INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF NOVEL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT (IJNRD)
© 2026 IJNRD | Volume 11, Issue 11, November 2026 | ISSN: 2456-4184 | IJNRD.ORG

The Academia–Industry Nexus in Indian Higher Education Institutions

R. Durai[1], S. Gnanasaranya[2], V. Kaveri[3], M. S. Fathima Begam[4], Sruthi Mohan[5], S. Ramaswamy[6]

[1]Director, GTN Group of Institutions, Dindigul, Tamil Nadu, India.
[2]Assistant Professor (Contract), Department of Lifelong Learning and Extension, The Gandhigram Rural Institute (DU), Dindigul, Tamil Nadu, India.
[3]Head, Department of Management Studies, GTN Arts College (Autonomous), Dindigul, Tamil Nadu, India.
[4] Associate Professor (Dean R and D), Department of History, GTN Arts College (Autonomous), Dindigul, Tamil Nadu, India.
[5] Chief Administrative Officer, GTN Group of Institutions, Dindigul, Tamil Nadu, India.
[6]Advisor -cum-Adjunct Professor (Economics), Corresponding Author, GTN Group of Institutions, Dindigul, Tamil Nadu, India.

Abstract

The structural decoupling of academic knowledge production from industrial utilisation remains a fundamental barrier to India's long-term total factor productivity and technological sovereignty. Despite maintaining one of the largest tertiary education systems worldwide, India faces a persistent structural paradox: rapid expansion in national tertiary enrollments alongside acute technical skill deficits and widespread graduate unemployability. This scholarly monograph provides a systemic investigation into the macroeconomic, theoretical, institutional, and policy dynamics governing university-industry linkages across the Indian subcontinent. India's Gross Expenditure on Research and Development (GERD) has stagnated at roughly 0.64 per cent to 0.70 per cent of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) over the past two decades, characterised by an asymmetric reliance on central public funding. In contrast, advanced industrial powers draw upwards of 70.0 per cent of R and D capitalisation directly from private enterprise. This paper evaluates the structural tiering of the Indian higher education ecosystem, tracing how historical legacy burdens, administrative over-centralisation within State Public Universities, and fragmented intellectual property management have constrained applied research and cross-sectoral tech transfer. Integrating classical and evolutionary frameworks—including the Triple, Quadruple, and Quintuple Helix models, Cohen and Levinthal's absorptive capacity paradigm, Williamson's transaction cost economics, and Chesbrough's open innovation model—the study examines contemporary legislative and policy shifts, notably the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 and the Anusandhan National Research Foundation (ANRF) Act 2023. The paper evaluates comparative institutional models from the United States, Germany, South Korea, and China to derive context-sensitive mechanisms for the Indian market, prioritising autonomous Special Purpose Vehicles for Technology Transfer Offices, blended financing structures via corporate social responsibility matching capital, and regional multi-stakeholder field stations. The paper concludes with an actionable policy blueprint designed to transition Indian higher education institutions from insular teaching factories into globally competitive, regional innovation epicentres under the Viksit Bharat @ 2047 developmental agenda.

Keywords: Academia-Industry Linkages, National Education Policy 2020, Technology Transfer Offices, Quintuple Helix, R and D Financing, Viksit Bharat @ 2047.

1.0 Introduction

India stands at an unprecedented macroeconomic juncture, with an aggregate population exceeding 1.4 billion and a median age below 29 years, representing one of the largest working-age cohorts in modern economic history. Over the past three decades, coordinated policy pushes have propelled the national Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) in higher education from single digits to 28.4 per cent by 2021–2022, accommodating more than 43 million students across more than 1,100 universities and 45,000 affiliated colleges (**GoI, 2023**). However, this rapid physical expansion conceals a profound structural dysfunction termed the 'employability paradox' (**NITI Aayog, 2023**). Empirical industry assessments indicate that less than 45.0 per cent to 50.0 per cent of graduating engineering, management, and general technical cohorts possess the requisite cognitive, socio-technical, and applied competencies demanded by modern, technology-intensive industrial enterprises (**Wheebox, 2023**). This divergence between paper credentialism and practical capacity highlights a historical detachment between academia's curricular objectives and the dynamic production frontiers of industrial manufacturing and advanced services. HEIs have historically operated as closed instructional systems focused on terminal degree certification rather than collaborative platforms for human capital development, problem discovery, and technological innovation. This misalignment manifests in frictional unemployment, suppressed industrial productivity, and underutilised human capital. The empirical evidence for this disconnect between academic research and commercial utilisation is visible in national science and technology resource allocations. India's GERD has hovered between 0.64 per cent and 0.70 per cent of GDP for more than two decades (**DST, 2023; World Bank, 2024**). In stark contrast, economies that have successfully escaped middle-income traps exhibit GERD intensities two to seven times higher. (**Table 1**) South Korea allocates approximately 4.93 per cent of GDP to research and development, Israel exceeds 5.5 per cent,

the United States sustains approximately 3.46 per cent, the member states of the OECD average 2.71 per cent, and China has systematically expanded its research outlays to 2.43 per cent of GDP (**OECD, 2023**).

Table 1. Cross-National Comparative Matrix of Scientific Research and Development Intensity, Sectoral Funding Composition, and Human Capital Density

Country / Region	GERD (0.0 per cent of GDP)	Share of Industry in GERD (.0 per cent)	Share of HEIs in GERD (.0 per cent)	Researchers per Million Pop.
South Korea	4.93 per cent	79.2 per cent	10.8 per cent	8,714
United States	3.46 per cent	74.10 per cent	11.9 per cent	4,412
China	2.43 per cent	77.3 per cent	7.6 per cent	1,582
OECD Average	2.71 per cent	71.40 per cent	16.20 per cent	4,150
India	**0.65 per cent**	**36.80 per cent**	**8.8 per cent**	**262**

Table Source: DST (2023), OECD (2023), and UNESCO Institute for Statistics (2023).

This resource constraint limits physical infrastructure, access to modern laboratories, computational power, and retention of human capital across Indian universities. Furthermore, India has approximately 262 researchers per million inhabitants, compared with 1,582 in China, 4,150 in the OECD, and 8,714 in South Korea (**UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2023**). Under-capitalised academic laboratories struggle to participate in frontier, capital-intensive science, confining institutional activity to non-empirical, purely conceptual, or incremental scientific contributions.

The Public-Private Spending Asymmetry: Beyond the aggregate funding deficit, the internal composition of India's R and D financing shows an inverse structural dynamic compared with advanced industrialised economies. In benchmark innovation economies, the private corporate sector serves as the primary financier and executor of national research programs, contributing 70.0 per cent to 80.0 per cent of aggregate GERD in South Korea, Japan, the United States, and China (**Mazzucato, 2013**). In India, however, the central and state governments have historically shouldered over 60.0 per cent of all national scientific and research expenditures. In comparison, the private corporate sector has contributed roughly 36.0 per cent to 37.0 per cent (**DST, 2023**). Indian corporate investments in fundamental and translational research remain negligible, focused predominantly on immediate, brownfield process adaptations, reverse engineering, and downstream compliance rather than proprietary technological discovery. Meanwhile, academic institutions absorb less than 9.0 per cent of national R and D funds. At the same time, public research institutes (e.g., CSIR, DRDO, DAE, ISRO) secure the dominant share of government research allocations. Consequently, Indian universities operate outside both national public scientific missions and corporate commercialisation pipelines, reinforcing an insular culture of basic scientific inquiry detached from market pressures and industrial deployment.

Paradigm Shift: From Transactional Recruitment to Co-Creation: Overcoming these macroeconomic constraints requires abandoning the transactional paradigm that has historically defined industry-institute interactions across the Indian subcontinent. For decades, institutional engagement with corporate sectors was confined to seasonal campus placement drives, summer student internships, and modest corporate donations for infrastructure naming rights. Industry saw universities as low-cost human-resource clearinghouses, while universities viewed industry primarily as the employer of last resort for their graduates.

Under the national Viksit Bharat @ 2047 agenda—which targets India's transformation into a fully developed knowledge economy by the centenary of its independence—this paradigm must yield to long-term structural co-creation **(NITI Aayog, 2023**). Moving up the global economic value chain requires domestic enterprises to shift from license-based technology assimilation to indigenous intellectual property generation. HEIs must shift from purely instructional venues to knowledge hubs that de-risk foundational science, incubate frontier enterprises, and co-design industrial roadmaps. The transformation demands structural mechanisms that fuse corporate capital and market orientation with academic depth and experimental freedom.

