.

Despite these challenges, substantial university-industry collaborations occur across three primary modes of interaction: student engagement, sponsored research, and technology transfer/commercialization.[3]

Student Engagement

Student-focused programs are a cornerstone of university-industry collaboration, offering students meaningful exposure to real-world challenges while giving companies early access to emerging talent. These experiences may be embedded in the academic curriculum—such as co-ops and capstone projects—or take place outside of it through internships, fellowships, and research assistantships facilitated by the university. In each case, students are introduced to industry practices and culture, gaining technical, professional, and interpersonal skills that enhance their employability.

From the industry perspective, these programs offer not only a talent pipeline but also opportunities to shape academic programming. Company partners may influence curricular content, project design, and skill development to better align with evolving workforce demands. Industry-sponsored capstone projects, for example, have grown in complexity, moving beyond traditional consulting-style engagements to sophisticated, research-oriented initiatives that address real business problems while satisfying academic requirements.

Graduate research assistantships sponsored by industry represent a deeper level of integration, often linking directly to thesis or dissertation work. These collaborations create mutual value—advancing company research priorities while supporting students' academic and professional development.

Timing mismatches between academic calendars and industry project cycles can create difficulties in working with students. Additionally, balancing educational objectives with commercial deliverables requires careful management to ensure students receive appropriate learning experiences while meeting industry expectations, a particular issue with graduate students as we discuss below. Perhaps the largest challenge though is a disconnect between the education students receive and the capabilities that companies need, in terms of skills with which individual hires are equipped; the quantity of talent produced in high demand fields; and

[3] While student engagement, sponsored research, and commercialization are primary modes of interaction, university-industry interactions also include philanthropy, alumni engagement, executive education, faculty consulting and others (Education Advisory Board, 2020).

lack of soft skills required to navigate effectively in a business environment (National Science Board, 2024b).

Examples of Student Engagement

Colby College Davis Connects: A holistic career and experiential learning hub that actively involves industry partners to provide students with career-enhancing experiences like internships and research opportunities. Through a strong network of alumni and companies, facilitates connections to help students explore career paths and achieve post-graduation success. https://davisconnects.colby.edu/

University of California at San Francisco-Genentech Fellowship Program: Offers PharmD graduates a two-year, mentored experience combining academic clinical investigation at UCSF with pharmaceutical industry training at Genentech. Fellows engage in clinical research, patient care, and interdisciplinary didactics, developing competencies in clinical trials, safety surveillance, and research methodologies to prepare for careers in biotechnology and pharmaceutical industries. https://pharm.ucsf.edu/ucsf-genentech

Sponsored Research

Sponsored research is a well-established form of university-industry collaboration in which companies fund specific academic research projects, typically conducted by faculty, postdoctoral researchers, and graduate students. These projects often address applied problems of commercial relevance. Companies gain access to academic expertise, advanced research facilities, and the latest research; universities gain insights into emerging industry challenges, avenues to expand their research agendas, and platforms to offer industry-relevant training for students.

Industry sponsored research at U.S. universities accounted for approximately $6.2 billion in FY2023, making up roughly 6% of total research and development funding at U.S. universities. While the amount of industry funding has been steadily increasing, its share of overall funding has been stable at 5-7% for many decades. This compares to $60 billion in research funding from federal sources, or 55% of the total. By far the fastest growing source of research funding has been universities' own internal investments, at $27.7 billion or 25% of the total–an additional factor contributing to the financial pressure facing universities today (National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics, 2024a).

Industry sponsored research creates value through its combination of academic rigor and practical application, producing research outcomes that neither party could achieve independently. Universities bring theoretical frameworks, methodological expertise, and research infrastructure, while industry partners provide real-world context, market insights, and implementation pathways. This synergy often leads to innovations that simultaneously advance scientific knowledge and create commercially viable solutions, bridging the gap between laboratory discoveries and market applications.

Despite their benefits, sponsored research partnerships are frequently hampered by perennial frictions: negotiating terms and long contract review delays, managing reporting requirements, meeting deadlines, and ensuring adherence to institutional policies or practices and compliance requirements. Cultural differences and mismatched incentives (commercial products versus scientific publications) contribute to misalignment. To address these, some companies and universities are establishing master research agreements or long-term strategic partnerships. These frameworks streamline contracting, clarify IP terms, and enable more agile engagement and shared priorities.

