

**Title Page: Assessing the value of advanced computing infrastructure for supporting research: new tools to inform research policy**

Winona G. Snapp-Childs<sup>1</sup>  
David Y. Hancock<sup>2</sup>  
Preston M. Smith<sup>3</sup>  
John Towns<sup>4</sup>  
Craig A. Stewart<sup>5\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Pervasive Technology Institute, Office of the VP for IT, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, 47408, USA

<sup>2</sup>Research Technologies, Office of the VP for IT, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, 47408, USA

<sup>3</sup>Rosen Center for Advanced Computing, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47906, USA

<sup>4</sup>National Center for Supercomputing Applications, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801, USA

<sup>5</sup>Department of Computer Science, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, 47408, USA

\*Corresponding author

**Email addresses:** wsnappch@iu.edu (Snapp-Childs), dyhancoc@iu.edu (Hancock), psmith@purdue.edu (Smith), jtowns@illinois.edu (Towns), stewart@iu.edu (Stewart)

**Declaration of Interests (Funding sources)**

The authors declare financial support was received for the research, authorship, and publication of this article, specifically NSF awards to: Towns (Snapp-Childs IU subcontract PI) (#1053575, #1548562); Hancock (#1445604, #2005506); Xiaohui Carol Song (Smith, Co-PI) (#2005632) and support from the IU Pervasive Technology Institute to Snapp-Childs.

**Acknowledgments**

This work was supported by the following organizations: National Science Foundation grants to: Towns (Snapp-Childs IU subcontract PI) (#1053575, #1548562); Hancock (#1445604, #2005506); Xiaohui Carol Song (Smith, Co-PI) (#2005632). Snapp-Childs also received support from the Indiana University Pervasive Technology Institute. We thank Kristol Hancock for editing and Katja Bookwalter for graphic design.

## Abstract

**Purpose:** How much to invest in research facilities has long been a question in research policy and practice in higher education. This matter is time-sensitive due to critical financial challenges at institutions in the USA, with signs of significant problems in Europe. The purpose of this report is to present new techniques for assessment of one particular type of research infrastructure - computing facilities and staff that support research. These new approaches are timely because of the ongoing financial crises which may make it essential for institutions of higher education to make difficult decisions regarding research infrastructure.

**Principal results:** We present recently developed methods for assessment of the economic and scientific value of investment in advanced computing facilities and services. Existing examples of these tools in use show that investment in advanced computing facilities and services contributes importantly to positive financial and academic outcomes for institutions of higher education. We present a format based on the Balanced Scorecard concept for summarizing such information.

**Conclusion:** The methods presented here enable quantitative assessment of the relationship between investment in computing facilities and research and education outcomes. These methods should be of interest to research policy investigators and practitioners. The analysis methods described may be applied retroactively, making this report of potentially immediate value in setting research policies.

## Keywords

Cyberinfrastructure, eScience, ROI, cost-benefit analysis, production function

## 1. Introduction

Availability and allocation of funding are issues of longstanding concern in higher education, recently becoming urgent in the USA. Colleges and universities in the USA closed at a rate of more than one per month in 2024 (Moody 2024). There was an announcement of a budget deficit exceeding \$10M at university in the USA more than once per quarter in 2023 and 2024.<sup>1</sup> Universities making announcements included R1 universities<sup>2</sup> such as the University of Nebraska, West Virginia University, and elite Ivy League Brown University. The impact of such challenges can be significant. West Virginia University eliminated 143 faculty positions and 28 academic programs (Quinn 2024) as a result of its budget shortfall. Notable budget concerns are also present in European higher education institutions (European Commission 2024).

When financial challenges become an existential threat to institutions of higher education, every aspect of financial expenditures must be analyzed and is potentially subject to drastic change. This includes infrastructure supporting research. Computing and data storage infrastructure in support of research is very much an area of current consideration. The distinct nature of computing facilities supporting research is indicated by the particular definitions for this aspect of research infrastructure. In North America the term cyberinfrastructure is used for such research facilities, often defined as consisting of “computing systems, data storage systems, advanced instruments and data repositories, visualization environments, and people, all linked together by software and high performance networks to improve research productivity and enable breakthroughs not otherwise possible” (Stewart, Knepper, et al. 2018). In Europe the term eScience is used, defined in ways that are largely similar, but its definition does not include personnel. The provisioning of such resources today is typically a mixture of on-premise

---

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix 1.

<sup>2</sup> R1 designates “doctoral universities” with “very high research activity” in the Carnegie classification of USA higher education institutions (American Council on Education 2023).

facilities, facilities outsourced to cloud vendors, and use of government-sponsored facilities. Such facilities, though valuable, are not invulnerable to budget pressure. Within the USA there have been cuts in cyberinfrastructure facilities and staff at multiple higher education institutions (Snapp-Childs et al. 2024).

Only recently have quantitative methods for assessing the financial and academic value of investments in these facilities been published. Research on cost-effectiveness of on-premise cyberinfrastructure systems shows that it would have been three times more expensive for a university to outsource its computational activities than operate an on-premise supercomputer (Stewart, Hancock, et al. 2018). In terms of investments supporting national research communities, it would have been two to three times more expensive for the USA federal government to contract with commercial firms than to contract with universities to provide cloud services (op. cit.) or provide cyberinfrastructure support and management services (Stewart et al. 2023). Other research shows strong relationships between investment in local computing facilities and support staff with graduation of new PhDs and total university research spending (closely related to total grant income to the university) (Smith 2024; Smith et al. 2025). These new research papers have been as important in developing new methodologies as they have been in their conclusions about investments in computing facilities. Many of the methods described may be applied after the fact, given the existence of good organizational records. Little of this work has appeared in journals focused on research policy, although it seems useful in guiding research policy. Related work has appeared in research policy journals, e.g. Cao et al. (2025), which discussed the relationship between private sector research innovation and leadership by CEOs with expertise as accountants. Presidents of higher education institutions function as CEOs and need good information about investments of all sorts in order to balance budgets while fostering innovation.