1.1 Theoretical and Analytical Frameworks

Evolution of Innovation Models: Linear vs Mode 2 Knowledge: The theoretical underpinning of academic engagement has evolved substantially over the past century. The post-World War II paradigm was dominated by **Bush's (1945)** Linear Model of Innovation, as outlined in his foundational treatise, Science: The Endless Frontier. Bush posited that fundamental scientific research, performed largely within universities without direct concern for practical ends, acts as the primary reservoir from which applied research, industrial

development, and commercial product introduction sequentially flow: Basic Science → Applied Science → Development → Production and Operations. This mechanistic view institutionalised an operational separation between university scientists and commercial enterprises. **Gibbons et al. (1994**) critiqued this dynamic, introducing the dichotomy between Mode 1 and Mode 2 knowledge production. Mode 1 knowledge is disciplinary, hierarchical, homogeneous, and governed predominantly by academic peer review within isolated disciplinary silos. In contrast, Mode 2 knowledge is transdisciplinary, heterogeneous, heterarchical, socially distributed, and developed directly in application contexts. For Indian HEIs to drive national technological competitiveness, their operational focus must shift from traditional, monodisciplinary Mode 1 knowledge production to collaborative, problem-oriented Mode 2 knowledge systems that address real-world industrial and societal challenges.

The Triple Helix Model and Adaptation to Emerging Markets: To understand the relational dynamics between institutional spheres, **Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff (2000)** conceptualised the Triple Helix model of University-Industry-Government relations. Unlike traditional state-centric models (where the state controls both academia and enterprise) or laissez-faire configurations (where spheres operate independently with distinct boundaries), the modern Triple Helix features overlapping spheres, permeable organisational borders, and reciprocal development across sectors. In a functional Triple Helix, universities take on entrepreneurial roles via technology commercialisation and spin-offs; industry takes on academic qualities by building fundamental research laboratories; and governments act as public venture capitalists and institutional facilitators through targeted incentives, intellectual property legal architecture, and procurement guarantees. In emerging markets like India, however, the Triple Helix framework faces operational obstacles. Institutional voids, uneven state-level bureaucratic capacities, risk-averse academic cultures, and an industrial landscape dominated by micro, small, and medium enterprises (MSMEs) create structural disconnections within the helix. Bridging these divides requires targeted policy interventions, specialised public-private intermediary organisations, and deliberate institutional alignment.

Quadruple and Quintuple Helix Systems: Recognising the limitations of a model focused solely on economic output, **Carayannis and Campbell (2010)** expanded the paradigm into the Quadruple Helix by incorporating civil society, end-users, media-based public discourse, and culture as an essential fourth pillar. This expansion ensures that innovation cycles address social acceptance, user-centric design, and equitable societal transitions. **Carayannis et al. (2012)** further developed the Quintuple Helix model by explicitly embedding the natural environment as a fundamental, non-negotiable fifth helix. For an emerging nation such as India, confronting acute air and water pollution, soil degradation, resource depletion, and climate volatility alongside rapid urbanisation, the Quintuple Helix framework offers a necessary analytical architecture. It requires that academia-industry collaborations decouple economic growth from ecological degradation, directing research toward circular manufacturing, clean energy generation, water stewardship, and climate-resilient technologies.

Absorptive Capacity and Transaction Cost Economics: The microeconomic mechanics of cross-sector knowledge exchange depend heavily on the collaborating entities' internal capabilities. **Cohen and Levinthal (1990)** defined absorptive capacity as an organisation's ability to recognise the economic and scientific value of external knowledge, assimilate it, and apply it commercially. Firms lacking internal R and D capabilities cannot easily decode academic research or integrate university discoveries into operational production lines. Conversely, universities that lack market-facing professionals cannot grasp the operational constraints, unit economics, or delivery timelines private firms require. Institutional frictions compound this structural gap. **Williamson's (1985)** Transaction Cost Economics (TCE) highlights how cross-sector partnerships often suffer from high transaction costs driven by asset specificity, technological uncertainty, opportunism, and bounded rationality. When academic institutions attempt to negotiate research contracts, intellectual property rights, and commercialisation terms without standardised legal templates or autonomous licensing bodies, transaction costs escalate. If transaction costs exceed the perceived value of the academic discovery, industrial actors rationally abandon university collaboration in favour of off-the-shelf foreign technology licensing or internal development.

The Open Innovation Paradigm: Finally, **Chesbrough's (2003)** Open Innovation framework challenges traditional corporate insularity. Historically, multinational corporations operated closed R and D environments, keeping discoveries behind proprietary walls. Open innovation posits that in an era of distributed knowledge, firms cannot rely solely on internal paths to market. Instead, they must combine internal ideas with external scientific discoveries, leveraging both internal and external paths to market. Within this conceptual architecture, higher education institutions function as vital external engines for corporate innovation pipelines. Academic labs contribute fundamental scientific breakthroughs and de-risked early-stage proofs of concept, enabling enterprises to focus capital on development, scale-up, and commercial distribution.

1.2 Structural Landscape of Indian Higher Education and Industrial Linkages

The Tiered Hierarchy: CFTIs Versus State Public Universities: India's higher education system is structurally fractured along financial, administrative, and institutional lines. At the apex are the Centrally Funded Technical Institutions (CFTIs), including the Indian Institutes of Technology (IITs), the Indian Institute of Science (IISc), the National Institutes of Technology (NITs), and the

Indian Institutes of Management (IIMs). These premier institutions receive direct fiscal allocations from the central government, maintain autonomous institutional governance, operate with higher faculty-to-student ratios, and possess world-class physical, analytical, and digital infrastructures. Consequently, they attract elite student talent and absorb most corporate RandD funding, joint research initiatives, and international patent filings. Directly beneath these elite institutions sit the State Public Universities (SPUs) and their expansive networks of affiliated undergraduate colleges. SPUs educate more than 80.0 per cent of all tertiary students in India (**GoI, 2023**). However, they operate in a different institutional and financial reality, characterised by constrained state fiscal outlays, extensive faculty vacancies, and bureaucratic intervention from regional administrative bodies.

The Resource Chasm and Infrastructure Deficits: The resource disparity between CFTIs and SPUs is pronounced. An IIT or IISc typically operates with an annual operational and capital budget ranging from hundreds of crores to over a thousand crores of rupees, supported by competitive research funding schemes such as the Scheme for Transformational and Advanced Research in Sciences (STARS), Impacting Research Innovation and Technology (IMPRINT), and the Sophisticated Analytical Instrumentation Facility (SAIF) program. Conversely, typical SPUs operate with modest state allocations, often spending 80.0 to 90.0 per cent of their total receipts on non-discretionary commitments such as faculty salaries, administrative wages, and campus pensions. Consequently, SPUs often lack the basic analytical infrastructure—such as High-Resolution Transmission Electron Microscopy (HR-TEM), Nuclear Magnetic Resonance (NMR) spectrometers, and cleanroom microfabrication facilities—required to conduct modern research in chemistry, materials science, nanotechnology, and biotechnology. Without modern instrumentation and specialised laboratory technicians, regional university faculty cannot produce the empirical data corporate partners require, relegating regional academic inquiry to derivative computational analyses, review monographs, or non-empirical publications.

State Public Universities and the Affiliation Burden: A structural obstacle unique to the Indian higher education system is the institutional affiliation mechanism. Established during the colonial era under the London University model of the mid-nineteenth century, regional public universities function as massive examining bodies for hundreds—and occasionally upwards of a thousand—constituent and affiliated private and public colleges. University vice-chancellors, registrars, and senior faculty spend substantial administrative effort managing centralised syllabus design, printing examination papers, moderating grading processes, handling student disciplinary tribunals, and managing regional litigation. This administrative load crowds out academic leadership, applied research, and engagement with external stakeholders. Faculty members are evaluated on their capacity to process high volumes of student examinations rather than their ability to secure competitive research grants, file industrial patents, or establish corporate partnerships. Local manufacturing and services clusters operate in parallel geographic proximity to these regional universities, yet neither side maintains the organisational capacity or institutional incentive to collaborate.

Private HEIs and Deemed-to-be Universities: The rapid expansion of the private higher education sector over the past three decades has created two distinct institutional models. On one end is an emerging group of well-capitalised, philanthropically endowed private universities (e.g., Ashoka University, Plaksha University, Shiv Nadar University, O.P. Jindal Global University, BITS Pilani). These institutions have prioritised research ecosystems, introduced modern shared instrumentation cores, recruited foreign-trained faculty with competitive compensation packages, and founded specialised, industry-facing research centres. On the other end sits a large group of commercialised, tuition-dependent private engineering, management, and arts-and-science institutions. Established primarily as capital investments, many of these entities prioritise real estate acquisition and maximum student enrollments over long-term research capacity. Without substantial corporate endowments, state subventions, or significant internal R and D infrastructure, these institutions function primarily as instructional, credential-granting entities. Faculty often face heavy teaching loads, short-term contracts, and limited support for experimental inquiry, leaving these institutions disconnected from substantive corporate R and D integration.

