

Application of the Cyberinfrastructure Production Function Model to R1 Institutions

PRESTON M. SMITH, Purdue University, USA

JILL GEMMILL, Clemson University, USA

DAVID Y. HANCOCK, Indiana University, USA

BRIAN W. O'SHEA, Michigan State University, USA

WINONA SNAPP-CHILDS, Indiana University, USA

JAMES WILGENBUSCH, University of Minnesota, USA

High-performance computing (HPC) is widely used in higher education for modeling, simulation, and AI applications. A critical piece of infrastructure with which to secure funding, attract and retain faculty, and teach students, supercomputers come with high capital and operating costs that must be considered against other competing priorities. This study applies the concepts of the production function model from economics to evaluate if previous research on building a model for quantifying the value of investing in research computing is generalizable to a wider set of 5 universities. We show that this model does appear to generalize, showing positive institutional returns from the addition of computing resources and staff. We do, however, find that the relative relationships between model inputs and outputs vary across institutions, which can often be attributed to understandable institution-specific factors.

1 Introduction

In higher education, university leaders must balance competing priorities in which to invest funding for infrastructure. While federal funding opportunities do exist for cyberinfrastructure, it is best treated as a coordinated investment by many stakeholders, including the universities themselves.

At a given university, a vice president for research must decide if a proposed new electron microscope adds the most value, or is it a wind tunnel instead? Even within an IT organization, a CIO must choose between research IT, the enterprise resource planning system, student wireless internet, and more. In order for research computing and data to reach the top of any of these lists, a clear alignment of the value proposition to the institution's goals and measures of success must be communicated.

However, many research computing organizations are immature at communicating their value, instead approaching the importance of investing in research computing as an article of faith. [11] described the state of the community's quantification of costs, benefits, and their relationship as "There is not much research available to answer these questions. In fact: **almost no research**"

This claim by Ludwig is further illustrated by [6], where the authors noted that relatively few centers even measure the usage of their systems (41 of 69), academic outcomes (33 of 69), and ROI (32 of 69).

In this study we will apply the production model for cyberinfrastructure described by [16] to several additional institutions to evaluate the model's suitability for general use.

A model built on one institution's data is a necessary first step, but if it is to be repeated and generalized into a generally applicable model that is adopted by the research computing and data community it must be robust in the presence of differences in institutional characteristics (size, research output, medical school, engineering school, etc),



and must reliably demonstrate at multiple institutions the relationship between cyberinfrastructure investments and institutional output.

2 Materials and Methods

2.1 Literature Review

A systematic literature review of ROI from educational research grant funding can be found in [14] where the authors examine published ROI studies over a twenty year period from 2001 to 2021 and sort deliverables into output and outcomes, specifically those that are tangible and intangible. They also discuss the different types of return on investment measurement found in those studies: financial, cost benefit analysis, return on equity, and social return on investment. A case is made to define and communicate research grant output definitions early so that uniform research evaluations and measurement of the impact and ROI of research funding can be accomplished.

There are also macro-analysis studies of ROI in research infrastructures as highlighted by [8] in an analysis of research infrastructure investment in the European Union between 1987 and 1991. Based on prior publication the author concludes the primary method of analysis for specific projects should use a cost benefit analysis approach. The author introduces a new cost effectiveness measure that factors in publications to provide a proxy rate of return and notes the difference in definition of similar terms in macro and micro studies. The conclusion at the macro-level is a positive contribution to economic growth and productivity from investment in large research infrastructures and notes the open issues of time lag over which the activities exert an impact, in addition to spillover between geographical regions and industries.

More detailed reviews of literature on measuring the value of cyberinfrastructure that serves as the theoretical foundation for this work may be found in [16] and [18]. The following sections summarize the key outcomes from these previous works.

2.1.1 ROI in Cyberinfrastructure. The methods utilized in this study are described in [16], which employed the concept of the production function [7] from economics as a tool to describe how CI investment contributes to institutional output. Apon's works ((year?), (year?)) were some of the first studies of the ROI of cyberinfrastructure, and their exploration of how the presence of a robust cyberinfrastructure impacted institutional and departmental productivity were a key influence for Smith's model.

At Indiana University, [17] used the International Integrated Reporting Framework to assess the cost of the XSEDE cyberinfrastructure and the value of the end products created using it. [19], coining the notion of ROI_{proxy} , noted that "A value of greater than one indicates that what was done would have cost more if done by an alternative method."

[20] found positive ROI (greater than 1) for each of a campus supercomputer, Jetstream, and XSEDE by assigning financial values to them by comparing to commercial services or user surveys.

[16] developed his model to build upon Apon's, specifically adding a people dimension and addressing the decreasing utility of the Top 500 list as a proxy for an institution's computing capacity. Smith only assessed investment and outputs of one institution, however, leading to a clear opportunity for improvement by applying the production function model to more institutions than just Purdue. It is this gap that this study seeks to fill.

Several articles provide a theoretical base on selecting metrics with which to measure CI investment and institutional output. [19] described several potential outcome metrics, including the amount of grant income, new products and patents, the amount of economic impact, and new research innovations (e.g., papers, citations).

[3] “developed a taxonomy of the CI projects and defined a set of standard metrics for the assessment of the projects belonging to the different categories in the taxonomy.” Various metric categories evaluated include outcomes like publications, citations, IP, time to degree, and the resulting MICI (Measuring the Impact of CyberInfrastructure) model introduces an impact score as a broadly applicable way to measure CI projects.