Examples of Sponsored Research Partnerships

University of Central Florida-Siemens Energy Pegasus: Partnership to significantly grow impactful research in energy systems and sustainable energy - aims to enhance how UCF prepares students to thrive in the dynamic energy industry after graduation. https://www.ucf.edu/news/new-ucf-siemens-energy-pegasus-partnership-to-grow-inventive-sustainable-energy-research-expand-educational-opportunities/

Clemson University Center for Automotive Research: Founded in 2007, houses the nation's first graduate and undergraduate programs in automotive engineering and hosts over 20 on-site corporate partners with more than 100 global collaborators. Serves as a public-private innovation hub, integrating education, interdisciplinary applied research and industry engagement across five dedicated "technology neighborhoods" to advance the future of mobility. https://cuicar.com/

California Institute of Technology-AWS Quantum Computing Lab: A state-of-the-art facility located on the Caltech campus - brings together experts from AWS, Caltech, and other institutions to work on building a fault-tolerant quantum computer and accelerating the development of quantum computing hardware and applications. https://aws.amazon.com/blogs/quantum-computing/announcing-the-opening-of-the-aws-center-for-quantum-computing/

Technology Transfer and Commercialization

Technology transfer and commercialization are mechanisms for moving university-generated IP—such as patents, software, materials, and know-how—into practical use and commercial markets. This model includes identifying, protecting, and licensing innovations to existing companies or startup ventures. Technology transfer offices serve as intermediaries, facilitating agreements such as licenses, option rights, and startup formation.

From the university perspective, technology transfer provides a way to demonstrate societal impact, generate revenue, and strengthen its reputation. Faculty gain opportunities to see their discoveries applied in real-world contexts. Licensing university technologies provides companies with IP portfolios, technical expertise, and ongoing research relationships that support product development and market differentiation. Startup companies formed around university technologies generate economic impact and often maintain close ties with their originating institutions through research collaborations, student internships, and advisory relationships.

This model creates distinctive value by aligning academic discovery with industry application. Universities contribute fundamental research, technical expertise, and IP protection, while industry partners provide market knowledge, development resources, and commercialization pathways. This collaboration enables the translation of basic research into solutions that address societal needs while creating economic value.

Still, these partnerships also face challenges. Differences in IP valuation, technology readiness, and expectations around timelines or revenue potential can complicate negotiations. Academic inventors may have limited understanding of commercialization requirements, while industry partners may underestimate additional development needed to transform research prototypes into market-ready products. University technology transfer offices frequently are responsible for covering operating expenses through licensing revenue, which can skew incentives. To address these challenges, institutions are developing approaches including proof-of-concept funding, entrepreneurship education, entrepreneurs in residence, express licensing, and hybrid models that combine licensing with equity participation.

Examples of Technology Transfer and Commercialization Partnerships

Vanderbilt University-Deerfield Management Ancora Innovation: Collaborative enterprise backed by up to $65 million to accelerate life-science discoveries into therapeutics. Through Ancora, Deerfield commits capital and operational expertise to advance novel Vanderbilt research projects and support spin-off companies throughout drug development. https://news.vanderbilt.edu/2018/03/28/deerfield-management-and-vanderbilt-university-announce-the-launch-of-ancora-innovation/

The Engine: In 2016, MIT launched Tough Tech, an independent venture firm built to bridge university research and industry application—especially for early-stage "tough tech" startups that typical VC models overlook. https://engine.xyz/about/our-mission

Impact of Recent Federal Actions

Recent federal actions are reshaping the landscape of U.S. research and innovation, with significant implications for university-industry collaboration. Against the backdrop of the long-standing trend of stagnating federal investment in basic research, recent executive actions and legislative efforts are accelerating a transition toward more applied R&D. Recently enacted and proposed cuts to USAID, NSF, NIH, NASA and other sources of federal funding, reductions of indirect cost rates, restrictions on international students, increased scrutiny over foreign funding, and other executive actions aimed at universities are upending the U.S. university research enterprise (Association of American of Universities, 2025; National Institutes of Health, 2025; National Science Board, 2024c; White House Office of Management and Budget, 2025). These changes are altering institutional behaviors, influencing university research and education priorities and approaches, and requiring universities to rethink their business models and value propositions.

At the same time, the U.S. also is at an inflection point where maintaining global leadership in science and technology requires not just continued discovery but more aggressive translation from lab to market (Council on Competitiveness, 2025). This moment has been shaped by dynamics already underway: a growing emphasis on mission-driven research and a shift in funding toward large-scale, use-inspired initiatives (Department of Commerce, 2025; National Science Foundation, 2025). Recent federal guidance promoting national priorities such as domestic manufacturing, critical technologies, and artificial intelligence has amplified these dynamics and signaled that universities must evolve to meet new expectations (Executive Order 14241, 2025; Executive Order 14293, 2025; Office of Management and Budget, 2025).