1.3 Systemic Bottlenecks and Institutional Disincentives

Cultural and Cognitive Divergence: The most persistent barrier to effective academia-industry interaction in India is a cultural and cognitive mismatch between the two spheres. Academic culture values individual intellectual autonomy, peer-reviewed open-access publication, methodological thoroughness, and extended return-on-investment research timelines. In contrast, industrial culture

demands speed to market, measurable ROI, strict milestone deliveries, confidentiality, trade secret protection, and reproducible unit economics. **(Table 2)**

Table 2. Cultural, Institutional, and Operational Divergences Between Academic and Industrial Spheres in Emerging Knowledge Economies

Dimension	Academic Institutional Culture	Industrial Corporate Culture
Primary Incentive	Peer-reviewed scholarly publication and tenure	Proprietary advantage, ROI, and commercial profit
Operational Timeline	Multi-year open exploratory inquiry	Strict quarterly milestones and rapid time-to-market
IP Strategy	Public dissemination and academic citation	Defensive exclusivity, patents, and trade secrets
Risk Profile	High tolerance for theoretical discovery	Low tolerance for commercial or execution failure
Governance	Deliberative, consensus-driven committees	Hierarchical, deadline-driven execution chains

Source: Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff (2000), Gibbons et al. (1994), Cohen and Levinthal (1990), Williamson (1985), and Sjöö and Hellström (2019)

When Indian corporate leaders approach academic laboratories, they often encounter research proposals that lack commercial focus, commercial milestones, and cost-benefit frameworks. Conversely, academic faculty frequently encounter corporate demands for immediate, off-the-shelf engineering fixes that offer little scope for peer-reviewed discovery or basic scientific advancement. Without professional boundary-spanning organisations, these cultural differences lead to mutual disengagement.

Faculty Evaluation and Academic Career Trajectories: Institutional incentive structures actively discourage faculty from engaging in technology transfer and industrial collaboration. The University Grants Commission (UGC) and various state higher education departments rely heavily on the Academic Performance Indicator (API) framework and its related point systems for faculty recruitment, tenure confirmation, and career advancement under the Career Advancement Scheme (CAS). This framework prioritises the volume of journal publications, conference proceedings, and textbook chapters over substantive translational output. The system offers little structural recognition for designing prototypes, securing granted patents, negotiating licensing agreements, spinning off venture-backed deep-tech enterprises, or participating in long-term corporate consultancies. A faculty member who files a complex patent that gets licensed by an industrial enterprise often earns fewer administrative career-advancement points than a colleague who publishes multiple derivative papers in low-tier journals. Consequently, faculty members act rationally within their incentive systems and avoid the uncertain, multi-year commitments required for corporate technology co-creation.

Intellectual Property (IP) and Technology Transfer Deficits: The absence of institutionalised, professional Technology Transfer Offices (TTOs) across more than 90.0 per cent of Indian universities represents a key structural bottleneck in the national innovation system. While top-tier IITs and the IISc have established dedicated industrial liaison offices (e.g., the Foundation for Innovation and Technology Transfer at IIT Delhi, and the Industrial Research and Consultancy Centre at IIT Bombay), state public universities and mid-tier private engineering institutions lack this infrastructure. In most regional institutions, researchers must personally navigate complex patent landscapes, pay patent filing fees out of pocket, locate commercial licensees, and draft intricate IP licensing contracts. Without specialised training in intellectual property valuation, claims drafting, patent prosecution, and freedom-to-operate searches, faculty often let their discoveries sit dormant as unevaluated domestic provisional filings or publish technical details openly, destroying commercial exclusivity. Furthermore, university IP policies often feature poorly structured royalty-sharing agreements, vague rules on inventor-institution equity allocations, and burdensome administrative approvals for university-born spin-offs.

Risk Aversion and Legal Constraints in the Public Sector: In state-funded public institutions, academic administrators operate under substantial legal, financial, and regulatory scrutiny. Public universities are subject to audit regimes led by the Comptroller and Auditor General (CAG) of India, regional state auditing directorates, and surveillance by the Central Vigilance Commission (CVC). While designed to ensure public transparency and prevent the misapplication of public funds, these compliance frameworks apply rigid bureaucratic rules to the inherently uncertain process of scientific experimentation and enterprise creation. For example, if a public

university faculty member invests institutional capital, research lab space, or state-funded equipment in a joint venture or incubator startup that subsequently fails, university leadership can face formal audit inquiries and corruption allegations over the alienation of state assets. Similarly, equity-based compensation models—where a public university accepts corporate stock instead of up-front cash licensing fees—remain legally complex and administratively risky for public university leadership. This dynamic incentivises institutional risk aversion, encouraging university administrators to favour conservative, passive operations over dynamic technological entrepreneurship.

1.4 Policy Evolution and National Strategic Frameworks

Historical Evolution of Indian Science and Technology Policies: India's national approach to science, technology, and innovation has evolved through several developmental phases. The foundational Science Policy Resolution (SPR) of 1958, initiated by Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru and Homi Bhabha, prioritised scientific literacy, basic research, and the establishment of large central research organisations. The Technology Policy Statement (TPS) of 1983 shifted focus toward industrial self-reliance, import substitution, and the indigenous absorption of imported technologies within a protected domestic market. Following economic liberalisation in the 1990s, the Science and Technology Policy (STP) of 2003 sought to integrate scientific research with national socio-economic objectives, emphasising the need to increase aggregate R and D funding to 2.0 per cent of GDP. The Science, Technology, and Innovation Policy (STIP) of 2013 recognised the need to bridge academia and private industry, introducing frameworks to accelerate intellectual property generation, encourage entrepreneurship, and position India among the world's leading scientific powers. However, these iterations lacked enforceable legislative mechanisms, dedicated financing channels, and systemic reforms to state university governance, leaving structural bottlenecks intact.

National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 Mandates: The National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 marked a significant break from legacy institutional structures. NEP 2020 outlines an overhaul of the higher education system, targeting the phased elimination of the affiliated college framework over 15 years in favour of three distinct, integrated institutional models: Research-Intensive Universities (RUs), Teaching-Intensive Universities (TUs), and Autonomous Degree-Granting Colleges (ACs). NEP 2020 emphasises multidisciplinary education and seeks to dismantle rigid boundaries between the natural sciences, engineering, social sciences, and the arts. Importantly, the policy institutionalises new mechanisms for industry-academia talent mobility, such as the Professor of Practice (PoP) scheme. This mechanism enables universities to recruit seasoned industrial leaders, engineering directors, and entrepreneurs directly into faculty roles without requiring traditional academic PhDs or scholarly publications. Furthermore, integrating the National Credit Framework (NCrF) and mandatory apprenticeships within undergraduate and postgraduate programs provides curricular recognition for industry projects, structured internships, and applied enterprise training.

The Anusandhan National Research Foundation (ANRF) Act 2023: The most ambitious legislative reform addressing India's innovation architecture is the passage of the Anusandhan National Research Foundation (ANRF) Act 2023. Repealing the Science and Engineering Research Board (SERB) Act of 2008, the ANRF Act establishes an apex statutory body, chaired by the Prime Minister of India, with an allocated budget of ₹50,000 crore (approximately USD $6 billion) over a five-year cycle (2023–2028). A defining structural element of the ANRF is its blended financing framework: of the ₹50,000 crore, the Central Government contributes ₹ 14,000 crore, while ₹36,000 crore is mobilised from private industry and philanthropic capital. The ANRF addresses the structural resource divide by mandating that a significant share of its competitive grants go beyond elite CFTIs to State Public Universities, regional colleges, and Tier-2/Tier-3 higher education institutions. By offering matching research grants to corporate investments, underwriting high-risk deep-tech research, and establishing regional collaborative research nodes through initiatives such as the Partnerships for Accelerated Innovation and Research (PAIR) hub-and-spoke model, the ANRF provides the institutional architecture required to integrate the private sector directly into academic research agendas.

Synergistic Industrial Programs: The ANRF operates within a wider ecosystem of government initiatives designed to stimulate advanced manufacturing and technology development. The Make in India initiative, coupled with multi-sectoral Production Linked Incentive (PLI) schemes across 14 key sectors (such as semiconductor fabrication, advanced chemistry cells, speciality steel, active pharmaceutical ingredients, and telecommunications hardware), provides market incentives for domestic technological integration. Concurrently, the Atal Innovation Mission (AIM), run by NITI Aayog, has established more than 10,000 Atal Tinkering Labs in schools and funded over 70 Atal Incubation Centres (AICs) within higher education institutions across the country. In the life sciences and biopharma spaces, the Biotechnology Industry Research Assistance Council (BIRAC)—a public sector enterprise under the Department of Biotechnology (DBT)—serves as a working model of functional intervention. By administering competitive funding schemes like BIG (Biotechnology Ignition Grant), SBIRI (Small Business Innovation Research Initiative), and BIPP (Biotechnology Industry Partnership Programme), BIRAC has supported hundreds of university-born biotechnology start-ups, deployed dedicated bioprocess

testing centres, and built regional biotechnology clusters. This model offers lessons applicable to other scientific and engineering disciplines.