We summarize recent developments in quantitative assessment of the value of research cyberinfrastructure and eScience facilities, referencing relevant studies in highly regarded journals of computer science and scientometrics. We then present a format based on the Balanced Scorecard concept for summarizing such information. The examples we present are focused on cyberinfrastructure and eScience but are applicable to any sort of research-enabling infrastructure. Analysis of cyberinfrastructure and eScience investments is of particular importance in informing technology policies and strategies for research for entities ranging from individual institutions to nations.

## **2. Methods for assessment of cyberinfrastructure**

In this paper, we focus on time-tested and new approaches that we deem of particular practical value in evaluating cyberinfrastructure and eScience facilities<sup>3</sup>:

- Traditional measures of cost and quality;
- Bibliometric analysis;
- A proxy for Return on Investment (ROI);
- Leverage;
- A production function analysis of academic and financial outputs;
- Value to society.

Much of the research cited in this paper is based on research by three organizations. At Indiana University, the central IT organization has focused on assessment of cost and quality since the 1990s (Peebles et al. 2001). Purdue University has been a long-standing leader in implementation of community clusters - computing clusters operated by the central IT organization but funded largely by the university research community (Smith 2024). XSEDE (the eXtreme Science and Engineering Discovery

---

<sup>3</sup> Stewart et al. (2022) present a review.

Environment) was one of the largest cyberinfrastructure projects ever funded by the National Science Foundation (NSF) (Towns et al. 2014). From 2011 to 2022, XSEDE provided allocations, support, training, and security services for a suite of HPC systems, clouds, and visualization systems available to academic researchers throughout the USA (Stewart et al. 2023).

### **2.1. Traditional measures of quality and cost**

Traditional measures of quality and cost include satisfaction surveys, systems usage, and total cost of ownership (TCO).

User satisfaction surveys are a basic aspect of the quality assessment of any research-enabling infrastructure. Highly negative survey ratings of course indicate problems. Positive ratings demonstrate that the users of a facility like it, but this does not necessarily prove that a facility is a cost-effective or a strategic investment (Peebles et al. 2001).

Typical metrics for operation of cyberinfrastructure and eScience facilities include percent of theoretical maximum uptime used, number of jobs submitted and completed, CPU- and GPU- hours used per month, and amount of data stored. Unusually low numbers relative to resource availability are indicative of some sort of problem. A recent topical collection in the journal *SN Computer Science* presents three different frameworks for these sorts of metrics (Aurora 2024).

Total cost of ownership (TCO) is another critical metric. TCO estimates must include operational costs of staffing, electricity, cooling, maintenance, and insurance, along with pro-rated or amortized costs of capital purchases.

All of these metrics are useful but have limitations. Good survey results do not necessarily imply that a particular resource confers value commensurate with its expense. Low utilization figures may indicate some sort of operational problem or mismatch between investment and need. TCO for cyberinfrastructure provides a measure of expense but does not provide information about the relationship of cost and benefits.

### **2.2. Bibliometric analyses**

von Laszewski et al. (2021) suggested that research publications created through use of advanced computing facilities are cited more than similar papers created without use of such facilities. They suggested that scientific papers created with use of XSEDE facilities were cited more often than similar papers that did not make use of these resources. While this suggestion is intriguing, there are significant shortcomings in this work. Most problematic among the shortcomings are availability of the data and replicability of the analysis. Shortcomings notwithstanding, the suggestion offers

### **2.3 $ROI_{proxy}$**

Apon et al. (2010) investigated the relationship between investment by universities in high performance computers (HPC) and a number of important academic metrics measure of university investment in cyberinfrastructure was possession of an HPC system of computational capability sufficient to be included in the list of the 500 fastest supercomputers in the world (Strohmaier et al. 2024), published twice per year. Investment in cyberinfrastructure at such levels was found to be associated with increased numbers of peer-reviewed publications and increased grant income. This was a breakthrough in quantitative analysis of investment in cyberinfrastructure related to research outcomes. Apon's analysis included data regarding institutions of higher education in the USA from the inception of the Top 500 list in 1993, when 49 universities were represented on that list, to 2009, when 100 universities were included.

Unfortunately this sort of analysis is not as helpful today. The most recent list, published in November 2024, includes just 15 computing systems funded and owned by an institution of higher education in the USA. It has become extremely expensive to purchase a system of sufficient capability to make it onto the list. The acquisition cost of the system ranked 500th on the most recent list was approximately US\$ 5M, not inclusive of costs for installation, operations, facilities, or staff. The 15 systems funded and owned by universities on the list represent very few data points for analysis. Further, one would have to extrapolate to systems smaller than those on the list in order to draw conclusions relevant to most institutions of higher education.