Federal investments of the past decades have rewarded institutions that demonstrate strong industry, workforce, and economic impact. Universities are struggling to preserve and restructure their research enterprises in the face of decreased federal research funding. The confluence of these dynamics has made universities more motivated to collaborate with industry partners, and there is eagerness and openness on the part of universities to engage and adapt. Since the federal government is seen as a diminished source of research funding, universities hope that industry will step up and play a larger role (Chung & Gillers, 2025). Taken together, these trends have the potential to create the most substantial realignment of university-industry engagement since the post-World War II era.

This realignment creates an opportunity to overcome the barriers and misalignment that has traditionally held back university-industry partnerships. However, these opportunities also introduce new risks. One major risk is the expectation by universities that industry will fill the hole left by declines in federal funding. While industry engagement is rising, it still represents a modest portion of total university research funding—as noted above, approximately 6%, which has remained stable even as the overall size of U.S. research investment has increased over the past decades—underscoring both its value and its limitations as a substitute for federal support (National Science Foundation, 2023). Moreover, the foundational, curiosity-driven research traditionally supported by federal agencies—research that may not have immediate commercial applications but is essential to long-term innovation—is unlikely to be replicated by industry. Furthermore, research agendas might be constrained by commercial priorities and considerations as universities become more reliant on industry funding.

Emerging Models

These trends collectively underscore that the role of university-industry collaboration has become even more essential but also more complex. Universities today are being asked to contribute not only through existing modes of education, research, and commercialization but also through faster technology transfer, deeper participation in industry and national priorities, and preparation of a rapidly evolving twenty-first century workforce. While inertia and resistance to change within universities are considerable, there is also tremendous creativity, dynamism, and experimentation at the university-industry interface. Some universities are innovating and reinventing quickly; and some companies are seizing on the opportunities created by the current realignment. New models are emerging that emphasize agility, co-creation, and ecosystem-level approaches. Overall, they represent a deeper shift from transactional exchanges to strategic collaboration.

Rethinking Research Partnerships

A key area of experimentation lies in the structuring of research collaborations, especially around funding and IP. Traditional approaches—often hindered by rigid negotiations and misaligned incentives—are being supplemented by flexible, collaborative, exploratory models. These new frameworks often include joint funding with shared oversight, enabling projects to launch more quickly while aligning goals and managing risk collectively.

In areas such as advanced materials, energy systems, and digital technologies, where innovation cycles are fast and stakes are high, universities are adapting to meet industry needs. This includes offering clearer IP pathways, streamlining contracting processes, and creating space for strategic alignment. These shifts are enabling more intensive, focused collaborations with the potential to deliver both immediate and sustained impact.

Intermediary organizations are playing an increasing role in facilitating university-industry interactions by bridging cultural, operational, and strategic differences. These entities—research consortia, subsidiary organizations, nonprofit accelerators—help translate academic research into commercially viable outcomes by managing IP, negotiating contracts, and aligning research goals with market needs. They also provide platforms for sustained collaboration, such as joint research centers and incubators, that foster multi-faceted engagement over discrete projects. By reducing transaction costs, building trust, and bridging divides, intermediaries enhance the efficiency and impact of university-industry collaborations.

New Approaches to Research Partnerships

Tufts University Epsilon Materials Institute: An $11.5 sponsorship for research on developing advanced battery materials, specifically aiming to reduce reliance on limited lithium supplies by exploring new chemical compounds for batteries. This research will contribute to a more sustainable energy future by improving clean energy storage and delivery and advancing the circular economy by finding ways to reuse and recover critical materials used in battery manufacturing. https://now.tufts.edu/2025/04/29/115-million-sponsorship-creates-new-research-institute

BioGenerator: The investment arm of BioSTL, a non-profit focused on driving bioscience innovation and economic growth in the St. Louis region, accelerates bioscience innovation by combining staged venture investments with shared wet-lab and office infrastructure to de-risk early-stage startups. Working closely with faculty from local universities, especially Washington University, BioGenerator also provides executive coaching and entrepreneurial support to help research spin-outs successfully scale. https://www.biostl.org/what-we-do/biogenerator

Enriching Talent Pathways

Talent development has become a central pillar of modern industry-university collaboration. Industry increasingly seeks to shape not just the outcomes of education, but its structure—co-developing curricula, advising on program design, and participating directly in delivery. This has led to the growth of non-degree credentials, micro-certifications, and hybrid programs that integrate technical and liberal-arts education. These new formats often leverage online platforms and modular instruction, enabling working professionals to upskill while also allowing students to engage with industry-standard tools and frameworks early in their education. In some cases, companies are sponsoring faculty positions, establishing on-campus innovation labs, or embedding R&D fellows in academic departments.