[13] proposed a “Framework for assessing the scientific and socio-economic impact of Research Infrastructures” and linked 58 potential impact indicators for research infrastructure (RI) to strategic objectives. These indicators include the number of publications, citations, high impact publications, grants, patents, students trained, and more.

In a 2014 workshop report, (author?) [4] identified four dimensions for CI value outcomes: economic, science, workforce, and innovation. In a subsequent panel at SC14 [12], speakers described input investments as “physical infrastructure, energy, capital equipment and software and personnel”. Academic products (outputs) are described as “Intellectual/Reputation ROI (publications, graduations, numbers of faculty and student users, and enhancement to reputation); and Financial ROI (grants and contracts, recharge fees, and patents/royalties).”

2.1.2 The Production Function Model. Charles Cobb and Paul Douglas’ 1928 article “A Theory of Production” [7], described a statistical model that framed the output of production Y , using the inputs of capital C , and of labor L .

The production function model is represented in equation form in Equation 1.

$$Y = f(L, C) \quad (1)$$

Using a least-squares regression, Cobb and Douglas reported that the production function had coefficients of 0.75 for L and 0.25 for C , indicating a 75% and 25% proportion of labor and capital’s contribution to the output of the function.

Comparing to Cobb and Douglas’ 75:25 proportion in the academic cyberinfrastructure sector, [16] reported production function labor and capital coefficients for Purdue University of 63:31, 65:39, 60:35, or 58:36 respectively, depending on the output being modeled.

2.2 Datasets

A dataset was collected from 5 participating R1 institutions between 2011 and 2022 that included the annual year-over-year HPC capacity operated and the annual university-funded salary and wage expenses relating to HPC. These self-reported, internal data are combined with publicly available metrics of outputs: R&D expenditures as reported to the NSF HERD Survey, publications, the high-impact subset of those publications tracked in the Nature Index, and earned doctorates.

Input and output metrics are summarized in Table 1, and further details about metrics are further described in Section 2.2.1 and 2.2.1.

Table 1. Selected Input and Output Metrics

Input	Output
Labor: Annual salary costs	R&D expenditures reported to HERD
Capital: Total TF operated	Earned doctorates reported to SED
	Total publications produced, per Scopus
	High-impact “Nature Index” publications

2.2.1 Input Metrics. The set of annual input and output metrics is described in further detail below:

- **TeraFLOPS of compute capacity available:** This metric represents the aggregate compute capacity operated at the institution during a given year. A proxy for overall center size, this information was assembled from internal records maintained by center leadership. These resources do not include HPC resources that are funded and operated on behalf of outside entities.
- **Total salary costs for the HPC center:** This metric is the total salary and wage expenses for the campus Research Computing and Data (RCD) organization per internal financial systems. These dollars do not include expenditures on grant accounts, as this study is investigating *institutional* investment.

Capacity in FLOPS is used rather than a raw count of cores, nodes, or GPUs to account for the relative performance of those cores or GPUs as time goes on. For example: 10,000 7-year old cores are likely not an indicator of greater capacity or investment compared to 7,000 1-year old cores. The 1 year-old cores will most likely have a greater peak performance than the 7-year old system. Further, a center with large but extremely old resources may actually be one subject to under-investment. For labor metrics, FTE count is potentially an equivalent proxy for investment, but potentially more difficult to track historically than salary dollars, which can be reported from institutional financial systems.

2.2.2 *Output Metrics.* The following annual data are described in further detail below:

- **HERD-reported R&D Expenditures:** This metric represents the total annual institutional R&D expenditures reported to the NSF Higher Education Research and Development (HERD) survey ¹.
- **Earned Doctorate Degrees:** This metric represents the number of Doctoral degrees awarded by each institution annually, reported to the NSF Survey of Earned Doctorates (SED) ².
- **Total Publications by authors affiliated with the institution:** This metric is the total number of publications reported in Scopus ³, for a given year, with an affiliation tying to the institution
- **Total Publications in High-Impact Journals:** This metric is the total number of publications reported in Scopus for a given year, where an author with the institution's affiliation published in one of the high-quality journals listed in the Nature Index ⁴.

2.3 Institutional Characteristics

The analyzed institutions are all Carnegie Classification R1 (Doctoral Universities – Very high research activity), 4 of which are members of the Association of American Universities (AAU). All are ranked in the top 110 of R&D expenditures nationally as reported to the HERD survey. 3 institutions are land grant colleges, two operate a top-50 medical school, two boast top 50-engineering programs, and two more are in the top 80. 4 of the 5 institutions have total enrollments of approximately 50,000.

3 institutions are ranked in the top 25 of doctoral degrees granted annually, and a 3rd in the top 50. On average, these institutions have produced nearly 7,000 peer-reviewed publications per year per the Scopus database.

2.4 Benchmark: Investment as a percentage of an output

A question at the front of the mind of any research computing leader is “is my center appropriately resourced for the expectations of researchers at my university?” Comparing raw numbers to each other does not provide a good benchmark - a \$300M/year research enterprise is unlikely to require the level of resources that a billion-dollar university

¹<https://www.nsf.gov/statistics/srvyherd>

²<https://www.nsf.gov/statistics/doctorates/>

³<https://scopus.com>

⁴<https://www.natureindex.com/>

does. Much like nations measure defense or healthcare costs as a fraction of GDP, we will measure RCD investment as a function of R&D expenditures and identify a common ratio that can guide center directors, policymakers, and budget planners.