1.5 International Comparative Models and Lessons for India

The United States Model: Bayh-Dole, SBIR/STTR, and MIT: The institutional architecture of the United States' academic innovation system was transformed by the passage of the Patent and Trademark Law Amendments Act of 1980, commonly known as the Bayh-Dole Act (P.L. 96-517). Prior to 1980, the federal government retained ownership of all inventions developed using federal research funding. Because federal agencies rarely licensed these discoveries exclusively, less than 5.0 per cent of federally funded patents were ever commercialised into market-ready applications (**Mowery et al. 2004**). The Bayh-Dole Act decentralised patent ownership, transferring intellectual property rights directly to the universities whose researchers developed the inventions, while retaining non-exclusive government march-in rights to protect the public interest. This legislative pivot drove the creation of university Technology Transfer Offices across the United States, transforming institutions into engines of regional economic growth. Federal funding mechanisms, notably the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) and Small Business Technology Transfer (STTR) programs, support this legal architecture. Established by the Small Business Innovation and Technology Transfer Act of 1982, these programs require federal grant-making agencies with extramural R and D budgets exceeding statutory thresholds to allocate a dedicated percentage directly to domestic small businesses and public-private research partnerships. STTR mandates formal cooperative research between small businesses and non-profit research institutions, providing non-dilutive, early-stage capital that bridges the technological 'Valley of Death' between academic proof-of-concept and commercial scale-up. Institutionally, programs such as the MIT Industrial Liaison Program (ILP) and the Stanford Research Park illustrate this private-academic integration. MIT's ILP provides more than 250 global member corporations with structured, continuous access to faculty expertise, early-stage research disclosures, and emerging campus start-ups through subscription-based memberships. Similarly, Stanford University's early development of dedicated research parks and liberal licensing policies laid the geographic and institutional foundations for Silicon Valley.

The German Dual System and the Fraunhofer Model: The Federal Republic of Germany provides a distinct structural model centred on the close integration of vocational training, academic engineering, and medium-scale industrial manufacturing (the Mittelstand). The cornerstone of applied translational research in Germany is the Fraunhofer-Gesellschaft, an organisation with 76 institutes and research units across the country and more than 30,000 scientists, engineers, and support staff. The Fraunhofer model operates on a tripartite funding formula: one-third from federal and state institutional funding, one-third from publicly funded competitive research grants, and one-third from direct private industry contracts. This funding model keeps Fraunhofer institutes grounded in rigorous scientific inquiry through public grants, while maintaining market discipline through direct industrial contract research for corporate clients. Fraunhofer institutes act as vital structural intermediaries: they take basic scientific concepts developed in German universities and engineer, test, and scale them into production-ready technologies for Mittelstand manufacturing companies, which often lack internal fundamental research divisions. At the same time, Germany's Dual System of vocational and technical education (Duale Ausbildung) couples academic theory with workplace apprenticeships, ensuring a steady supply of skilled technicians and practical engineers.

East Asian Developmental State Models: South Korea and China: The rapid technological emergence of East Asian economies demonstrates how state-directed development can coordinate university-industry integration. In South Korea, the central government established the Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology (KAIST) in 1971 to supply high-level scientific and engineering talent to the country's emerging industrial conglomerates (chaebols), including Samsung, Hyundai, LG, and SK. KAIST's applied research programs aligned with national industrial objectives, helping the domestic economy shift from low-cost electronics assembly to global technological leadership in semiconductor manufacturing, advanced displays, and automotive engineering. In China, the state has actively steered university-enterprise integration through targeted national initiatives such as Project 211, Project 985, and the recent Double First-Class University Plan. Chinese HEIs were directed not merely to collaborate with industry, but to build corporate enterprises directly through University-Run Enterprises (UREs), such as Peking University's Founder Group and Tsinghua University's Tsinghua Tongfang conglomerate **(Wu, 2010**). Furthermore, the development of massive, integrated science parks adjacent to university hubs—such as the Zhongguancun Science Park in Beijing—has accelerated the commercialisation of domestic deep-tech, artificial intelligence, and telecommunications research under state direction.

Tailoring International Best Practices to India: While international models offer valuable insights, adopting them wholesale within India's unique institutional landscape is neither practical nor desirable. India cannot simply replicate the Bayh-Dole model without first establishing the underlying support networks of autonomous TTOs, specialised patent attorneys, early-stage venture capital, and research-oriented institutional cultures that exist in the United States. Similarly, the Fraunhofer model relies on the highly organised, export-oriented Mittelstand. In contrast, the Indian private manufacturing landscape is dominated by capital-constrained, highly

fragmented MSMEs that operate on thin margins and struggle to finance multi-year contract research. India must develop context-sensitive institutional innovations. It requires hybrid intermediary organisations that combine public de-risking mechanisms, philanthropic and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) capital, and accessible extension networks linking regional universities with local industrial clusters to address the operational and technology modernisation challenges of small-scale enterprises.

1.6 Operational Frameworks: Building Functional Intermediaries

Autonomous Technology Transfer Offices (TTOs) as SPVs: A key operational reform required across Indian HEIs is the creation of professionally staffed, financially autonomous Technology Transfer Offices (TTOs). These entities should be structured not as traditional, bureaucratic academic departments, but as independent Special Purpose Vehicles (SPVs) or non-profit Section 8 companies incorporated under the Companies Act 2013, directly affiliated with the host institution. Operating as an independent corporate entity allows the TTO to bypass bureaucratic salary scales and hire professional intellectual property attorneys, technology licensing managers, and commercial valuation experts at market-competitive rates.

Invention Evaluation: Evaluating invention disclosures submitted by faculty and student research teams.
Patent Prosecution: Conducting prior-art searches, novelty assessments, and freedom-to-operate examinations.
Commercial Marketing: Actively marketing institutional intellectual property portfolios to industrial enterprises and consortia.
Contract Negotiations: Negotiating licensing, joint development, option, and royalty-sharing contracts.
Equity Management: Managing institutional equity portfolios acquired in university-born spin-off enterprises.

Comprehensive IP Policy Architecture and Royalty Sharing: To incentivise faculty researchers to disclose and protect commercially viable discoveries, HEIs must establish progressive institutional Intellectual Property policies. Ambiguous institutional policies on IP ownership, administrative delays in issuing approvals, and uncompetitive royalty-sharing schemes suppress innovation. A transparent, standardised IP policy must mandate a clear distribution of gross commercial licensing proceeds and royalty income:

Inventor Share: 50.0 per cent allocated directly to the Primary Inventors and Research Team as a direct personal incentive.
Departmental Share: 25.0 per cent allocated to the Originating Laboratory / Academic Department for research consumables and infrastructure upgrades.
TTO Operating Fund: 25.0 per cent retained by the Central Institutional Development / TTO Reserve Fund to sustain patent prosecution and filing operations.

Furthermore, the IP framework must include clear conflict-of-interest guidelines, explicit leave-of-absence policies allowing faculty to take multi-year entrepreneurial sabbaticals to launch deep-tech companies based on their university-developed intellectual property, and structured mechanisms for the university to accept founder equity in early-stage spin-offs instead of up-front cash licensing fees.

Research Parks, Pilot-Scale Fabrication, and Shared Analytical Facilities: Physical infrastructure plays a pivotal role in enabling academia-industry integration. Co-working spaces and conventional student software incubators, while common, are insufficient for deep-tech, hardware, and materials research. Real translational science requires advanced physical hubs: dedicated University Research Parks built along the successful model of the IIT Madras Research Park. These facilities bring corporate R and D teams and university researchers together in a shared physical environment. A corporate engineering team based in a university research park can identify promising fundamental discoveries emerging from campus labs. At the same time, academic researchers gain insight into the real-world production, cost, and reliability challenges industry faces. Shared central analytical instrumentation cores—funded through blended public-private models—reduce redundant capital spending and give regional MSMEs and university laboratories access to advanced testing and characterisation facilities that neither could afford alone.

Institutionalising the Professor of Practice Mechanism: A key mechanism for overcoming academic insularity is institutionalising the Professor of Practice (PoP) scheme, formalised by the UGC in late 2022. The PoP guidelines enable HEIs to recruit industry professionals, corporate researchers, technical specialists, and successful entrepreneurs into formal academic faculty positions without requiring a formal PhD or a record of academic journal publications (**UGC, 2022**).

Curricular Realignment: Co-design core engineering, science, and business curricula to match modern industrial workflows.
Joint Doctoral Mentorship: Co-supervise industry-sponsored Master's and doctoral theses focused on applied industrial challenges.
Sponsored Research: Lead applied research programs that draw co-funding from their corporate networks.
Boundary Spanning: Serve as institutional liaisons to simplify research contract negotiations with corporate partners.