Apon's work did not actually attach economic value to investment in HPC systems. It seems essential to do this. What is the return on investment (ROI) in cyberinfrastructure and eScience facilities? ROI is a cost accounting term, defined as (Kinney and Raiborn 2011):

$$ROI = \frac{\text{(Funds received from sales or services)}}{\text{(Costs to deliver those sales or services)}} \quad [1]$$

This equation cannot typically be applied to academic research facilities because typically no products or services are actually sold or bought. A *proxy* for ROI was defined (Stewart et al. 2023) as:

$$ROI_{\text{proxy}} = \frac{\text{(Market value of services delivered and products created)}}{\text{(Costs to deliver those services and products)}} \quad [2]$$

In this formula, as in the formula for ROI, a value of 1.0 indicates a break-even level, and higher is better.  $ROI_{\text{proxy}}$  is a way to measure the financial effectiveness of investments in cyberinfrastructure in the absence of anything being bought or sold. These calculations are conceptually straightforward. The denominator is the annualized TCO. For the numerator, one tallies as many services and products created via use of the cyberinfrastructure resources as possible, finds prevailing market prices for as many of these services as possible, and arrives at a total estimated market value. Credible valuations are available for a surprising array of entities, from scientific accomplishments to educational outcomes to improvements in quality of life. These valuations may be done annually or over longer time periods. The results are approximate and are likely to be an underestimation of the actual long-term value. There will often be benefits that are impossible to quantify and thus not included in calculations. Further, the economic value of some benefits will increase over time as the scope of application expands. Healthcare and other benefits to quality of life for people are examples.

### 2.3.1 On-premise vs. outsourced computational facilities

$ROI_{\text{proxy}}$  has been used to demonstrate the cost-effectiveness of on-premise versus cloud-hosted services (Stewart et al. 2018). A formula for applying this sort of analysis in particular depends on understanding the TCO for a real or potential on-premise facility and an estimated cost for outsourcing work to commercial clouds.

The cost of on-premise facilities<sup>4</sup> is calculated as:

---

<sup>4</sup> "On premise" includes owned facilities that are located either locally or at a remote data center.

$$TC_{onprem} = AC + MC + TS + TPC + TCC \quad [3]$$

where AC is acquisition cost, MC is maintenance cost, TS is total system administration salary, TPC is total power cost, and TCC is total co-location or space cost.

TS is simply the sum of salary and benefits costs for FTEs (full-time equivalents) devoted to system administration.

TPC is:

$$TPC = P_{avg} \times PUE_{avg} \times kWh_{avg} \times 365.25 \times n \quad [4]$$

where  $P_{avg}$ ,  $PUE_{avg}$ , and  $kWh_{avg}$  are daily averages of, respectively, power consumed, power usage efficiency, and cost per kilowatt hour, and  $n$  is the number of years.

The cost for cloud services can be challenging to calculate. For Amazon Web Services (AWS) the relevant formula would be:

$$TC_{AWS} = CH \times IC \quad [5]$$

where  $TC_{AWS}$  is the cost to use AWS cloud services, CH is hours consumed, and IC is Instance Cost. (These formulae may also be implemented on the basis of node usage and time rather than a per-core basis. Our experience is that these approaches provide similar results.)

$ROI_{proxy}$  then becomes a tool to determine if a particular on-premise facility is cost effective relative to outsourcing. A value  $> 1$  favors on-premise as the more economical choice:

$$ROI_{proxy} = TC_{AWS} / TC_{onprem} \quad [6]$$

The practical challenge in making such calculations is choosing the appropriate cloud instance comparison, among many options. Image size and processor characteristics must match the actual processor and memory configuration of a real or hypothetical on-premise system. Picking the right priority / time characteristics is essential. Spot pricing might work for sophisticated research groups with extensive check-pointing or short-running jobs. Spot-priced instances do not match the operating characteristic of a typical on-premise cluster. Reserved instances match the behavior of on-premise clusters and support the type of resource most disciplinary researchers expect and need to pursue their goals. Such instances are much more expensive than spot pricing.

The general conclusion reached in 2018 was that on-premise facilities are less expensive than outsourcing to cloud for the sort of workloads that one would execute on a cluster (Stewart, Hancock, et al. 2018). This conclusion holds today. Outsourcing to commercial cloud providers may sometimes hide rather than decrease costs. Outsourcing to clouds and decreasing funding for local research computing and data (RCD) professionals<sup>5</sup> may reduce the costs visible in the budget of a university or college. So doing may transfer the work of staff supporting researchers to lab staff not trained in such work, thus increasing total cost through inefficiency. Outsourcing to clouds may also damage collaborations and communities of

---

<sup>5</sup> “Research computing and data professionals” are staff who support use of cyberinfrastructure (Campus Research Computing Consortium 2024).

practice within an institution (Shah et al. 2024), and such communities of practice often decrease support costs in practice because of shared knowledge and within-community information transfer.

In the USA, when institutions of higher education and independent research centers invest in cloud services, it's typically for reasons other than cost savings (Broude Geva et al. 2021). Uses of commercial cloud services often complement on-premise facilities. Such cases include:

- satisfying the needs of a few researchers whose system requirements are unusual relative to the general needs of an institution's research community;
- storing and analyzing regulated data, such as protected health information;
- meeting highly variable demand (“bursty demand” in cloud computing terms);
- using cloud-native applications.

In addition, using desktop computers and cloud facilities exclusively may be a rational choice for an institution so small that it simply cannot hire and retain the staff needed to manage facilities on-premise.

Several government-supported consortia provide (or previously provided) cyberinfrastructure and eScience facilities and services in Europe and North America. None of these facilities are operated with the intent to be a mechanism for higher education institutions to “outsource” routine computational workloads without cost. Examples of these sorts of facilities in the USA include XSEDE; its successor, ACCESS; and NAIRR (National Science Foundation 2024). EU-based examples include the Human Brain and Blue Brain projects. The Open Science Grid is a major multi-continent facility and is used for analysis of Large Hadron Collider data. The Open Science Grid was essential for analysis of data that led to confirmation of the existence of the Higgs Boson, a discovery awarded the 2013 Nobel Prize in Physics. These government-supported resources are designed to meet extraordinary needs of particular merit and typically involve an allocation process which would prevent institutions from successfully “outsourcing” routine computational work to these specialized resources.