Specifically, we will answer these questions:

- What are the observed ratios of computing capacity to R&D Expenditures?
- What are the observed percentage of salary costs vs. R&D Expenditures?
- With this information, can we present formulae for appropriately sizing an RCD center's people and capital resources?

2.5 Correlation Analysis

Next, we will perform a correlation analysis of single institutional research computing investment factors with university outputs.

Hypothesis: there is universally a strong correlation between institutional inputs and outputs, as has been shown at Purdue University in [16].

2.6 Production Function Model

Following correlation analysis, the production function regression models will be performed first against the combined dataset and then for each institution, regressing institutional outputs on compute capacity and RCD staff investment. Regression coefficients will be summarized, compared to those for Purdue identified by [16], and the coefficients translated to real-world impact on the selected output.

Hypothesis: the individual production function models will be highly-performant for all institutions examined, as with Purdue in [16].

2.6.1 Model Comparison. In the event that production function model predictors are not statistically significant or otherwise relatively weak, the model will be compared to simpler models to evaluate which model is stronger. Models will be compared by adjusted R^2 values (where larger is better), BIC, and AIC (lower is better).

2.7 Relative Importance of Coefficients

Using the `lmg` method implemented in the R package `relaimpo` [9], we will calculate the proportion of the overall variance explained by each input in the model.

Hypothesis: the proportions of variance on the institutions' production function models will be similar to Purdue's in [16].

3 Results

3.1 Institutional Benchmarks

Figure 1 depicts the reported research computing capacity as a ratio of the university's R&D activity, on an annual basis. Per-institution average ratios of capacity to R&D expenditures are summarized in Table 2, with an average ratio of 7.7 TF per million dollars of R&D expenditures in 2022.

Based on this average, Table 3 models total research computing capacity at various scales of research enterprises. This model suggests that an institution with \$750M of research expenditures would have 5.7 PetaFLOPs of compute capacity in 2022.




Fig. 1. Ratio of TeraFLOPs operated to R&D Expenditures

	Institution A	Institution B	Institution C	Institution D	Institution E
Avg Ratio (2022)	5.34	12.29	7.58	3.46	9.79

Table 2. Average ratio of TeraFLOPs to R&D Expenditures

R&D Expenditures (\$M)	Modeled TF Capacity (2022)
1000	7693.96
750	5770.47
400	3077.58
200	1538.79

Table 3. Modeled TF capacity per R&D expenditure level

Per-institution average ratios of salary and wage costs to R&D expenditures are summarized in Table 4, with an overall average salary cost of 0.48% of R&D expenditures.

	Institution A	Institution B	Institution C	Institution D	Institution E
Avg Ratio	0.74%	0.57%	0.27%	0.37%	0.46%

Table 4. Average percentage of RCD salary expense to R&D Expenditures

[10] for Gartner, Inc. report that “34% of enterprise IT spending is allocated to personnel salaries and benefits”. Using this formula and the known salary and wage expense at the institutions being evaluated in this study, we can estimate a total annual budget, and therefore the fraction of R&D expenditures that budget represents, shown in Table 5.

On average, research computing budgets of the 5 studied institutions are estimated at 1.42% of annual R&D expenditures.

	Institution A	Institution B	Institution C	Institution D	Institution E
Avg Est % of R&D Expenditures	2.08%	1.72%	0.81%	1.07%	1.41%

Table 5. Estimated average percentage of RCD budget to R&D expenditures

Using these rules of thumb, Table 6 models RCD salary budgets and total center budgets at various scales of research enterprises. This model suggests that an institution with \$750M of research expenditures ideally should allocate \$3.79M on RCD staff salaries, with a total center budget of \$10.64 million dollars.

R&D Expenditures (\$M)	Modeled RCD Staff Investment (\$M)	Modeled RCD Total Budget (\$M)
1000	\$5.05	\$14.19
750	\$3.79	\$10.64
400	\$2.02	\$5.68
200	\$1.01	\$2.84

Table 6. Modeled salary and wage investment per R&D expenditure level

3.2 Correlation Analysis

First, we perform a correlation analysis using the Kendall Tau rank correlation, comparing the capital input TeraFLOPS and labor input Salaries to identified outputs. Kendall correlation is used rather than Pearson due to the non-normal distribution of TeraFLOPs and Salaries for each institution. For TeraFLOPs, all institutions show a strong correlation with each output, with the exception of Institution D's earned doctorate output. This specific result is explained by a fluctuating trend in doctoral degrees awarded (Figure 2a), rising in the early 2000s, followed by a decline over the last decade. Further investigation reveals that this overall decline is due to a decline in doctoral degrees awarded outside the institution's 10 largest fields of science, primarily occurring in the humanities (Figure 2b). At the same time degrees awarded in the top 10 fields have increased significantly, but not in large enough quantity to offset the decline in humanities fields. These external institutional factors indicate that the output of earned doctorates is not likely to be meaningful for this institution.