Such partnerships extend beyond internships or guest lectures to include immersive, collaborative experiences that bridge academic theory with applied industry practice. Whether in research-intensive institutions or liberal arts colleges, these programs reflect a broader view of what it means to be "industry-ready"—emphasizing critical thinking, adaptability, and cross-disciplinary fluency alongside technical proficiency. This approach supports a more responsive talent pipeline aligned with rapidly evolving workforce needs in fields such as AI, quantum computing, climate technology, and advanced manufacturing.

Examples of Talent Pathway Partnerships

University of Michigan-Google Training Partnership: Offers all 66,500+ U-M students free access to Google Career Certificates and AI Essentials training - programs cover high-demand fields like cybersecurity, data analytics, and UX design, and include foundational AI and prompting courses taught by Google experts to enhance students' career readiness. https://news.umich.edu/u-m-partners-with-google-to-provide-all-students-free-access-to-google-career-certificates-and-ai-training/

Purdue-Eli Lilly 360 Initiative: Eli Lilly is investing up to $250 million in an expanded partnership with Purdue University to accelerate pharmaceutical innovation, including AI-powered drug discovery and manufacturing technologies. Initiative focuses on enhancing workforce development in the pharmaceutical industry, aiming to create a highly skilled talent pipeline and ensure a strong workforce to meet the growing demands of Lilly and related employers. https://www.forwardpathway.us/purdue-university-and-eli-lilly-elevate-strategic-partnership-with-250m-investment-for-pharma-innovation-and-talent-development

Orchestrating Ecosystems

Universities and industry are also stepping into new roles as brokers and conveners within broader innovation ecosystems, drawing on their expertise, credibility, and convening power. By aligning their research, educational, and community engagement activities, universities are positioning themselves as central nodes in regional and national strategies for technology and economic development.

These collaborative platforms often connect government entities, industry, nonprofit organizations, investors, and local communities. They can take the form of interdisciplinary research centers, public-private partnerships, and innovation districts—spaces where key partners co-locate to advance work on regional or national priorities such as defense modernization, clean energy, biomedical innovation, and digital infrastructure. Universities are also increasingly involved in shaping regional frameworks, contributing data, analysis, and thought leadership to inform how ecosystems are built and sustained.

To lead in this space, universities must operate with high levels of internal coordination and cross-sector fluency. This requires breaking down silos within academia as well as building new capabilities in external partnership management. Success depends on the institution's ability to mobilize collective action, cultivate shared vision, and serve as a trusted intermediary among sectors that often operate with divergent goals and incentives.

Examples of Institutions as Collaborative Platforms

Empire Discovery Institute: Drug discovery and development accelerator in upstate New York, formed through a partnership between the University at Buffalo, the University of Rochester, and Roswell Park Comprehensive Cancer Center. EDI connects academic research with pharmaceutical expertise and funding to efficiently translate scientific discoveries into commercially viable medicines. https://www.discoveredi.org/

NVIDIA-Pittsburgh: NVIDIA established Pittsburgh as its first "AI Tech Community," recognizing the city's significant potential for advancements in AI and its strong academic and industry ecosystem. This initiative strengthens Pittsburgh's position as a hub for AI innovation, with two joint research centers at Carnegie Mellon University and the University of Pittsburgh focusing on robotics and healthcare applications of AI, respectively. https://blogs.nvidia.com/blog/pittsburgh-ai-tech-community/

University of Texas at San Antonio National Security Collaboration Center: Plays a critical role in San Antonio by strengthening the city's position as a national hub for cybersecurity and national security innovation. Fosters public-private partnerships that bring together government, industry, and academia to address pressing national security challenges, develop talent for the growing cybersecurity workforce, and drive economic development in the urban core. https://nscc.utsa.edu/

These emerging models mark a fundamental shift in how universities and industry can collaborate for mutual benefit. Focusing on capabilities rather than projects, they embrace risk and experimentation, recognizing that breakthrough innovations often require approaches that may not succeed. They require institutional willingness to experiment with governance structures, funding mechanisms, and criteria for success that may differ from traditional academic or corporate approaches.