### *2.3.2. Assessing cost-effectiveness of cyberinfrastructure and eScience facilities*

Stewart et al. (2023) analyzed the operation of XSEDE and estimated  $ROI_{\text{proxy}}$  for its operating activity for federal fiscal years 2017-2022. Their estimate for  $ROI_{\text{proxy}}$  for XSEDE services was between 2 and 3. That is, had the NSF bought on the open market the services that it paid XSEDE to deliver, the NSF would have paid two to three times more than it did his same sort of analysis can be done for any cyberinfrastructure facility, with recent publications providing examples of important metrics and good sources for valuations. There are two critical requirements for this approach to be effective. One is good record-keeping of costs and operational activities. The other is to go beyond the idea that “this is science, you can’t put a value on it,” to recognize that it is possible to place an approximate financial value on many entities, ranging from a peer-reviewed published paper to a human life. This is a pursuit in which “reasonable but imperfect” valuations are far better than no valuations.

## **2.4 Leverage**

“Leverage” has been used to refer to the total value of outcomes that made use of or “leveraged” a research-supporting facility, and is discussed just after ROI because it has been confused with ROI in some publications. This can be useful in concise statements that explain the value of a facility. Using data from Snapp-Childs, Costa, et al. (2024), for example, one could say that “The NSF leveraged \$200M of investment in XSEDE to support \$4.5B in total grant award investments during XSEDE’s last six years of operation.” These figures must be used with a measure of care because of the matter of shared credit. Suppose that a discovery critically depends on two different research-enabling facilities. The value of such a discovery can be considered as “leverage” of each. But it would be double counting to count the

full value as part of the “return” on the investment in each facility in the sense of ROI. Snapp-Childs, Costa, et al. (op cit.) developed a mathematical definition for partial credit for research outcomes depending on multiple factors, which is almost always the case in practice.

### **2.5 Production functions and academic outputs**

Smith built on a 1928 work by Cobb and Douglas who proposed a “production function” that specified factory output (Y) as a function of investment in capital (K) and labor (L). Smith (2024) used this approach to relate production of a variety of academic outputs (Y) to capital investment in systems (as measured in TeraFLOPS) and labor costs for the staff that operate and support them as:

$$Y = f(K_{flops}, L_{staff}) \quad [7]$$

Smith used the following variables (measured annually):

- Inputs:
  - Total TeraFLOPS operated on premise (a time-dependent proxy for capital);
  - Salary costs (labor) for RCD professionals;
- Annual outputs and metrics:
  - Higher education expenditure on R&D (HERD expenditures) - total research and development expenditures in a given year as reported to the NSF (National Science Foundation 2023);
  - Total financial value of new grant awards received in a given year (in US\$);
  - total number of annual peer-reviewed publications;
  - total number of annual high-impact publications (as listed in Springer Nature (2025));
  - total number of earned doctorates, as reported to the USA National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics (2023).

All of the outputs are in some measure a function of investment in cyberinfrastructure. HERD expenditures and new grant awards are related to each other over time but in a given year relatively distinct. HERD expenditures in a given year represent total R&D expenditures most of which is a result of grant funding in prior years, but may also reflect expenditures from gifts other than grants and use of institutional funds. New grant award dollar totals in a given year measure of success in obtaining funding in the form of extramural grants specifically. The large majority of such funds will be spent in years following that in which an award is made. HERD expenditures, conceptually, are a function of investment in cyberinfrastructure because the ability to execute externally funded research in many sciences (and some humanities and arts) is a function of local computing power required to perform analyses, do simulations, and create visualizations. Availability of local cyberinfrastructure is often a consideration in evaluation of grant proposals in these same fields, so success in grant-getting can depend in part on local cyberinfrastructure resources.

Smith’s 2024 analysis considered data over 21 years of history from Purdue University. Key results from this analysis are shown in Tables 1 and 2.



**Table 1. Relationship of academic output metrics to on-premise HPC TeraFLOPS capacity and investment in staff supporting use of HPC systems at Purdue University, 1999–2020. Research Computing and Data (RCD) professional staff salaries are listed in increments of US\$100k because this expenditure is roughly equivalent to one full-time staff person.**

|   | Fitted slope of Outputs as linear correlates of Inputs, measured annually |                           |              |                          |              |
|---|---|---------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|--------------|
| Input   | HERD Expenditures (US\$ M)  | New Grant Awards (US\$ M) | Publications | High-Impact Publications | PhDs Awarded |
| 100 TeraFLOPS                                       | 1.29*   | 1.81*                     | 7.14         | 3.34**                   | 1.84**       |
| RCD Professional Salaries in increments of US\$100K | 14.34***  | 9.56**                    | 155.30***    | 22.98***                 | 10.23***     |

\* indicates statistical significance of correlation at the  $p < 0.05$  level; \*\* indicates  $p < 0.01$  level; and \*\*\* indicates  $p < 0.001$  level.