	Institution A	Institution B	Institution C	Institution D	Institution E
HERD Expenditures	0.618	0.945	0.850	0.892	0.924
Publications	0.955	0.956	0.919	0.892	0.911
Hi Impact Pubs	0.678	0.895	0.867	0.834	0.909
Earned Doctorates	0.670	0.598	0.500	0.178	0.851

Table 7. Correlation Coefficients - TF vs Outputs, by Institution

Institution A shows weaker correlations than other institutions due to variability in RCD salary investment over time (Figure 2c). This variability is attributed to shifting institutional priorities. RCD salary investment grew steadily until the 2017 retirement of the Provost, the President, and a research-focused CIO. This significant change in leadership was followed by a period of steady budget reductions until the current CIO, hired in 2021, reversed the decline. This external




Fig. 2. Outside Variability in Source Data.

factor suggests that salary investment for Institution A may be a weaker predictor than was observed in previous work, or with other institutions in this study.

Salary investment from all institutions show a moderate to strong correlation with most outputs (≈ 0.6 to 0.9), with Institution A's salary correlations being the weakest overall. Again, Institution D's correlation with earned doctorates is not meaningful (it's negative, here, in fact), due to the external institutional trends in doctoral degrees awarded described above.

3.3 Production Function Model

Tables 9 and 10 summarize the results of the production function model across the entire combined dataset of all 5 studied institutions. The resulting models report moderate adjusted R^2 values for each output, with statistically significant predictors.

	Institution A	Institution B	Institution C	Institution D	Institution E
Hi Impact Pubs	0.354	0.842	0.633	0.429	0.804
HERD Expenditures	0.362	0.884	0.667	0.857	0.804
Publications	0.648	0.863	0.633	0.786	0.788
Earned Doctorates	0.589	0.557	0.661	-0.429	0.710

Table 8. Correlation Coefficients - Salary Costs vs Outputs, by Institution

Despite only moderately high adjusted R^2 and a limited population of not completely demographically identical institutions, this application of the production model to this population shows promise as a proof of concept for future work of a model incorporating more than a single institution. Table 10 reports the results of the combined production function model in plain terms, with, for example, each increase of 100 TeraFLOPs corresponding with an increase of \$3.10 million in annual HERD R&D Expenditures. Each \$100k investment in RCD salaries corresponds with an increase of \$14.46 million of annual HERD expenditures.

	Publications	Earned Doctorates	HERD Expenditures	High Impact Publications
(Intercept)	1937.775*** (418.656)	302.924*** (35.931)	154.275*** (39.022)	258.257*** (62.512)
TF	0.246* (0.112)	0.016 (0.010)	0.031** (0.010)	0.045** (0.017)
Salaries	1349.733*** (197.136)	76.839*** (16.919)	144.584*** (18.375)	207.775*** (29.436)
R^2	0.537	0.348	0.621	0.569
Adj. R^2	0.526	0.331	0.611	0.558
Num. obs.	82	82	82	82

*** $p < 0.001$; ** $p < 0.01$; * $p < 0.05$

Table 9. Production Function Models - All Institutions

	Publications	Earned Doc- torates	HERD Ex- penditures	Hi Impact Pubs
100 TeraFLOPs	24.63	1.56	3.10	4.47
\$100k Salaries	134.97	7.68	14.46	20.78

Table 10. Production Function Models - Combined Dataset

As we explore deeper, we apply the production function model to each institution individually, as performed by [16] for Purdue. Each subsection in Section 3.3 examines an output (Publications, Earned Doctorates, High-Impact Publications, and HERD R&D Expenditures) and first presents each individual institution's model results. Then, if production function models exhibit low adjusted R^2 , that model is compared to single predictor models with adjusted R^2 , AIC, and BIC. Each subsection is closed with a summary of the impact that an increase of each predictor has on that particular output.

3.3.1 Publications. In Table 11, production function models on publications exhibit high adjusted R^2 for all institutions. Despite neither predictor exhibiting a p-value < 0.05 , the production function model for Institution D is notably stronger

than single-predictor models (Table 12). The high p-values for this institution is likely due to the limited number of observations (only 8 years), and we anticipate that model predictors would be statistically significant with the addition of further data points.

	Institution A	Institution B	Institution C	Institution D	Institution E
(Intercept)	1675.405*** (82.936)	1525.324*** (167.016)	4330.235*** (158.829)	9229.195*** (1077.371)	1947.354*** (259.787)
TF	0.637*** (0.063)	0.085** (0.023)	0.255*** (0.048)	0.231 (0.098)	0.206** (0.057)
Salaries	5.165 (78.540)	1133.767*** (61.401)	860.442*** (123.474)	149.197 (332.278)	1372.489*** (133.413)
R ²	0.957	0.974	0.931	0.784	0.933
Adj. R ²	0.949	0.970	0.920	0.697	0.926
Num. obs.	14	20	16	8	24

*** $p < 0.001$; ** $p < 0.01$; * $p < 0.05$

Table 11. Production Function Models - Predicting Publications

	adj.r.squared	sigma	AIC	BIC	p.value
TF	0.43	1560.83	407.42	410.82	0.00
Salary	0.47	362.96	120.71	120.95	0.04
Prod. Func.	0.70	273.72	116.74	117.05	0.02

Table 12. Model Comparison - Institution D Publications

Table 13 summarizes the results of the production function model on Publications in real-world terms. For Institution C, each increase of 100 TeraFLOPs operated corresponds with an annual increase of 25.5 publications coming from MSU, and each \$100k investment in RCD salaries corresponds with an annual increase of 123.24 publications.