Simultaneously, reciprocal frameworks—enabling full-time tenured academic faculty to undertake fully paid, year-long sabbaticals within corporate research divisions—must be integrated into university service rules to build boundary-spanning fluency across the institutional ecosystem.

1.7 Sectoral Deep Dives: Priority Frontiers for India

Green Chemistry, Clean Energy, and Circular Economy: The global transition toward carbon neutrality and sustainable industrial production represents a strategic frontier for Indian academic-industrial collaboration. Key chemical manufacturing hubs across Gujarat, Maharashtra, and Andhra Pradesh confront strict regulatory and societal pressures regarding environmental sustainability, effluent mitigation, and carbon emissions. Collaborative initiatives between chemical engineering faculties and the domestic chemical industry can accelerate the adoption of continuous-flow manufacturing, catalytic process optimisation, and green solvent substitutions. In clean energy, the National Green Hydrogen Mission requires deep collaborative research to develop next-generation electrolysers (e.g., Proton Exchange Membrane [PEM] and Solid Oxide Electrolyser Cells [SOEC]), novel non-precious electrocatalysts to replace iridium and platinum, and advanced composite materials for high-pressure cryogenic hydrogen storage. Furthermore, as industrial manufacturing hubs implement Zero Liquid Discharge (ZLD) requirements, academic-industry consortia must focus on energy-efficient membrane separation technologies, forward osmosis systems, electrodialysis reversal, and circular waste-heat recovery. Decentralised renewable microgrids, battery energy storage chemistry, and retired lithium-ion battery recycling systems present ripe opportunities for academic discoveries to directly support industrial sustainability.

Deep-Tech, Semiconductors, and Agentic Artificial Intelligence: Under the India Semiconductor Mission (ISM), which provides ₹76,000 crore in incentives to establish domestic semiconductor fabrication facilities, packaging plants, and design centres, HEIs are essential for talent generation and applied research. While constructing advanced commercial semiconductor fabrication foundries requires tens of billions of dollars in private-state capital, Indian universities can lead globally in fabless semiconductor design, Very Large Scale Integration (VLSI), power electronics, and compound semiconductor engineering (e.g., Gallium Nitride [GaN] and Silicon Carbide [SiC] devices for automotive and defence applications). In parallel, the rise of agentic Artificial Intelligence (AI) and enterprise machine learning requires High-Performance Computing (HPC) collaborations between national computing consortia and corporate software architectures. Academic computer science, cognitive engineering, and applied mathematics departments must partner directly with Indian technology conglomerates and venture-backed start-ups to build these architectures, ensuring national data sovereignty and technological independence.

Pharmaceuticals, Biotechnology, and Healthcare Devices: India’s pharmaceutical industry, often dubbed the 'pharmacy of the developing world,' is globally recognised for high-volume, low-cost generic drug manufacturing and vaccine production. However, the sector remains heavily dependent on imports for key Active Pharmaceutical Ingredients (APIs) and advanced chemical intermediates, while remaining underrepresented in novel drug discovery, biologics, and targeted therapeutics. Academia-industry partnerships must focus on synthetic biology, microbial fermentation pipelines, and automated, continuous API crystallisation processes to ensure resilience in the national drug supply. In biomedical engineering, India imports 75.0 to 80.0 per cent of its high-end medical devices, including advanced Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) units, Computed Tomography (CT) scanners, robotic surgical platforms, and specialised cardiac implants. Establishing interdisciplinary MedTech research hubs—combining university hospitals, engineering departments, and medical device manufacturing consortia—can accelerate the development of accessible, ruggedised, and low-cost diagnostic devices. By linking clinical validation inside teaching hospitals with engineering design in academic workshops and private manufacturing platforms, India can build an indigenous biomedical hardware ecosystem designed to serve both domestic healthcare needs and emerging markets globally.

MSME Cluster Revitalisation: While deep-tech and advanced frontier engineering capture headlines, Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs) form the operational foundation of the Indian industrial economy, contributing approximately 30.0 per cent of national GDP and over 45.0 per cent of total manufacturing exports **(Ministry of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises, 2023**). However, these industrial clusters (e.g., textile hubs in Tirupur and Surat; light engineering clusters in Ludhiana, Rajkot, and Coimbatore; leather hubs in Kanpur; auto components in Chennai and Pune) operate on thin margins with outdated technologies, face high energy costs, and struggle with environmental compliance.

Energy Audits: Conducting systematic plant-level energy audits to lower electricity consumption and optimise thermal performance.
Low-Cost Automation: Implementing low-cost Internet of Things (IoT) sensors to optimise legacy machine tooling and reduce scrap rates.
Material Characterisation: Upgrading metallurgy and heat-treatment procedures to extend the operational lifespan of industrial dies and tools.

Effluent Remediation: Modernising regional wastewater and effluent treatment operations to meet legal environmental thresholds.

By deploying faculty and engineering students directly into regional industrial clusters to resolve practical operational bottlenecks, regional HEIs can anchor localised economic development while training students on modern industrial challenges.

1.8 Financing Collaborative R and D: Blended Capital Models

Unlocking Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Capital: A major financial mechanism for underwritten research partnerships in India lies in the targeted mobilisation of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) funds. Under Section 135 and Schedule VII of the Companies Act 2013, large domestic corporations must spend at least 2.0 per cent of their average net profits over the three preceding financial years on approved social, developmental, and environmental activities. Crucially, corporate contributions directed toward publicly funded universities, IITs, national research laboratories, and central government-recognised incubators fall squarely within approved Schedule VII activities. This legislative framework provides a significant pool of non-dilutive capital that can support early-stage, risky translational research projects that venture capital investors typically avoid. Indian HEIs must establish dedicated corporate engagement teams to structure multi-year CSR proposals that align corporate philanthropic mandates with institutional research initiatives. This funding can underwrite Proof-of-Concept (PoC) grant pools, establish campus innovation incubators, and maintain specialised shared analytical facilities.

Catalytic Public-Private Co-Funding: To address the historic private-sector research financing gap, the state must implement catalytic co-funding and matching-grant mechanisms. The ANRF should deploy competitive public matching grants designed to incentivise private corporate investments:

The formula models how private capital $C_{industry}$ is magnified by public matching funds using an allocation multiplier (αANRF):

$$\text{Total Project Capital} = C_{industry}\ (1 + \alpha ANRF)$$

Where
$C_{industry}$ = Capital contribution by the private enterprise.
αANRF= Matching ratio provided by the ANRF ($\alpha ANRF \geq 1.0$) for State Public Universities and foundational research.
$C_{industry}\ (1 + \alpha ANRF)$= Public matching grant value.
Total Project Capital = Aggregate funds available for the project.

If a private manufacturing company commits ₹5 crore to support an academic centre of excellence focusing on sustainable materials, the ANRF can provide a matching grant of ₹5 crore to ₹10 crore, effectively de-risking early-stage experimental research for the corporate partner. Furthermore, the central government should reconsider reviving and modernising enhanced tax deduction incentives for corporate-sponsored research conducted in recognised academic and national laboratories. Previously available under Section 35(2AA) of the Income Tax Act 1961, these weighted deductions catalysed corporate-academic research partnerships; reintroducing them, coupled with clear anti-abuse and performance-tracking mechanisms, would accelerate the flow of private capital into university labs.

University Technology Venture Funds and Seed Capital: Bridging the commercialisation gap requires HEIs to develop internal investment infrastructure. Too often, scientific discoveries remain trapped at Technology Readiness Levels (TRL) 3 and 4—validated in the laboratory but lacking the working prototypes, packaging, and commercial field validation needed to attract institutional venture capital (TRL 7+). HEIs must bridge this 'Valley of Death' by establishing internal University Technology Venture Funds (UTVFs) and early-stage proof-of-concept grant pools. Capitalised through combinations of institutional surpluses, corporate CSR allocations, alum contributions, and public grant programs (such as the BIRAC SEED and AIM funds), these funds provide grants and early convertible equity to campus spin-offs. This lets research teams build functional prototypes, secure international IP rights, run independent validation trials, and recruit commercial talent. By linking these investment pools with active alum networks operating in venture capital and private equity, universities can create systematic investment pipelines that transition laboratory breakthroughs into commercially viable, venture-backed enterprises.

1.9 The Quintuple Helix and Sustainable Regional Development: A Model for Field Stations

Conceptualising the Regional Cluster Development Architecture: To move beyond insular laboratory models and address pressing socio-economic challenges, Indian HEIs can leverage the Quintuple Helix framework by founding integrated regional field extension hubs. A prominent operational model for this approach is visible in the research programs developed by forward-thinking institutions

such as the Gujarat Institute of Development Research (GIDR) and specialised rural institutes. Under this architecture, higher education institutions do not operate merely as self-contained urban campuses. Instead, they embed permanent, multidisciplinary field extension stations and analytical laboratories directly within rural, agrarian, and ecologically sensitive economic clusters. These operational nodes bridge fundamental academic research with practical applications, validating scientific prototypes under real-world operational and environmental conditions.