Doctoral Students: Bridging Academic Training and Industry Readiness

Doctoral students sit at a unique junction in the research enterprise, balancing the traditions of academic scholarship with the demands of an increasingly diversified set of career options. While doctoral education in STEMM fields has primarily focused on preparation for academic careers, today's talent pipeline increasingly flows toward industry, government, and other applied research settings. Approximately half of STEMM PhDs end up working in industry (National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics, 2024b), underscoring the need to examine how graduate training aligns—or does not—with the variety of careers that doctoral-level researchers now enter.

Much of today's doctoral training continues to emphasize scholarly independence, disciplinary depth, and original contributions to academic literature. These skills remain foundational, but they may not fully capture the range of competencies needed in non-academic settings. Many industry roles, for instance, prioritize the ability to translate technical knowledge into practical outcomes, communicate across functional teams, and navigate business or regulatory environments—domains that receive limited attention in traditional PhD programs. Growing recognition of these career patterns has prompted discussions about how STEMM doctoral students might be better prepared for applied research settings.

Examples of Doctoral Preparation for Applied Research Settings

Case Western-UL Research Institutes: Graduate Fellowship Program to prepare STEM PhD students for industry-impactful careers. Fellowship offers stipends, professional development, and hands-on applied research experiences with ULRI to bridge academic discovery and real-world innovation. https://case.edu/provost/new-grant-ul-research-institutes-launches-industry-focused-fellowship-stem-phd-students-case-western-reserve

UC Davis Biomolecular Training Program: Funded through the NIH, the UC Davis BTP integrates industry sponsors which provide fellowship support, guest lectures, student internships, and advisory roles. These partnerships help students develop applied biotechnology skills—ranging from lab protocols to entrepreneurship and regulatory communication. https://biotech.ucdavis.edu/nih-biomolecular-training-program-nih-btp

Bridging Expectations for Doctoral Students

Doctoral students working on industry-funded research may face competing expectations, as universities emphasize academic norms like peer-reviewed publication and independent contributions, while industry prioritizes confidentiality and achieving technical objectives. These tensions, however, don't necessarily signal irreconcilable differences, but rather underscore the importance of carefully structuring such collaborations. Addressing these dual demands highlights the need for graduate training to encompass skills valued in industry, which often extend beyond deep technical knowledge, research methodology, critical thinking, and scientific communication typically honed in doctoral programs. Specifically, skills such as translating research to business applications, writing technical reports or regulatory submissions, and adapting to fast-paced project timelines are particularly important for a successful transition to industry.

In response to these evolving demands, some institutions have embedded industry relevance in their academic missions and culture. Dual-mentorship models involving advisors from both academia and industry have helped clarify expectations; and agreements established up front around publication rights, IP, and timelines provide a stronger foundation for effective collaboration. Programs are offering more flexible credit structures to allow doctoral students to take industry-relevant electives—such as business courses, communication training, or IP law—without extending time to degree.

Internships also represent an underutilized but potentially powerful mechanism for aligning doctoral training with career outcomes. While common at the undergraduate level, graduate-level internships are not as prevalent despite their value in gaining expertise, building relationships, and serving as entry points into industry (Schnoes et al., 2018). Structural challenges remain barriers for graduate student internships, including aligning industry and academic timelines and operational issues with payment and work hours, particularly related to graduate student unionization.

Examples of Doctoral Preparation for Career Outcomes

Google PhD Fellowship Program: Recognizes and supports outstanding graduate students pursuing innovative research in computer science and related fields, connecting them with a Google Research Mentor. This program fosters strong academic relations and encourages research that influences the future of technology by providing financial support and mentorship. https://research.google/programs-and-events/phd-fellowship/

Genentech Internship Program: Genentech offers a structured internship program for graduate students in biomedical and life sciences fields, providing hands-on experience working on cutting-edge research projects aligned with industry priorities. Interns receive mentorship from both their academic advisors and Genentech scientists, navigating the balance between academic research goals and proprietary industry requirements. https://careers.gene.com/us/en/internships

Rethinking Roles for Doctoral Students

The evolving career paths of STEMM PhDs may also prompt a broader reconsideration of how universities and companies view their respective roles in training. Industry's role in STEMM training extends beyond recruiting graduates and can take various forms: providing internships and co-op opportunities, contributing to curriculum development, and creating research partnerships that expose students to industry problems and approaches.

Addressing potential gaps might involve considering systematic approaches to doctoral curricula and training models. Programs may benefit from incorporating structured opportunities for students to develop industry-relevant skills. This might encompass courses in project management, IP, and technology commercialization; training and mentoring in soft professional skills; and capstone projects that demonstrate the practical application of research findings.