	Institution A	Institution B	Institution C	Institution D	Institution E
100 TeraFLOPS	63.66	8.47	25.50	23.09	20.59
\$100k Salaries	0.52	113.40	123.24	14.92	137.25

Table 13. Summary - Publications Output

3.3.2 Earned Doctorates. For the output of Earned Doctorates, Institution E demonstrates a strong model with high adjusted R² and a p-value <0.05, indicating significant predictors. Despite the TF predictor not being statistically significant, Institution B and Institution C have similar results, with a model utilizing a single predictor of RCD salary expenses **slightly** outperforming the production function in terms of adjusted R², AIC, and BIC. The production function model for Institution A is the best model in terms of adjusted R², AIC, and BIC, though neither predictor is significant.

For Institution D no model is strong, due to the external factors related to the output itself discussed in Section 3.2.

Table 18 summarizes the results of the production function model on Earned Doctorates in real-world terms. For example, we can see that for Institution E, each additional 100 TeraFLOPs aligns with with an annual increase of 2.44 PhDs awarded , and each \$100k investment in RCD salaries corresponds with an additional 9.43 earned doctorates annually.

	Institution A	Institution B	Institution C	Institution D	Institution E
(Intercept)	164.493*** (17.435)	307.601*** (25.050)	439.657*** (12.347)	622.061* (202.725)	386.305*** (19.484)
TF	0.021 (0.013)	-0.001 (0.003)	-0.003 (0.004)	-0.020 (0.018)	0.024*** (0.004)
Salaries	29.012 (16.511)	47.896*** (9.209)	38.903** (9.599)	30.359 (62.524)	94.256*** (10.006)
R ²	0.677	0.683	0.604	0.238	0.941
Adj. R ²	0.618	0.645	0.543	-0.067	0.935
Num. obs.	14	20	16	8	24

*** $p < 0.001$; ** $p < 0.01$; * $p < 0.05$

Table 14. Production Function Models - Predicting Earned Doctorates

	adj.r.squared	sigma	AIC	BIC	p.value
TF	0.15	44.04	232.88	236.15	0.04
Salary	0.66	27.51	193.23	196.22	0.00
Prod. Func.	0.65	28.20	195.08	199.07	0.00

Table 15. Model Comparison - Institution B Earned Doctorates

	adj.r.squared	sigma	AIC	BIC	p.value
TF	0.04	32.63	160.80	163.11	0.23
Salary	0.56	22.20	148.47	150.79	0.00
Prod. Func.	0.54	22.51	149.72	152.82	0.00

Table 16. Model Comparison - Institution C Earned Doctorates

	adj.r.squared	sigma	AIC	BIC	p.value
TF	0.55	17.81	124.20	126.12	0.00
Salary	0.57	17.43	123.60	125.52	0.00
Prod. Func.	0.62	16.44	122.74	125.30	0.00

Table 17. Model Comparison - Institution A Earned Doctorates

3.3.3 HERD Expenditures. For HERD R&D Expenditures, all institutions exhibit a strong production function model with a high adjusted R². Only Institution A has an insignificant predictor (Salaries), but the production function model still outperforms single-predictor models in terms of adjusted R², AIC, and BIC (Table 20).

Table 21 summarizes the results of the production function model on HERD Expenditures in real-world terms. For example, we can see that for Institution B each additional 100 TeraFLOPs represents an annual increase of \$1.89M of research expenditures, and each \$100k investment in RCD salaries corresponds with an additional \$13.27M of annual expenditures.

3.3.4 High-Impact Publications. The production function models for high-impact publications are varied - Institution E and Institution C both have models that explain significant variation in the output, with both a high adjusted R² and

	Institution A	Institution B	Institution C	Institution D	Institution E
100 TeraFLOPS	2.09	-0.12	-0.29	-2.05	2.44
\$100k Salaries	2.90	4.79	3.89	3.04	9.43

Table 18. Summary - Earned Doctorates Output

	Institution A	Institution B	Institution C	Institution D	Institution E
(Intercept)	174.934*** (18.423)	119.177* (47.536)	375.449*** (24.506)	440.168*** (58.239)	175.543*** (26.211)
TF	0.070*** (0.014)	0.019* (0.007)	0.032*** (0.007)	0.027** (0.005)	0.026*** (0.006)
Salaries	-19.935 (17.446)	132.698*** (17.476)	112.708*** (19.051)	136.264*** (17.962)	125.500*** (13.460)
R ²	0.794	0.885	0.904	0.986	0.931
Adj. R ²	0.756	0.872	0.889	0.981	0.925
Num. obs.	14	20	16	8	24

*** $p < 0.001$; ** $p < 0.01$; * $p < 0.05$

Table 19. Production Function Models - Predicting HERD Expenditures

	adj.r.squared	sigma	AIC	BIC	p.value
TF	0.75	17.59	123.85	125.77	0.00
Salaries	0.26	30.26	139.04	140.96	0.04
Prod. Func.	0.76	17.37	124.28	126.84	0.00

Table 20. Model Comparison - Institution A HERD Expenditures

	Institution A	Institution B	Institution C	Institution D	Institution E
100 TeraFLOPS	7.01	1.89	3.20	2.73	2.62
\$100k Salaries	-1.99	13.27	11.27	13.63	12.55

Table 21. Summary - HERD Expenditures Output

significant predictors. Institution B has a high adjusted R² but only the Salaries predictor is significant to the model with a p-value <0.05.