**Table 2. Percent variance in academic output metrics at Purdue University explained by on-premise HPC TeraFLOPS capacity and investment in staff supporting use of HPC systems at Purdue University, 1999–2020.**

|   | Percent variance of Outputs explained by linear correlation with inputs |                           |              |                          |              |
|---|---|---------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|--------------|
| Input   | HERD Expenditures (US\$ M)  | New Grant Awards (US\$ M) | Publications | High-Impact Publications | PhDs Awarded |
| 100 TeraFLOPS                                       | 31%   | 34%                       | 29%          | 35%                      | 36%          |
| RCD Professional Salaries in increments of US\$100K | 63%   | 54%                       | 65%          | 61%                      | 58%          |
| Other factors                                       | 6%  | 12%                       | 5%           | 4%                       | 6%           |

US\$ 100,000 will now procure compute node servers providing approximately 200 TeraFLOPS of FP64 Tensor Core performance. A leader at Purdue University could conclude that an investment of US\$ 100,000 in computational capability will correspond with an increase in total university research expenditures by the institution of US\$ 6.45M. This implies a significant increase in receipts of extramural grant funding. Similarly, US\$ 100,000 is roughly the full annual cost of one entry-level RCD professional (salary and benefits). Every US\$ 100,000 invested in staff costs – adding one person – corresponds with an increase in total grant expenditures by US\$ 14M.

This analysis has been extended across five different R1 institutions (Smith et al. 2025). Unsurprisingly, the correlations are somewhat weaker across five institutions than within one. Still, over a total of 82 total years of data from five institutions, strong relations are detectable, as shown in Tables 3 and 4. A confounding factor in the data is a progressive decrease in the total number of PhDs awarded per year at one institution, which weakened correlations with degrees conferred. The correlation between investment in cyberinfrastructure and HERD expenditures is consistent with the findings of Canton (2025) regarding portfolios of investment (in a slightly different context than Canton’s analysis).

**Table 3. Relationship of academic output metrics as correlated to on-premise HPC TeraFLOPS capacity and investment in staff supporting use of HPC systems at 5 R1 universities.**

|   | Fitted slope of Outputs as linear correlates of Inputs, measured annually |              |                          |              |
|---|---|--------------|--------------------------|--------------|
| Input   | HERD Expenditures (US\$ M)  | Publications | High-Impact Publications | PhDs Awarded |
| 100 TeraFLOPS                                       | 3.10**  | 24.63*       | 4.47**                   | 1.56         |
| RCD Professional Salaries in increments of US\$100K | 14.46***  | 134.97***    | 20.78***                 | 7.68***      |

\* indicates statistical significance of correlation at the  $p < 0.05$  level; \*\* indicates the  $p < 0.01$  level; and \*\*\* indicates the  $p < 0.001$  level.

**Table 4. Percent variance in academic output metrics explained by on-premise HPC TeraFLOPS capacity and investment in staff supporting use of HPC systems at 5 R1 universities.**

|   | Percent variance of Outputs explained by linear correlation with inputs |              |                          |              |
|---|---|--------------|--------------------------|--------------|
| Input   | HERD Expenditures (US\$ M)  | Publications | High-Impact Publications | PhDs Awarded |
| 100 TeraFLOPS                                       | 18%   | 15%          | 17%                      | 1%           |
| RCD Professional Salaries in increments of US\$100K | 44%   | 39%          | 40%                      | 25%          |
| Other factors                                       | 38%   | 46%          | 43%                      | 74%          |

This sort of analysis will speak strongly to the financial and academic officers of any institution, and also succinctly communicates the value of investment in cyberinfrastructure to elected officials, regarding publicly supported institutions, and to donors, regarding private institutions.

### 2.6. Value to society

How does one know if the work being enabled by a research cyberinfrastructure facility is sufficiently *financially* significant that the investment in that facility is *financially* worthwhile? Not that the facility

operates cost-effectively relative to market costs, but rather that the value it adds to creating meaningful end products justifies the investment in the facility.

Two well-known modeling tools enable the estimation of the combined direct and indirect economic effects of investments in projects and services. The Regional Input–Output Modeling System (RIMSII) uses empirically derived multipliers specific to each region of the USA to relate investments, such as building a parking garage or the operation of a cyberinfrastructure facility, to the total direct and indirect economic impact and total number of jobs created (USBEA 2024). IMPLAN (2025) offers the same approach globally. These approaches use general categories of investment and may underestimate the value of investment in highly unusual areas, such as cyberinfrastructure and eScience facilities. However, they are well known and widely trusted. They produce figures that constitute a reliable and widely trusted lower bound for the overall economic impact of any investment.

Snapp-Childs, Costa, et al. (2024) approached the question of the societal value of USA federal government return on investment for XSEDE. They tallied the value of end products created using an internationally recognized accounting framework (IIRC 2021). The International Integrated Reporting Council (IIRC) Framework defines six areas of value creation, from financial gains to quality of life. Snapp-Childs, Costa, et al. (op cit.) tallied end products created via use of XSEDE for which they could find a market value and estimated their value based on published market values. After calculating the total end-product value, they calculated the percentage of credit attributable to XSEDE required to result in an ROI of at least 1.0. They posited that XSEDE deserved at least 1% of the credit for outcomes stemming from use of XSEDE, leading to a conclusion that return on USA federal investment in XSEDE was at least 1.0. That is, XSEDE created sufficient benefits to taxpayers of the USA and society generally that the value created by XSEDE within the USA was greater than its cost to taxpayers of the USA. This sort of summing up of total value and arguing based on the reasonableness of assigning percentage credit is not precise, but it can be persuasive when it is impossible to assign percentage credit for various contributions to outcomes (as is generally the case). The only other publication we have found that assigns an overall cost-benefit value to a major research infrastructure project is the work of Florio et al. (2016), which uses very sophisticated economic analyses to suggest that there is a net public benefit to investment in the Large Hadron Collider. This latter approach requires a great deal of economic information and a very complicated analysis. The “appeal to reasonableness” used in this analysis seems a reasonable and practicable option where the economic data required to employ the methodology of Florio et al. (2016) is not available.