Training models could potentially embrace greater flexibility, allowing students to customize their educational experience based on career goals. This approach might involve specialized tracks for industry-bound students, joint degree programs that combine technical training with business education, or modular approaches that allow students to develop specific competency sets. As universities and industry partners consider their roles in supporting talent development, there is potential to shape a system that honors the values of both discovery and application—without forcing early-career researchers to prematurely specialize at the expense of broader preparation.

Moving Forward: From Nice to Have to Essential

University-industry partnerships have become indispensable for universities to remain relevant and at the forefront of discovery in light of decreased federal funding. Given universities' financial and reputational challenges, companies are realizing they are in a much more powerful negotiating position to influence research agendas and shape talent pipelines.

The barriers that have long impeded collaboration—bureaucratic hurdles, misaligned incentives, and communication gaps—are eroding. Universities are modernizing engagement strategies and rethinking their processes and policies, while industry leaders are seeking holistic partnerships over transactional arrangements. This evolving landscape presents a rare and timely opportunity for forward-thinking universities and companies to gain a competitive edge by co-creating solutions.

It is too early to know whether the dynamics of the current environment—particularly the willingness of universities to undergo major changes in the face of federal cuts—will lead to a fundamental realignment of how universities and industry work together. This rapidly evolving landscape is shifting in encouraging ways, and there is considerable ferment and experimentation underway.

Elements of Success

As university and industry leaders seek to pursue more productive and effective collaborations, a number of factors stand out as key elements of success:

Culture

The most effective partnerships emerge when institutions pursue collaborations as enablers of cultural transformation. For universities, this means fostering environments where faculty can identify industry engagement as intellectually valuable and not academically compromising; where administrators understand that corporate partnerships require different expectations, metrics, and timelines than federal grants. Industry funding is not federal funding with different letterhead. For industry, this means recognizing that universities operate according to principles of knowledge and talent creation that extend beyond contract research delivery and preparing future employees, and that the academic enterprise has its own value and integrity despite its perceived (and actual) inefficiencies. Recognition of these differences shapes everything from contract negotiations to research design.

Structure

While organizational structure often dominates discussions of university-industry collaboration, the most successful partnerships are built on deeper foundations: culture, leadership commitment, and strategic alignment. Universities have experimented with various structural approaches—centralized technology transfer offices, distributed engagement models, hybrid approaches that blend corporate relations with research administration; separate corporate engagement from traditional development activities (Education Advisory Board, 2020). While each model has its strengths and weaknesses, structure alone cannot overcome the various cultural and operational barriers to university-industry collaborations.

Leadership

Perhaps the most critical element of successful university-industry collaboration is clear institutional commitment from organizational leadership. Top-level leadership engagement is essential to partnership success. University presidents and provosts (and, by extension, deans, department chairs, and tenure committees) must value industry collaboration, while corporate executives must view university partnerships as strategic investments of time and money. This leadership commitment signals institutional priority and provides the authority necessary to overcome bureaucratic obstacles and cultural resistance. This alignment cannot be forced through contracts or administrative arrangements; it must emerge from genuine shared interests and complementary capabilities.

Speed, Compliance, Intellectual Property

Three practical challenges consistently emerge in university-industry partnerships: speed of decision-making, regulatory compliance, and IP management. Successful partnerships address these challenges proactively. Industry partners often operate on compressed timelines, where delays in contracting or approval can mean missed market windows. Universities, in contrast, are shaped by layered decision-making processes, risk-averse legal environments, and compliance obligations rooted in public accountability. Bridging this gap requires streamlined internal processes, clear escalation pathways, and an understanding of the regulatory environment (e.g. export control, data privacy, conflict of interest, human subjects protections).

Internal Support

Faculty and industry professionals alike must be equipped, empowered, and incentivized to engage across institutional boundaries. On the university side, faculty need support to navigate the complexity of corporate collaboration. This can include training on partnership models, access to experienced administrative staff, and clear policies around contracting, compliance, and publication. Tenure and promotion systems must recognize and reward the scholarly value of applied research, translational impact, and industry engagement. Company researchers and technical staff also need institutional support and clear incentives to engage meaningfully with academic partners. This includes time allocated for collaboration, recognition of external engagement as valuable to career advancement, and internal processes that reduce friction—such as streamlined contracting and coordination across legal, R&D, and procurement teams. Industry personnel need clarity on how university partnerships align with business objectives and strategies and individual performance goals.