As summarized in Table 23, Institution A has a moderately high adjusted R², but RCD salary expense is not a significant predictor. Comparing to single-predictor models, we see that the model with the single predictor of TeraFLOPs slightly outperforms the production function model in terms of adjusted R², AIC, and BIC. This difference between models, however, is so small as to be negligible.

Institution D, however, shows a mixed picture for confirming the strongest model: the single predictor of TF shows the highest adjusted R² and a p-value <0.05, but the production function model has far lower AIC and BIC. For this output for this institution, the best predictor is TF operated at the university, with no salary costs in the model. Each 100 TeraFLOPs operated at the RCD center corresponds with an annual increase in 15.49 high impact publications from the institution.

As with Publications (Section 3.3.1), this result for this one institution is likely due to limited number of observations for it in the model (only 8 years). Production function results are expected to improve with a larger set of data points.

	Institution A	Institution B	Institution C	Institution D	Institution E
(Intercept)	208.561*** (21.551)	182.483*** (37.335)	569.667*** (27.006)	1257.600** (238.894)	325.803*** (39.131)
TF	0.059*** (0.012)	0.005 (0.005)	0.052*** (0.008)	0.009 (0.022)	0.054*** (0.009)
Salaries	12.739 (15.654)	183.611*** (13.726)	133.594*** (20.995)	57.533 (73.679)	201.886*** (20.095)
R ²	0.775	0.944	0.935	0.382	0.949
Adj. R ²	0.734	0.937	0.925	0.135	0.944
Num. obs.	14	20	16	8	24

*** $p < 0.001$; ** $p < 0.01$; * $p < 0.05$

Table 22. Production Function Models - Predicting High-Impact Publications

	adj.r.squared	sigma	AIC	BIC	p.value
TF	0.74	20.02	127.48	129.40	0.00
Salaries	0.31	32.72	141.24	143.16	0.02
Prod. Func.	0.73	20.53	128.97	131.53	0.00

Table 23. Model Comparison - Institution A High Impact Publications

	adj.r.squared	sigma	AIC	BIC	p.value
TF	0.50	208.69	314.86	318.26	0.00
Salaries	0.26	56.31	90.90	91.13	0.11
Prod. Func.	0.14	60.69	92.64	92.95	0.30

Table 24. Model Comparison - Institution D High Impact Publications

Table 25 summarizes the results of the production function model on High Impact Publications in real-world terms. For example, we can see that for Institution E, each additional 100 TeraFLOPs represents an annual increase of 5.49 high impact, Nature Index publications, and each \$100k investment in RCD salaries corresponds with an additional 20.19 high-impact publications annually.

	Institution A	Institution B	Institution C	Institution D	Institution E
100 TeraFLOPs	7.26	0.52	5.17	0.88	5.42
\$100k Salaries	-1.32	18.22	13.36	5.75	20.19

Table 25. Summary - High-Impact Publications Output

3.4 Relative Importance of Coefficients

Using the `lmg` method implemented in the R package `relaimpo` [9], we can calculate the proportion of the overall variance explained by each input in the model. Table 26 shows the relative importance of each input per output, for the production function model built from the combined dataset.

Tables 27 and 28 describe the relative importance of each input per output, itemized by each institution.

For example, in Table 28 we can see that for Institution C, Institution B, and Institution E, the production function model for HERD expenditures shows similar proportions of variance explained by TeraFLOPs available on campus and

salary costs across all institutions, averaging 31% and 59%, respectively. These models have high adjusted R^2 values between .925 and .955.

The relative importance of the combined model shows salary as approximately twice as important as TeraFLOPs of capacity as a predictor. As noted regarding Table 9 and 10, the relative importance for the combined dataset for the entire population is much lower than the models for each institution, due to the limited set of data and imperfect population.

	TF	Salaries
Publications	0.146	0.392
Earned Doctorates	0.010	0.248
High Impact Publications	0.168	0.401
HERD Expenditures	0.183	0.438

Table 26. Relative Importance - Combined Data

Publications			High Impact Publications		
	TF	Salaries		TF	Salaries
Institution A	0.829	0.128	Institution A	0.611	0.164
Institution B	0.232	0.742	Institution B	0.176	0.767
Institution C	0.411	0.520	Institution C	0.466	0.468
Institution D	0.508	0.276	Institution D	0.164	0.219
Institution E	0.318	0.614	Institution E	0.400	0.548

Table 27. Relative Importance - Publications and High-Impact Publication Outputs

Earned Doctorates			HERD Expenditures		
	TF	Salaries		TF	Salaries
Institution A	0.384	0.379	Institution A	0.764	0.063
Institution B	0.072	0.533	Institution B	0.276	0.609
Institution C	0.061	0.543	Institution C	0.391	0.512
Institution D	0.195	0.043	Institution D	0.450	0.536
Institution E	0.392	0.549	Institution E	0.358	0.573

Table 28. Relative Importance - Earned Doctorates and HERD Expenditures Outputs

4 Discussion

With these results, we present a set of metrics and models that will allow university leaders to generalize the work by [16] and validate this initial model for institutions beyond Purdue University. This will allow leaders to make informed resource allocation decisions about their campus cyberinfrastructure.