### **3. Depicting the value of research cyberinfrastructure across multiple dimensions**

The Balanced Scorecard was designed to present “a set of measures that gives top managers a fast but comprehensive view of the business” (Kaplan and Norton 1992) and focuses on four questions:

- *How do customers see us? (customer perspective);*
- *What must we excel at? (internal perspective);*
- *Can we continue to improve and create value? (innovation and learning perspective);*
- *How do we look to shareholders? (financial perspective).*

Figure 1 presents a Balanced Scorecard template for assessment of eScience and cyberinfrastructure facilities. This depiction shows rows of metrics - in practice such would include measured values and any quantitative goals set (e.g. Key Performance Indicators).

**Figure 1. Balanced scorecard for cyberinfrastructure and eScience facilities (abbreviated as “CI” within the diagram).**



#### 4. Future work

Miles et al. (2023) qualitatively considered how cyberinfrastructure supports career development of a science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) workforce. Steps to further quantify this relationship have already been published (Snapp-Childs, Hart, et al. 2024). Several papers in a recent collection (Aurora 2024) also present qualitative approaches for evaluation. All of these approaches could be applied in a more quantitative fashion, for policy-setting situations in which quantification is relevant.

The assertion mentioned earlier that there is a linkage, among otherwise similar papers, between use of advanced computing facilities in preparation of a paper and the long-term impact of that paper merits further investigation.

Wiedmann (2017) measured the value of an eScience facility in terms of researcher hours saved. This approach could be expanded and used in policy setting, particularly for planning staffing ratios of researchers to RCD professionals.

Much of the work we have presented involves applying economic and financial concepts to the assessment of cyberinfrastructure and eScience. There are now two published methods for evaluating the overall societal financial value of investment in research infrastructure. One is based on ROI - the work of Snapp-Childs et al. presented here, applied to computing. The other, earlier, work is based on economic

value added (EVA) (Florio et al. 2016). There is also potential utility in the concept of “Real Options” (van Rhee et al. 2008). As long as finances remain a critical concern, financially based assessments are likely to be of continued value, and the continued extension of such methods seems highly likely to be valuable.

The future role and importance of AI in scientific research remains largely a matter of speculation. A divide may emerge between the capabilities at institutions that are able to provide their own AI cyberinfrastructure resources and those that outsource to commercial clouds. Scientific rigor, replicability, data privacy, and freedom from licensing entanglements may emerge as important factors favoring on-premise facilities. Access to the newest commercially developed AI tools may be a factor driving use of commercial clouds. The Top500 list of the fastest supercomputers in the world shows the importance attributed to on-premise AI research. Of the 15 university-funded and -owned supercomputers in the most recent list, six are dedicated to AI research and together represent 60% of the total computational power of university-funded systems on the list.

## 5. Conclusions

Credible hypotheses about linkage between economic growth and investment in innovation have existed at least since Schumpeter’s 1912 *Theorie der Wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung (Theory of Economic Development)*. Recent analyses convincingly depict relationships between investment in information technology and economic benefits in general terms at a national level (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine 2020). It is far more difficult to assess the value of any particular piece of research infrastructure, such as a cyberinfrastructure or eScience facility. However, doing so is essential for setting policy and investment plans for any particular type of infrastructure at any given institution or within any given national research sector.

We have presented here several approaches to assessing and conveying the value of investment in particular facilities. We can summarize these approaches as follows:

- 1) Satisfaction surveys, usage metrics, and TCO are essential metrics of facility performance and cost.
- 2)  $ROI_{proxy}$  is well suited to assessment of cost-effectiveness of facility operations, and can be meaningfully measured annually.
- 3) Production function analyses demonstrate relationships between investments in facilities and academic and financial outputs. This can aid policy setting and management within particular organizations.
- 4) Economic multiplier systems provide an unimpeachable lower bound for the total regional economic impact of a cyberinfrastructure or eScience facility.
- 5) Analysis of total value of system products as compared to costs is highly useful but feasible only on a longer-term basis, e.g. entire grant-funded projects or the full lifetime of a computing system.

All of these methods may be applied to any sort of research-facilitating infrastructure. Methods 2, 4, and 5 may be used to indicate investments in research-facilitating infrastructure have a positive or negative impact on the budget at an organizational level or are of net benefit to society at a political/geographical level. All of these methods save surveys may be applied retroactively and are applicable to any sort of research-supporting infrastructure, given good records. Most of these methods incorporate economic considerations in some way and have now been published in highly rated peer-reviewed journals. These approaches, combined with the Balanced Scorecard as a way to depict outcomes, offer important tools for research policy planning and analysis.

**Data statement**

No new data presented.

**Author contributions: CRediT**

Conceptualization - all; Formal analysis - all; Funding acquisition - Snapp-Childs, Smith, Towns; Investigation - all; Writing original draft, review, editing - all.

**Generative AI statement**

No generative AI used.