University-industry partnerships also require internal champions on both sides who have the authority, time, and trust to nurture long-term relationships. In both industry and universities, staff responsible for managing partnerships often lack the organizational stature to elevate partnerships to the level of strategic priority; or if a senior executive is tasked to oversee a partnership, they may lack sufficient bandwidth. In the absence of stable and effective leadership, many partnerships lose momentum or collapse after a project ends.

Conclusion

The true success of university-industry partnerships is measured by their ability to generate outcomes that neither side could achieve alone. They can catalyze new models of education, generate dynamic research environments, and build organizational capabilities benefiting both sectors. Genuine innovation arises when the depth and rigor of academic research meet the urgency, ingenuity, and real-world applicability of industry.

While each sector has distinct cultures, priorities, and incentives, they share a common imperative: to align research, workforce development, and technology advancement to address pressing societal challenges and economic opportunities. Achieving such impact requires intentional design, mutual understanding, and a willingness to overcome structural and cultural barriers.

Universities that skillfully balance their core missions with the opportunities presented by dynamic industry partnerships are positioning themselves as essential players in a rapidly evolving environment. Companies that capitalize on universities' current openness will gain competitive advantage over peers. When universities and industry pursue collaborations based on flexibility, trust, and a shared sense of purpose, both sides and the broader U.S. innovation enterprise benefits.

References

Association of American Universities. (2025, June 6). *White House proposes steep cuts to science and education funding*. Association of American Universities. https://www.aau.edu/newsroom/leading-research-universities-report/white-house-proposes-steep-cuts-science-and-education.

Association of American Universities. (2024, March 8). *Leading research universities report*. Association of American Universities. https://www.aau.edu/newsroom/leading-research-universities-report/leading-research-universities-report-march-11-2024.

Association of American Universities. (2023, May 8). *Leading research universities report, May 8, 2023*. Association of American Universities. https://www.aau.edu/newsroom/leading-research-universities-report/leading-research-universities-report-may-8-2023.

Bush, V. (1945). *Science, the endless frontier: A report to the President on a program for postwar scientific research*. United States Government Printing Office.

Bruneel, J., D'Este, P., & Salter, A. (2010). Investigating the factors that diminish the barriers to university–industry collaboration. *Research Policy, 39*(7), 858–868. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2010.03.006.

Chung, J., & Gillers, H. (2025, June 27). *Harvard is asking corporations to fill its federal funding gap*. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved July 5, 2025, from https://www.wsj.com/us-news/education/harvard-funding-corporate-sponsors-4ee36388.

Claydon, J., Farley-Barnes, K., & Baserga, S. (2021). Building skill-sets, confidence, and interest for diverse scientific careers in the biological and biomedical sciences. *FASEB BioAdvances, 3*(12), 998–1010. https://doi.org/10.1096/fba.2021-00087.

Cohen, W. M., Nelson, R. R., & Walsh, J. P. (2002). Links and impacts: The influence of public research on industrial R&D. *Management Science, 48*(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.48.1.1.14273.

Cohen, W. M., Florida, R., Randazzese, L., & Walsh, J. (1998). Industry and the academy: Uneasy partners in the cause of technological advance. In R. L. Noll (Ed.), *Challenges to the research university* (pp. 171–199). Brookings Institution Press.

Council on Competitiveness. (2025). *A call to action for a new, tech-driven industrial base and national innovation ecosystem: Compact for America* (Technology Leadership & Strategy Initiative). https://compete.org/wp-content/uploads/coc_tlsi_compact-for-america.pdf.

Department of Education. (2023). *Foreign gift and contract disclosure report*. https://www2.ed.gov/policy/highered/leg/foreign-gifts.html.

Department of Commerce. (2025). *Building regional innovation ecosystems: Progress report*. https://www.commerce.gov/innovation-ecosystems.

Department of Justice. (2023). *Disruptive Technology Strike Force targets illicit technology transfers*. https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/disruptive-technology-strike-force.

Donovan, S. A., Bradley, D. H., & Collins, B. (2022, March 31). *Skills gaps: A review of underlying concepts and evidence* (CRS Report No. R47059). Congressional Research Service. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED622537.pdf.

Education Advisory Board. (2020). *Building a market-smart organizational structure for university–industry partnership*. https://eab.com/resources/research-report/market-smart-organizational-structure-university-industry-partnership/.

Executive Order 14241. (2025, March 25). *Executive Order: Immediate measures to increase American mineral production*. The White House.