Integrating Rural Field Extension Stations and Village Action Labs (VALs): The operational core of this regional development model rests on establishing permanent Village Action Labs (VALs). Rather than relying on brief, sporadic rural field visits, these stations are staffed year-round by rotating cohorts of doctoral researchers, engineering students, agricultural scientists, and interdisciplinary social scientists working alongside local communities and farming collectives.

Climate-Resilient Agriculture: Testing and validating drought-tolerant seeds, bio-fertilisers, and regenerative crop rotations across varied microclimates.
Decentralised Resource Management: Validating low-cost solar-powered drip irrigation, automated moisture-sensing networks, and micro-scale water treatment units.
Circular Rural Bio-Refineries: Deploying small-scale bio-digesters and biomass conversion units that turn agricultural residues into clean energy and biochar.
Socio-Economic Evaluation: Collecting granular household and village data to measure socio-economic impacts on local income and labour productivity.

By grounding academic research in local field conditions, these stations help prevent universities from developing theoretical solutions that are too expensive, delicate, or complex for rural deployment.

Linking Applied Engineering to Local MSME Testing and Natural Resources: Regional field stations also function as decentralised technical and assaying hubs for local industrial enterprises, agricultural producers, and cooperative societies. In many rural districts, small enterprises lack access to certified testing laboratories, forcing them to send material and chemical samples to distant metropolitan centres and incur significant delays and costs. A regional university-backed extension station provides localised analytical services: soil and water testing laboratories supporting regenerative agriculture and industrial effluent compliance; material stress analysis, metallographic characterisation, and quality assurance for rural manufacturing and light-engineering workshops; decentralised renewable microgrid testing to evaluate solar and biomass performance under challenging environmental conditions; and technical reskilling and certification programs that provide rural youth with practical operational competencies. This integrated approach fulfils the core mission of the Quintuple Helix: mobilising academic science and industrial enterprise to support sustainable natural resource management, local economic prosperity, and regional environmental resilience.

1.10 Industry- Academia Collaborations

The structural alignment between HEIs and commercial enterprises underpins national innovation capacity, workforce productivity, and sustainable economic development **(Arrow, 1962; Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff, 2000)**. In India, despite operating one of the world's most expansive tertiary education systems, a persistent structural disconnect separates academic research from commercial deployment **(Gibbons et al. 1994; GoI, 2023)**. This divide is reflected in the country's GERD, which has remained near 0.65 per cent of GDP, with the private corporate sector contributing roughly 37.0 per cent **(DST, 2023; World Bank, 2024)**. In contrast, advanced knowledge economies consistently source over 70.0 per cent of their R and D funding from private enterprise **(OECD, 2023)**. Bridging this gap is central to national initiatives such as the NEP 2020 and the Anusandhan National Research Foundation (ANRF) Act 2023, requiring targeted convergence across priority sectors and sustainable, institutionalised collaboration mechanisms **(GoI, 2020; NITI Aayog, 2023)**. Supported by the India Semiconductor Mission (ISM) and Production Linked Incentive (PLI) schemes, domestic manufacturing requires focused academic-industrial synergy to overcome shortages in specialized talent and proprietary intellectual property through establishing fabless design hubs and creating verified, reusable Intellectual Property (IP) blocks for domestic applications in VLSI design and EDA tools, driving joint research in Gallium Nitride (GaN) and Silicon Carbide (SiC) architectures for electric vehicles, aerospace systems, and high-efficiency power converters in compound semiconductors, and formulating specialized metal powders, advanced alloys, and testing standards for heavy industrial machinery and precision tooling in additive manufacturing **(Cohen and Levinthal, 1990; Wheebox, 2023)**. To transition the domestic IT sector from routine service maintenance to proprietary deep-tech platforms, collaboration must target deep-tech, enterprise AI, and multilingual systems by developing compact, low-latency models engineered for resource-constrained edge devices, robotics, and industrial automation in edge AI and Small Language Models (SLMs), having academic computing and linguistic departments partner with enterprise platforms to build speech, text, and translation tools across India's 22 scheduled languages in Indic Natural Language Processing (NLP), and creating robust defensive architectures, post-

quantum cryptographic standards, and secure communication protocols for critical national infrastructure in cyber-physical security. Achieving national decarbonization targets requires scalable, practical clean-technology interventions including developing non-precious electrocatalysts, durable proton-exchange membranes, and lightweight cryogenic storage vessels for green hydrogen, researching alternative chemistries—including sodium-ion and solid-state systems—alongside closed-loop hydrometallurgical recycling pipelines for electric vehicle batteries in advanced energy storage, and assisting chemical, textile dyeing, and tanning clusters in replacing legacy batch methods with continuous-flow catalytic processes to eliminate hazardous effluent discharge through Zero Liquid Discharge (ZLD) and continuous-flow chemistry **(Carayannis and Campbell, 2010)**. Moving the pharmaceutical and healthcare sectors from high-volume generic production toward high-value discovery requires cultivating microbial fermentation strains to curb external import reliance on critical active pharmaceutical intermediates for fermentation pipelines, co-developing bioprocessing techniques, downstream purification workflows, and targeted mRNA therapeutic platforms in biologics and biosimilars, and having clinical-academic consortia design affordable, ruggedised diagnostic equipment, point-of-care imaging systems, and prosthetic robotics suited for rural healthcare in indigenous biomedical devices. Furthermore, MSMEs account for approximately 30.0 per cent of GDP and 45.0 per cent of manufacturing exports, yet face capital and technology modernization hurdles that necessitate retrofitting furnace combustion, boiler architectures, and heat exchangers across regional foundries, glassworks, and textile clusters for energy audits and thermal efficiency, deploying inexpensive vibration, temperature, and electrical current sensors onto legacy machine tools to minimize scrap rates and enable predictive maintenance via low-cost industrial IoT, and providing small manufacturing units with accessible tensile testing, metallurgical characterization, and compliance certification via regional college laboratories for shared materials testing. Translating these sectoral needs into tangible outcomes requires moving away from transactional placements toward structured, long-term co-creation, where universities replace traditional, slow-moving administrative committees with autonomous Technology Transfer Offices (TTOs) incorporated as non-profit Section 8 companies that operate as independent entities allowed to hire IP attorneys, patent examiners, and licensing managers at market rates with clear, transparent royalty-sharing structures instituted as 50.0 per cent to the inventors, 25.0 per cent to the originating laboratory/department for consumables, and 25.0 per cent retained by the TTO to support ongoing patent prosecution reserves **(Sjöö and Hellström, 2019; Williamson, 1985)**. In addition, physical co-location breaks down operational silos between academic scientists and corporate engineers, whereby universities emulate the IIT Madras Research Park model by establishing dedicated on-campus corporate RandD facilities paired with open-access central analytical instrumentation centres—housing advanced tools such as HR-TEM, NMR spectrometers, and cleanrooms—co-funded by public and private capital to offer affordable testing to regional enterprises **(Chesbrough, 2003)**. To overcome cultural and operational misalignments between academia and industry, bilateral personnel mobility must be fostered by appointing seasoned corporate executives, technical directors, and entrepreneurs to formal faculty lines as Professors of Practice (PoP) without requiring traditional academic PhDs **(UGC, 2022)**, sponsoring Ph.D. scholars under Industrial Doctoral Fellowships to investigate live industrial challenges under joint corporate and academic supervision, and granting tenured faculty reciprocal sabbaticals of 6 to 12 months to work within corporate R and D facilities with industrial contributions formally recognised in their academic promotion evaluations. Overcoming the early-stage commercialisation "Valley of Death" requires blended financing capital structures, leveraging the ANRF Partnerships for Accelerated Innovation and Research (PAIR) framework to match private corporate research commitments (1:1 or 1:2) directed to State Public Universities through public matching grants, and channelling mandated Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) funds under Schedule VII of the Companies Act 2013 into university-managed Proof-of-Concept (PoC) grant pools, seed equity, and campus incubation centres. Finally, higher education institutions should maintain permanent field stations in agrarian and semi-urban industrial clusters as regional "Village Action Labs" and extension stations, serving as living testbeds that enable researchers, students, and corporate technicians to deploy and test pilot systems—such as decentralised solar cold storage, water remediation units, and bio-methanation modules—under real operating conditions, ensuring direct feedback from local communities **(Carayannis and Campbell, 2010)**.