**Appendix A. Universities announcing annual budget deficits of  $\geq$  \$US 10M in 2023-2024\***

| University                     | Deficit (in US\$)        | Year | Source  |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------|------|---|
| Brown University               | 46M                      | 2024 | <a href="https://www.insidehighered.com/news/quick-takes/2024/12/20/brown-faces-46-million-budget-deficit">https://www.insidehighered.com/news/quick-takes/2024/12/20/brown-faces-46-million-budget-deficit</a>   |
| Catholic University of America | 30M                      | 2024 | <a href="https://www.pillaratholic.com/p/catholic-university-of-america-facing">https://www.pillaratholic.com/p/catholic-university-of-america-facing</a>   |
| Portland State University      | 18M                      | 2024 | <a href="https://www.insidehighered.com/news/business/cost-cutting/2024/11/04/october-brings-deep-cuts-number-college-campuses">https://www.insidehighered.com/news/business/cost-cutting/2024/11/04/october-brings-deep-cuts-number-college-campuses</a> |
| Sonoma State University        | 24M                      | 2024 | <a href="https://www.highereddive.com/news/sonoma-state-university-job-program-cuts-athletics/738170/">https://www.highereddive.com/news/sonoma-state-university-job-program-cuts-athletics/738170/</a>   |
| St. Louis University           | \$20M                    | 2024 | <a href="https://www.firstalert4.com/2024/10/10/saint-louis-university-addresses-multimillion-dollar-budget-deficit/">https://www.firstalert4.com/2024/10/10/saint-louis-university-addresses-multimillion-dollar-budget-deficit/</a>                     |
| University of Arizona          | Reported as 170M to 225M | 2024 | <a href="https://www.chronicle.com/article/how-the-u-of-arizona-found-itself-in-a-financial-crisis-of-its-own-making">https://www.chronicle.com/article/how-the-u-of-arizona-found-itself-in-a-financial-crisis-of-its-own-making</a>                     |
| University of Nebraska Lincoln | 12M                      | 2023 | <a href="https://www.chronicle.com/article/most-public-flagships-are-booming-why-are-a-handful-flailing">https://www.chronicle.com/article/most-public-flagships-are-booming-why-are-a-handful-flailing</a>   |
| University of Vermont          | 10M                      | 2024 | <a href="https://www.sevendaysvt.com/news/facing-10-million-budget-deficit-uvn-considers-tuition-hike-42113479">https://www.sevendaysvt.com/news/facing-10-million-budget-deficit-uvn-considers-tuition-hike-42113479</a>                                 |
| University of West Virginia    | 45M                      | 2023 | <a href="https://www.chronicle.com/article/most-public-flagships-are-booming-why-are-a-handful-flailing">https://www.chronicle.com/article/most-public-flagships-are-booming-why-are-a-handful-flailing</a>   |
| Western Washington University  | 18M                      | 2024 | <a href="https://mybellinghamnow.com/news/297792-18-million-budget-deficit-leads-to-layoffs-at-western-washington-university/">https://mybellinghamnow.com/news/297792-18-million-budget-deficit-leads-to-layoffs-at-western-washington-university/</a>   |

## References

- American Council on Education. 2023. "Classification Methodology." Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. January 27, 2023  
<https://carnegieclassifications.acenet.edu/carnegie-classification/classification-methodology/>.
- Apon, Amy, Stanley Ahalt, Vijay Dantuluri, Constantin Gurdgiev, Moez Limayem, Linh Ngo, and Michael Stealey. 2010. "High Performance Computing Instrumentation and Research Productivity in U.S. Universities." *Journal of Information Technology Impact* 10:87–98.
- Aurora, Ritu, ed. 2024. "Metrics for Measuring Success of CyberInfrastructure (CI) Projects." SN Computer Science Topical Collection.  
[https://link.springer.com/journal/42979/topicalCollection/AC\\_e8e45e9fd5dab093110050bfa0211846](https://link.springer.com/journal/42979/topicalCollection/AC_e8e45e9fd5dab093110050bfa0211846)
- Broude Geva, Sharon, Alan Chalker, Curt Hillegas, Donald Petravick, Alan Sill, and Craig Stewart. 2021. "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: ACM.  
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3437359.3465589>.
- Campus Research Computing Consortium. 2024. "RCD Professionalization." 2024. <https://carcc.org/rcd-professionalization/>.
- Canton, Erik. 2025. "A Portfolio Approach to Research Funding." *Research Policy* 54:105129.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2024.105129>.
- Cao, Jian, Feng Chen, Mingxiang Li, and Xin Luo. 2025. "Accounting Backgrounds and Technological Innovation: Are Accountant CEOs Inferior Innovators?" *Research Policy* 54:105175.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2025.105175>.
- European Commission. 2024. "Investing in Education 2024." Luxembourg: Publications Office European Communities/Union. <https://doi.org/10.2766/969920>.
- Florio, Massimo, Stefano Forte, and Emanuela Sirtori. 2016. "Forecasting the Socio-Economic Impact of the Large Hadron Collider: A Cost-Benefit Analysis to 2025 and beyond." *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* 112:38–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2016.03.007>.
- Gardner Lee. 2023. Most Public Flagships Are Booming. Why Are A Handful Flailing? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/most-public-flagships-are-booming-why-are-a-handful-flailing?>.
- IIRC. 2021. "International IR Framework." International Integrated Reporting Council (IIRC).  
<https://www.integratedreporting.org/resource/international-ir-framework/>.
- IMPLAN. 2025. "IMPLAN." 2025. <https://implan.com/>.
- Kaplan, Robert S., and David P. Norton. 1992. "The Balanced Scorecard—Measures That Drive Performance." *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/1992/01/the-balanced-scorecard-measures-that-drive-performance-2>.
- Kinney, Michael R., and Cecily A. Raiborn. 2011. *Cost Accounting: Foundations and Evolutions*. Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.
- Miles, Tonya, Lizanne Destefano, and Julie Wernert. 2023. "A Longitudinal Study of XSEDE HPC Workshops." In *Practice and Experience in Advanced Research Computing*. New York, NY: ACM.  
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3569951.3593603>.
- Moody, Josh. 2024. "2024 Has Seen More College Closures than Last Year." Washington, DC: Inside Higher Ed. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/business/financial-health/2024/12/13/2024-has-seen-more-college-closures-last-year>.
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. 2020. *Information Technology Innovation: Resurgence, Confluence, and Continuing Impact*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics. 2023. "Survey of Earned Doctorates (SED)