This study confirms that, in most cases, investment in either computing resources or staff expertise pays substantial dividends in terms of multiple institutional outputs. While investment in the RCD center’s staff contributes for the largest relative importance in most models, as with Smith, no answer (systems or people) is incorrect.

We confirm that “a coordinated strategy that invests in computing resources and staff to support them together will yield the highest returns.” [16]. Further details on models to benchmark institutions and the results of the production function models follow in Sections 4.1 and 4.2.

4.1 Benchmarks

System Sizing Model

R&D Expenditures (\$M)	Modeled TF Capacity (2022)
1000	7693.96
750	5770.47
400	3077.58
200	1538.79

Budget Sizing Model

R&D (\$M)	Expenditures	Modeled RCD Staff Investment (\$M)	Modeled RCD Total Budget (\$M)
1000		\$5.05	\$14.92
750		\$3.79	\$11.19
400		\$2.02	\$5.97
200		\$1.01	\$2.98

Table 29. Center Investment Benchmarks - Model Results

Since 2011, the 5 institutions being studied have, on average, 3.02 TF of HPC capacity per million dollars of annual R&D expenditures, and a 2022 average of 7.69 TF of capacity per million dollars of annual R&D expenditures. Regarding their investment in people, the 5 institutions report an average salary cost of 0.5% of R&D expenditures; and, in good alignment with the previously-mentioned benchmark that “34% of enterprise IT spending is allocated to personnel salaries and benefits”, total research computing budgets of the 5 studied institutions average out at an estimated at 1.49% of annual R&D expenditures.

Table 29 describes the results of models created from ratios of TeraFLOPS to annual institutional R&D expenditures, and salary investment as a percent of annual institutional R&D expenditures. These models may be used as a rule of thumb for institutional decision makers to decide what are appropriate scales for HPC systems or budgetary needs as a function of the size of the research enterprise.

4.2 Model Results

Table 30 summarizes the results of production function models on all outputs, further organized by institution and for the entire combined dataset. Here we see that, generally speaking, the production function coefficients for the outputs from most institutions translate to values of similar orders of magnitude.

For the production model across the entire population, the resulting models report moderate adjusted R^2 values for each output, with statistically significant predictors. Further discussion of this combined model can be found in Section 3.3.

Section 3.4 describes the relative importance of each predictor to each output. The relative importance of the combined model shows salary as approximately twice as important as TeraFLOPs of capacity as a predictor.

Table 31 reports the average relative importance of each predictor in all the individual models to each output.

Publications						
	Institution A	Institution B	Institution C	Institution D	Institution E	Combined
100 TeraFLOPS	64.53	8.47	25.50	23.09	20.59	27.24
\$100k Salaries	-1.32	113.38	86.04	14.92	137.25	129.74
Earned Doctorates						
	Institution A	Institution B	Institution C	Institution D	Institution E	Combined
TeraFLOPS	0.03	0.00	0.00	-0.02	0.02	0.02
Salaries	31.12	47.90	38.90	30.36	94.26	70.62
HERD Expenditures (\$M)						
	Institution A	Institution B	Institution C	Institution D	Institution E	Combined
100 TeraFLOPS	6.79	1.89	3.202	2.73	2.62	3.36
\$100k Salaries	-2.33	13.27	11.27	13.63	12.55	13.96
Hi Impact Publications						
	Institution A	Institution B	Institution C	Institution D	Institution E	Combined
100 TeraFLOPS	5.92	0.52	5.17	0.88	5.41	4.87
\$100k Salaries	1.27	18.36	13.36	5.75	20.19	19.99

Table 30. Model Results - All Production Function Models

	TF	Salaries
Publications	0.460	0.456
Earned Doctorates	0.221	0.409
High Impact Publications	0.363	0.433
HERD Expenditures	0.448	0.459

Table 31. Average Relative Importance of Individual Production Models

Most output metrics show still strong (45%/45%) average relative importance of their capital and labor predictors [as in 16], at 60%/30%. Tables 27 and 28 report the specific relative importance of each predictor to each output for each individual institution.

4.3 Future Work

As discussed in Section 3.2, the external factor of declining and shifting trends in the doctoral degrees awarded at Institution D complicated modeling the earned doctorate output for that institution. Future work may explore a hypothesis that a university’s largest fields in terms of PhDs awarded are likely the CI users, and refine the earned doctorate models to use “earned doctorates from the institution’s top X% of fields of science” as an output instead of the entire number of PhDs awarded.

In 2023, the CASC-sponsored survey initially performed by [5] was re-run and updated with new questions about the scale of resources operated at member institutions. Future work may investigate leveraging the dataset(s) from these surveys to model a broader cross-section of the US cyberinfrastructure landscape.

Intuitively it stands to reason that there is a point of diminishing returns for institutional investment in one of the factors examined, such as a point where an even bigger supercomputer stops adding additional value. Future work could potentially build on the interaction analysis touched upon by [15] and analyze the interactions between people and capital investments. This would address questions that can more precisely guide institutional decision-making –

for example, it could answer the question of whether the rate of impact on HERD expenditures from investing more in computational resources are different at higher or lower levels of investment in RCD center staff.