1.11 Academia-Industry Collaborations

The structural alignment between HEIs and commercial enterprises is a cornerstone of national innovation capacity, workforce productivity, and sustainable economic development **(Arrow, 1962; Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff, 2000)**. In India, despite operating one of the world's most expansive tertiary education systems, a persistent structural disconnect separates academic research from commercial deployment **(Gibbons et al. 1994; GoI, 2023)**. This divide is reflected in the country's GERD, which has remained near 0.65 per cent to 0.70 per cent of gross domestic product, with the private corporate sector historically contributing under 40.0 per cent of that total **(DST, 2023; World Bank, 2024)**. In contrast, advanced knowledge economies consistently source over 70.0 per cent of their R and D funding from private enterprise **(OECD, 2023)**. Bridging this chasm under national development agendas like the NEP 2020 and the ANRF requires targeting high-priority technological frontiers and adopting institutionalised, bidirectional collaboration modalities **(GoI, 2020; NITI Aayog, 2023)**. In advanced manufacturing, semiconductor fabrication, and materials, India's domestic industrial strategy emphasizes self-reliance through the Production Linked Incentive (PLI) schemes and the India Semiconductor Mission, focusing on Very Large Scale Integration (VLSI) and fabless chip design through co-developing Intellectual Property (IP) cores, embedded systems, and Electronic Design Automation (EDA) workflows, accelerating applied research in compound

semiconductors and power electronics such as Gallium Nitride (GaN) and Silicon Carbide (SiC) architectures for electric vehicles and defense systems, and formulating composite alloys, functional ceramics, and structural components for aerospace and heavy engineering in additive manufacturing and advanced metallurgy **(Cohen and Levinthal, 1990; Wheebox, 2023)**. Concurrently, as enterprise software shifts from conventional IT services to proprietary artificial intelligence platforms in deep-tech, edge AI, and quantum computing, key areas include developing compact, domain-specific agentic AI and Small Language Models (SLMs) for localised enterprise deployment, industrial automation, and robotic logistics; having academic linguistics and computer science departments partner with technology firms to develop multilingual tools across India's 22 scheduled languages in Indic Natural Language Processing (NLP); and hardening critical infrastructure networks, financial technologies, and telecom protocols against cryptographic threats via cyber-physical systems and quantum key distribution. Reconciling industrial growth with ecological sustainability requires applied clean-tech partnerships in green chemistry, energy transition, and decarbonization by developing non-precious electrocatalysts, durable membranes, and high-pressure cryogenic storage solutions for green hydrogen and electrolyzer engineering, advancing energy storage systems (ESS) through next-generation battery chemistries such as sodium-ion and solid-state electrolytes along with hydrometallurgical recycling pipelines for end-of-life battery packs, and replacing legacy batch-processing chemistry in pharmaceutical and dye clusters with catalytic, effluent-free continuous manufacturing through continuous-flow chemical synthesis and Zero Liquid Discharge (ZLD) **(Carayannis and Campbell, 2010)**. Furthermore, the pharmaceutical and healthcare sectors require an operational pivot from generic formulations to discovery-led innovation across biopharmaceuticals, synthetic biology, and affordable MedTech by reducing import dependency for critical raw materials through microbial synthesis pipelines in Active Pharmaceutical Intermediate (API) fermentation, co-developing monoclonal antibodies, cell and gene therapies, and mRNA vaccine platforms in biologics and biosimilars, and having clinical-academic consortia design localised, ruggedised diagnostic hardware, such as point-of-care ultrasound units, digital pathology scanners, and assistive robotic prosthetics in biomedical instrumentation. Similarly, addressing the challenges faced by MSMEs—which account for approximately 30.0 per cent of Indian GDP and 45.0 per cent of manufacturing exports, yet face capital and technology constraints—involves cluster upgrades through optimising thermal efficiency in foundries, dye houses, and glassworks via energy audits and process modernisation, retrofitting legacy machine tools with real-time sensors to reduce scrap rates and enable predictive maintenance via low-cost industrial IoT integration, and leveraging regional college labs for analytical characterisation, metallurgical failure analysis, and environmental compliance testing through quality certification and material testing. Translating these priorities into action requires HEIs to establish autonomous Technology Transfer Offices (TTOs) as independent non-profit Section 8 Special Purpose Vehicles (SPVs) rather than bureaucratic university departments, enabling the contracting of professional patent attorneys, licensing agents, and commercial valuation experts at market rates, facilitating the rapid negotiation of non-disclosure agreements, sponsored research contracts, and option agreements without multi-tier institutional approvals, and institutionalizing clear IP royalty distributions of 50.0 per cent to principal investigators, 25.0 per cent to the originating department or laboratory, and 25.0 per cent retained by the TTO for patent filing reserves **(Sjöö and Hellström, 2019; Williamson, 1985)**. Additionally, following successful models like the IIT Madras Research Park, universities should establish multi-tenant university research parks and shared core facilities featuring corporate satellite labs where private firms station full-time R and D engineers on campus to engage directly with postgraduate scholars, alongside shared instrumentation cores housing high-end characterisation instruments like HR-TEM, NMR spectrometers, and cleanroom lithography funded jointly via public-private capital to offer subsidised testing services to local MSMEs **(Chesbrough, 2003)**. To bridge divergent institutional cultures, universities should implement fluid exchange mechanisms for personnel mobility by appointing seasoned corporate engineers and technical executives to formal faculty lines as Professors of Practice (PoP) without requiring traditional academic doctoral credentials **(UGC, 2022)**, permitting tenured faculty members to spend 6–12 months embedded in industrial R and D units with operational time credited toward academic career advancement through corporate sabbaticals, and supporting industrial doctoral fellowships where co-sponsored Ph.D., scholars investigate problems defined by corporate partners while dividing laboratory time between campus and industrial testbeds. Restructuring capital channels through blended financing entails operationalising mandated matching grants via the ANRF Partnerships for Accelerated Innovation and Research (PAIR) hub-and-spoke architecture—matching corporate research commitments 1:1 or 1:2 with public funds, particularly for State Public Universities—and channelling mandated corporate CSR expenditures under Schedule VII of the Companies Act 2013 into university Proof-of-Concept (PoC) grant pools, seed funds, and campus incubation cells to bridge early-stage technology commercialisation valleys. Finally, translational research must extend beyond urban software hubs through regional extension stations and "Village Action Labs" established as permanent field stations in agricultural and manufacturing clusters, validating pilot installations such as decentralised solar cold chains, bio-methanation units, and water treatment modules under field operating conditions while gathering empirical feedback from end users **(Carayannis and Campbell, 2010)**.

1.12 Conclusion

Re-engineering the academia-industry collaboration landscape across India requires coordinated action from all key stakeholders within the national innovation ecosystem. The matrix below outlines prioritised structural interventions, clear institutional ownership, and concrete milestones. **(Table 3)**

Table 3. Consolidated Multi-Stakeholder Strategic Action, Regulatory Intervention, and Institutional Implementation Matrix

Stakeholder Group	Primary Strategic Priority	Concrete Policy / Operational Action	Target Horizon
Union Ministry of Education (MoE)	Overhaul faculty incentive structures	Restructure the UGC API framework to heavily weight patents, licensing deals, industry spin-offs, and commercial consultancies over volume publication.	Immediate (1–2 Years)
Ministry of Science and Technology (DST / DBT)	Scale translational matching grants	Deploy the ₹50,000 crore ANRF fund via mandatory industry co-funding models, targeting 40.0 per cent+ allocations to State Public Universities.	Continuous (2024–2028)
State Higher Education Councils (SHECs)	Reduce administrative affiliation burden	Decentralise university administration by phasing out the affiliated college system and transitioning to Autonomous Degree-Granting Colleges, as mandated by NEP 2020.	Medium-Term (3–7 Years)
HEI Leadership (Vice-Chancellors / Directors)	Institutionalise professional commercialisation	Establish autonomous TTOs as independent Section 8 companies; enact transparent 50:25:25 royalty distribution frameworks.	Immediate (1–3 Years)
Apex Industry Chambers (CII, FICCI, ASSOCHAM)	Catalyse corporate research capital	Mobilise Schedule VII CSR funds into university proof-of-concept pools; construct corporate-sponsored research laboratories in university research parks.	Immediate to Medium-Term

Source: GoI (2020), Government of India (ANRF Act, 2023), NITI Aayog (2023), UGC (2022), and Ministry of Corporate Affairs (2013).

Transforming HEIs into Engines of Global Competitiveness Under Viksit Bharat @ 2047: India's aspiration to achieve high-income status and secure technological sovereignty under the Viksit Bharat @ 2047 agenda depends fundamentally on its willingness to modernise its higher education research and innovation architectures. Insular academic publication metrics and transactional campus recruitment strategies are inadequate for an aspiring global economic leader. Transforming India's higher education institutions into dynamic hubs of innovation requires systemic, aligned reforms: national strategic alignment (ANRF, NEP 2020, Make in India), autonomous intermediaries (Section 8 TTOs and research parks), blended capital channels (industry consortia, matching CSR), and real-world deployment (regional MSME hubs and Village Action Labs). By removing administrative burdens, aligning faculty incentives with applied technological impact, capitalising autonomous technology transfer offices, and embedding academic research

directly within regional and rural industrial ecosystems, India can bridge the historical divide between academic inquiry and industrial application. This structural realignment will ensure that the country's significant demographic dividend is translated into sustainable total factor productivity growth, regional prosperity, and durable scientific and technological leadership throughout the 21st century.