- 2023.” NSF 25-300. <https://nces.nsf.gov/pubs/nsf25300>.
- National Science Foundation. 2023. “Higher Education Research and Development (HERD) Survey.” 2023. <https://nces.nsf.gov/surveys/higher-education-research-development/2023>.
- National Science Foundation. 2024. “National Artificial Intelligence Research Resource (NAIRR) Pilot.” <https://nairrpilot.org/>
- Peebles, Christopher S., Craig A. Stewart, Brian D. Voss, and Susan Workman. 2001. “Measuring Quality, Cost, and Value of IT Services.” American Society for Quality. <https://hdl.handle.net/2022/426>
- Quinn, Ryan. 2024. “A Year after Cuts, WV Still Bleeding Faculty, Administrators.” Washington, DC: Inside Higher Ed. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/faculty-issues/tenure/2024/09/09/year-after-cuts-wv-still-bleeding-faculty-administrators>.
- Shah, Dhruvil, Rebecca Belshe, Gil Speyer, and Jason Yalim. 2024. “Measuring the Impact of Centralized High-Performance Computing with Research Collaboration Networks.” *SN Comput. Sci.* 5:600. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S42979-024-02890-6>.
- Smith, Preston. 2024. “The Value Proposition of Campus High Performance Computing Facilities to Institutional Productivity: A Production Function Model.” *SN Computer Science* 5:551. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42979-024-02888-0>.
- Smith, Preston M., Jill Gemmill, David Y. Hancock, Brian W. O’Shea, Winona G. Snapp-Childs, and James Wilgenbusch. 2025. “Application of the Cyberinfrastructure Production Function Model to R1 Institutions.” *Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics*. In review. Preprint: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.10264>.
- Snapp-Childs, Winona, Claudia M. Costa, Daniel Olds, Addison Snell, Julie A. Wernert, and Craig A. Stewart. 2024. “Economic Value of HPC Experience for New STEM Professionals: Insights from STEM Hiring Managers.” *Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics* 9:1462329. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frma.2024.1462329>.
- Snapp-Childs, Winona G., David L. Hart, Claudia M. Costa, Julie A. Wernert, Harmony E. Jankowski, John Towns, and Craig A. Stewart. 2024. “Evaluating Return on Investment for Cyberinfrastructure Using the International Integrated Reporting Framework.” *SN Computer Science* 5:558. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42979-024-02889-z>.
- Springer Nature. 2025. “Nature Index.” January 1, 2025. <https://www.nature.com/nature-index/>.
- Stewart, Craig A., Claudia M. Costa, Julie A. Wernert, Winona G. Snapp-Childs, Marques Bland, Philip Blood, Terry Campbell, et al. 2023. “Use of Accounting Concepts to Study Research: Return on Investment in XSEDE, a US Cyberinfrastructure Service.” *Scientometrics* 128:3225–55. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-022-04539-8>.
- Stewart, Craig A., David Y. Hancock, Julie Wernert, Matthew R. Link, Nancy Wilkins-Diehr, Therese Miller, Kelly Gaither, and Winona G. Snapp-Childs. 2018. “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).” In 2018 IEEE/ACM 11th International Conference on Utility and Cloud Computing (UCC). IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ucc.2018.00031>.
- Stewart, Craig A., Richard Knepper, Matthew R. Link, Marlon Pierce, Eric Wernert, and Nancy Wilkins-Diehr. 2018. “Cyberinfrastructure, Cloud Computing, Science Gateways, Visualization, and Cyberinfrastructure Ease of Use.” In *Information Science and Technology, Fourth Edition*, 1063–74. Hershey, PA: IGI Global. <https://hdl.handle.net/2022/21589>.
- Stewart, Craig, Julie Wernert, Claudia Costa, David Y. Hancock, Richard Knepper, and Winona Snapp-Childs. 2022. “Return on Investment in Research Cyberinfrastructure: State of the Art.” In *Practice and Experience in Advanced Research Computing*, New York, NY: ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3491418.3535131>.
- Strohmaier, Erich, Jack Dongarra, Horst Simon, and Martin Meuer. 2024. “Top 500.” <https://top500.org/>.



- Towns, John, Timothy Cockerill, Maytal Dahan, Ian Foster, Kelly Gaither, Andrew Grimshaw, Victor Hazlewood, et al. 2014. "XSEDE: Accelerating Scientific Discovery." *Computing in Science & Engineering* 16:62–74. <https://doi.org/10.1109/mcse.2014.80>.
- USBEA. 2024. "RIMS II: An Essential Tool for Regional Developers and Planners." USA Department of Commerce Bureau of Economic Analysis. [https://www.bea.gov/sites/default/files/methodologies/RIMSII\\_User\\_Guide.pdf](https://www.bea.gov/sites/default/files/methodologies/RIMSII_User_Guide.pdf).
- van Rhee, C.G, M. Pieters, and M.P van de Voort. 2008. "Real Options Applied to Infrastructure Projects: A New Approach to Value and Manage Risk and Flexibility." In 2008 First International Conference on Infrastructure Systems and Services (INFRA), 1–6. IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/infra.2008.5439633>.
- von Laszewski, Gregor, Fugang Wang, and Geoffrey C. Fox. 2021. "Comprehensive Evaluation of XSEDE's Scientific Impact Using Semantic Scholar Data." In *Practice and Experience in Advanced Research Computing*. New York, NY: ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3437359.3465601>.
- Wiedmann, Thomas. 2017. "An Input–output Virtual Laboratory in Practice – Survey of Uptake, Usage and Applications of the First Operational IELab." *Economic Systems Research* 29:296–312. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09535314.2017.1283295>.