Executive Order 14293. (2025, May 5). *Executive Order: Regulatory relief to promote domestic production of critical medicines. The White House*.

Geiger, R. L. (1993). *Research and relevant knowledge: American research universities since World War II*. Oxford University Press.

Mervis, J. (2017, March 9). *Data check: U.S. government share of basic research funding falls below 50%*. Science. https://www.science.org/content/article/data-check-us-government-share-basic-research-funding-falls-below-50.

Mowery, D. C., & Rosenberg, N. (1998). *Paths of innovation: Technological change in 20th-century America*. Cambridge University Press.

National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics. (2024a). *Higher Education Research and Development (HERD) Survey: Fiscal Year 2023* (NSF 25-313). National Science Foundation. https://ncses.nsf.gov/surveys/higher-education-research-development/2023.

National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics. (2024b). *Doctorate recipients from U.S. universities: 2023* (NSF 25-300). National Science Foundation. https://ncses.nsf.gov/pubs/nsf25300.

National Institutes of Health. (2025, May 30). *Fiscal year 2026 budget in brief*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. https://www.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/fy-2026-budget-in-brief.pdf.

National Institutes of Health, Office of Strategic Coordination. (2024, February 14). *Strengthening the biomedical research workforce*. NIH Common Fund. https://commonfund.nih.gov/strengthening-biomedical-research-workforce/strengthening-biomedical-research-workforce.

National Science Board. (2024a). *Trends in U.S. R&D performance* (NSB Report No. NSB-2024-6). National Science Board, National Science Foundation. https://ncses.nsf.gov/pubs/nsb20246/trends-in-u-s-r-d-performance.

National Science Board. (2024b). *The STEM labor force of the United States: Definition, size, and growth* (NSB-2024-5). National Science Foundation. https://ncses.nsf.gov/pubs/nsb20245/stem-pathways-degree-attainment-and-training-of-workers-in-stem.

National Science Board. (2024c). *The state of U.S. science and engineering 2024* (NSB-2024-1). National Science Foundation. https://ncses.nsf.gov/pubs/nsb20241.

National Science Board. (2022). *Science and engineering indicators 2022: Research and development: U.S. trends and international comparisons* (NSB-2022-5). National Science Foundation. https://ncses.nsf.gov/pubs/nsb20225.

National Science Foundation. (2023). *Higher education research and development: Fiscal year 2021*. National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics. https://ncses.nsf.gov/pubs/nsf23314.

National Science Foundation. (2025). *Directorate for Technology, Innovation and Partnerships (TIP).* https://www.nsf.gov/tip/.

Office of Management and Budget. (2025, February). *M-25-21: Accelerating federal use of AI through innovation, governance, and public trust*. https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2025/02/M-25-21-Accelerating-Federal-Use-of-AI-through-Innovation-Governance-and-Public-Trust.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com.

Perkmann, M., Tartari, V., McKelvey, M., Autio, E., Broström, A., D'Este, P., … & Sobrero, M. (2013). Academic engagement and commercialisation: A review of the literature on university–industry relations. *Research Policy, 42*(2), 423–442. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2012.09.007.

Popp Berman, E.. (2012). *Creating the Market University*. University of Chicago Press.

Radermacher, A., Walia, G., & Knudson, D. (2014). Investigating the skill gap between graduating students and industry expectations. *Information Systems Education Journal, 12*(5), 20–31. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1143928.pdf.

Rosenberg, N., & Nelson, R. R. (1994). American universities and technical advance in industry. *Research Policy, 23*(3), 323–348. https://doi.org/10.1016/0048-7333(94)90042-6.

Schnoes, A. M. M., Caliendo, A., Morand, J., Dillinger, T., Naffziger-Hirsch, M., Moses, B., & O'Brien, T. C. (2018). Internship experiences contribute to confident career decision making for doctoral students in the life sciences. *CBE—Life Sciences Education*, *17*(1), ar16. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29449270/.

Santacreu, A. M., & Zhu, H. (2018, May 14). *R&D: Business spending up, government spending flat*. Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. https://www.stlouisfed.org/on-the-economy/2018/may/rd-business-spending-up-government-spending-flat.

White House Office of Management and Budget. (2025). *Fiscal year 2026 discretionary budget request*. https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/Fiscal-Year-2026-Discretionary-Budget-Request.pdf.

Wu, J. (2018). *Why U.S. business R&D is not as strong as it appears*. Information Technology and Innovation Foundation. https://itif.org/publications/2018/06/04/why-us-business-rd-not-strong-it-appears/.