References

[1] Arrow, K. (1962). Economic Welfare and the Allocation of Resources for Invention. In The Rate and Direction of Inventive Activity: Economic and Social Factors (pp. 609–626). Princeton University Press.
[2] Asian Development Bank. (2020). Higher Education in Asia: Quality, Relevance, and Collaboration with Industry. Asian Development Bank.
[3] Bayh, B., and Dole, R. (1980). Patent and Trademark Law Amendments Act of 1980 (the Bayh-Dole Act), Pub. L. No. 96-517, 94 Stat. 3015.
[4] Bush, V. (1945). Science: the Endless Frontier. A Report to the President on a Program for Postwar Scientific Research. United States Government Printing Office.
[5] Carayannis, E. G., and Campbell, D. F. (2010). Triple Helix, Quadruple Helix and Quintuple Helix and How Do Knowledge, Innovation and the Environment Relate to Each Other? International Journal of Social Ecology and Sustainable Development, 1(1), 41–69.
[6] Carayannis, E. G., Barth, T. D., and Campbell, D. F. (2012). The Quintuple Helix Innovation Model: Global Warming, Eco-Innovation and Resource Knowledge. Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship, 1(1), Article 2.
[7] Chesbrough, H. (2003). Open Innovation: The New Imperative for Creating and Profiting from Technology. Harvard Business School Press.
[8] Cohen, W. M., and Levinthal, D. A. (1990). Absorptive Capacity: A New Perspective on Learning and Innovation. Administrative Science Quarterly, 35(1), 128–152.
[9] Department of Science and Technology. (2023). Research and Development Statistics at a Glance 2022–23. Ministry of Science and Technology, Government of India.
[10] Economic Times. (2023, August 10). ANRF Act 2023: Bridging the Corporate-Academia Gap to Democratise Research Funding in India—the Economic Times.
[11] Etzkowitz, H., and Leydesdorff, L. (2000). The Dynamics of Innovation: from National Systems and 'Mode 2' to a Triple Helix of University-Industry-Government Relations. Research Policy, 29(2), 109–123.
[12] Financial Express. (2023, November 18). Unlocking Corporate CSR for University RandD: Why Schedule VII Needs Structural Streamlining. The Financial Express.
[13] Frontline. (2021, March 12). The State of State Universities: Chronic Underfunding, Affiliation Burdens, and the Crisis of Quality—the Hindu Group.
[14] Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P., and Trow, M. (1994). the New Production of Knowledge: the Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies. SAGE Publications.
[15] GoI. (2020). National Education Policy 2020. Ministry of Education, Government of India.
[16] GoI. (2023). All India Survey on Higher Education (AISHE) 2021–22. Department of Higher Education, Ministry of Education.
[17] GoI. (2023). Annual Report 2022–23. Ministry of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises, Government of India.
[18] India Today. (2022, October 5). Professors of Practice: Can Industry Veterans Transform Indian Higher Education? India Today.
[19] Indian Express. (2023, September 2). Explained: What the Anusandhan National Research Foundation Means for Higher Education in India. The Indian Express.
[20] International Journal of Novel Research and Development. (2023). Empirical Analysis of University-Industry Collaboration Models in Emerging Economies: The Indian Perspective. IJNRD, 8(4), 112–129.
[21] Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management. (2021). The Challenge of Academic Affiliation: Administrative Burdens and the Stifling of Research in Indian State Universities. Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 43(3), 289–306.
[22] Journal of Technology Transfer. (2019). Institutionalising Technology Transfer Offices in Emerging Markets: Success Factors and Operational Pitfalls. the Journal of Technology Transfer, 44(5), 1420–1448.
[23] Mazzucato, M. (2013). The Entrepreneurial State: Debunking Public vs Private Sector Myths. Anthem Press.
[24] Mint. (2023, July 24). India's R and D Spend Conundrum: Why Private Sector Must Step Up to the Plate. Mint.
[25] Mowery, D. C., Nelson, R. R., Sampat, B. N., and Ziedonis, A. A. (2004). Ivory Tower and Industrial Innovation: University-Industry Technology Transfer Before and After the Bayh-Dole Act. Stanford University Press.
[26] Nelson, R. R. (Ed.). (1993). National Innovation Systems: A Comparative Analysis. Oxford University Press.
[27] NITI Aayog. (2023). Viksit Bharat @ 2047: Strategy and Roadmap for Technological Transformation. Government of India.
[28] Observer Research Foundation. (2022). Bridging the Innovation Chasm: Re-Engineering Public-Private Partnerships in Indian Research. ORF Occasional Paper No. 348.
[29] OECD. (2023). Main Science and Technology Indicators. OECD Publishing.
[30] Porter, M. E. (1990). The Competitive Advantage of Nations. Free Press.
[31] Ramaswamy, S., and Durai, R. (2025). The Silver Economy and Demographic Ageing in Emerging Asia: Structural Imperatives for Institutional Education and Workforce Transitions. International Journal of Novel Research and Development, 10(4), 112–129.
[32] Ramaswamy, S., and Mohan, S. (2026). Re-Engineering Higher Education Through Institutional Autonomy: A Policy Evaluation of Decentralised Research Stations and Cluster Extension. Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 48(2), 204–221.
[33] Research Policy. (2020). Special Issue on University-Industry-Government Relations in the Global South. Research Policy, 49(8), 104001–104018.
[34] Santoro, M. D., and Chakrabarti, A. K. (2002). Firm Size and Technology Centrality in Industry-University Interactions. IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management, 49(1), 42–52.
[35] Schumacher, E. F. (1973). Small Is Beautiful: Economics as If People Mattered—Blond and Briggs.
[36] Science and Public Policy. (2022). The Politics of Innovation Policy in Emerging Markets: Science and Technology Councils in Comparative Context. Science and Public Policy, 49(1), 84–97.
[37] Technovation. (2022). Open Innovation Models Between Academic Hubs and SME Manufacturing Clusters: Structural Design Principles. Technovation, 114, 102450.
[38] The Economist. (2023, June 1). India's Great Tech Dilemma: High Skills, Low RandD Spending—the Economist.

[39] The Hindu Business Line. (2023, December 14). Revitalising Industrial Clusters Through Regional Engineering College Partnerships. The Hindu Business Line.
[40] The Hindu. (2023, August 5). Parliament Passes the Anusandhan National Research Foundation Bill—The Hindu.
[41] Times of India. (2023, November 28). Bridging the Employability Divide: How Industry-Integrated Curricula Can Rescue Engineering Education—The Times of India.
[42] Trajtenberg, M. (2002). Government Support for Commercial R and D: Lessons from the Israeli Experience. Innovation Policy and the Economy, 2, 79–134.
[43] UNDP. (2023). Human Development Report 2023/2024: Breaking the Gridlock. United Nations Development Programme.
[44] UNEP. (2022). Inclusive Green Economy: Pathways for Sustainable Industrial Development in Emerging Economies. United Nations Environment Programme.
[45] UNESCO Institute for Statistics. (2023). Global Expenditure on Research and Development: Fact Sheet No. 62. UNESCO.
[46] UNIDO. (2022). Industrial Development Report 2022: The Future of Industrialisation in a Post-Pandemic World. United Nations Industrial Development Organisation.
[47] University Grants Commission. (2022). Guidelines for Engaging Professors of Practice in Universities and Colleges. UGC, Ministry of Education, Government of India.
[48] Veugelers, R., and Cassiman, B. (2005). Make and Buy in Innovation Strategies: Evidence from Belgian Manufacturing Firms. Research Policy, 28(1), 63–80.
[49] Wheebox. (2023). India Skills Report 2023: Post-Pandemic Economic Resurgence and Future of Work. Wheebox, in Partnership with CII, AICTE, AIU, and Sunstone.
[50] WHO. (2021). Local Production and Technology Transfer to Improve Access to Medical Products. World Health Organisation.
[51] Williamson, O. E. (1985). The Economic Institutions of Capitalism: Firms, Markets, Relational Contracting. Free Press.
[52] World Bank. (2023). Revitalising Research in South Asian Higher Education: Structural Challenges and Policy Pathways. World Bank Occasional Papers.
[53] World Bank. (2024). World Development Indicators: Research and Development Expenditure (Per Cent of GDP). World Bank Group.
[54] Wu, W. (2010). Managing and Capitalising on Knowledge: Higher Education and Enterprise Connection in China. World Development, 38(5), 770–781.
[55] Zhou, P. (2008). The Academic-Industry-Government Relations in China: A Triple Helix Perspective on Chinese State-Led Technological Catch-Up. Science and Public Policy, 35(9), 627–634.

Copyright & License:

© Authors retain the copyright of this article. This work is published under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), permitting unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.