5 Acknowledgements

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Award Numbers 2005632 and 2321090 (Smith), 2227627 (Snapp-Childs), 1445604 and 2005506 (Hancock). Elements of this work are based on the doctoral dissertation by P. Smith [15].

References

- [1] APON, A., AHALT, S., DANTULURI, V., GURDIEV, C., LIMAYEM, M., NGO, L., AND STEALEY, M. High Performance Computing Instrumentation and Research Productivity in U.S. Universities. *Journal of Information Technology Impact*, 10 (2010), 87–98.
- [2] APON, A. W., NGO, L. B., PAYNE, M. E., AND WILSON, P. W. Assessing the effect of high performance computing capabilities on academic research output. *Empirical Economics* 48, 1 (2 2015), 283–312.
- [3] ARORA, R., AND SONDHI, S. Towards developing an open-infrastructure for assessing the progress, success, and impacts of cyberinfrastructure projects. *SN Computer Science* 5 (2024), 617.
- [4] BERENTE, N., HOWISON, J., KING, J. L., CUTCHER-GERSHENFELD, J., AND PENNINGTON, R. Leading Cyberinfrastructure Enterprise: Value Propositions, Stakeholders, and Measurement. *SSRN Electronic Journal* (4 2014).
- [5] BERENTE, N., AND RUBLESKE, J. Academic computing management benchmarks: Beta version - a report on a pilot survey of the coalition for academic scientific computing (casc) members. *SSRN Electronic Journal* (2013).
- [6] BROUDE GEVA, S., CHALKER, A., HILLEGAS, C., PETRAVICK, D., SILL, A., AND STEWART, C. Results from a Second Longitudinal Survey of Academic Research Computing and Data Center Usage: Expenditures, Utilization Patterns, and Approaches to Return on Investment. In *Practice and Experience in Advanced Research Computing* (New York, NY, USA, 2021), PEARC '21, Association for Computing Machinery.
- [7] COBB, C. W., AND DOUGLAS, P. H. A theory of production. *The American Economic Review* 18, 1 (1928), 139–165.
- [8] DEL BO, C. F. The rate of return to investment in r&d: The case of research infrastructures. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* 112 (2016), 26–37.
- [9] GRÖMPING, U. Relative Importance for Linear Regression in R: The Package relaimpo. *Journal of Statistical Software* 17, 1 (2007), 1–27.
- [10] LOZADO, C., AND SAHOO, S. Optimize your IT Staffing Levels in 3 Steps. Tech. rep., Gartner, Inc., 2023.
- [11] LUDWIG, T. The costs of HPC-based science in the exascale era. *Proceedings - 2012 SC Companion: High Performance Computing, Networking Storage and Analysis, SCC 2012* (2012), 2120–2188.
- [12] NEWBY, G., APON, A., BERENTE, N., EIGENMANN, R., FRATKIN, S., LIFKA, D., AND STEWART, C. Return on Investment from Academic Supercomputing: SC14 Panel. Tech. rep., 11 2014.
- [13] OECD. Reference framework for assessing the scientific and socio-economic impact of research infrastructures.
- [14] RAHMAN, A. T. A., HANAFIAH, M. H., ABD HAMID, U. M., GHANI, N. A. M., AND ZAIN, N. A. M. Return on investment from educational research grant funding: deliverables and measurement. *Int J Eval & Res Educ ISSN 2252, 8822* (2024), 8822.
- [15] SMITH, P. The Value Proposition of Campus High-Performance Computing Facilities to Institutional Productivity - A Production Function Model.
- [16] SMITH, P. The Value Proposition of Campus High Performance Computing Facilities to Institutional Productivity: A Production Function Model. *SN Computer Science* 5, 5 (2024), 551.
- [17] SNAPP-CHILDS, W. G., HART, D. L., COSTA, C. M., WERNERT, J. A., JANKOWSKI, H. E., TOWNS, J. W., AND STEWART, C. A. Evaluating Return on Investment for Cyberinfrastructure Using the International Integrated Reporting <IR> Framework. *SN Computer Science* 5, 5 (2024), 558.
- [18] STEWART, C., WERNERT, J., COSTA, C., HANCOCK, D. Y., KNEPPER, R., AND SNAPP-CHILDS, W. Return on investment in research cyberinfrastructure: State of the art. In *Practice and Experience in Advanced Research Computing* (New York, NY, USA, 2022), PEARC '22, Association for Computing Machinery.
- [19] STEWART, C. A., APON, A., PAYNE, R., SLAVIN, S. D., HANCOCK, D. Y., WERNERT, J., FURLANI, T., LIFKA, D., SILL, A., BERENTE, N., McMULLEN, D. F., AND CHEATHAM, T. Assessment of financial returns on investments in cyberinfrastructure facilities. In *Proceedings of the Practice and Experience in Advanced Research Computing on Rise of the Machines (learning) - PEARC '19* (New York, New York, USA, 2019), ACM Press, pp. 1–8.
- [20] STEWART, C. A., HANCOCK, D. Y., WERNERT, J., LINK, M. R., WILKINS-DIEHR, N., MILLER, T., GAITHER, K., AND SNAPP-CHILDS, W. Return on Investment for three cyberinfrastructure facilities: a local campus supercomputer; the NSF-funded Jetstream cloud system; and XSEDE (the eXtreme Science and Engineering Discovery Environment).