

IMMIND THE GAP

THE TECHNOLOGY
AND STARTUP
GAP FUNDING AND
ACCELERATOR
PROGRAM REPORT

2020

SUMMARY

PRESENTED BY

innovosource

REPORT SUMMARY

The innovation system that transitions breakthroughs in research from the lab into the marketplace is constrained by the lack of available early-stage capital and development support. This “gap” extends from where the government funding of basic research ends to where existing companies or investors are willing to accept the risk to commercialize or invest in the technology or startup. The negative result is that a large portion of economic creation and commercial potential is left unrealized because it isn’t funded and supported.

This shortage of early-stage development capital and support must be recognized and addressed as a serious threat to future innovation and associated societal benefits. Left without a solution, many promising technologies and startups will stall or struggle to develop on a path of least resistance towards a sub-optimal end.

To address this challenge, research institutions and partners have created technology and startup gap funding and accelerator support programs as a capital and innovation support mechanism. These programs are uniquely positioned to address critical elements of technology development and startup formation from research institutions.

Over the past 20 years, gap fund programs have evolved from simple vehicles for injections of money into sophisticated programs that match much-needed capital with a full suite of accelerator support programs to evaluate and develop tech and startups.

This advancement has demonstrated increased commercialization through spinouts and licenses to existing companies and the attraction of public and private capital and partnership back into early-stage innovation. Additionally, smart companies and investors are leveraging these programs for insights, future technology, and attractive opportunities through direct investment, advisory, and mentorship support.

The Mind the Gap Report, now in its fifth iteration, has tracked the evolution of translational research, proof of concept, startup, and venture gap funding programs associated with these leading research institutions over the past 15 years.

The report now includes 141 gap funding programs affiliated with 84 research institutions and details their sources and sustainability, processes and management, focus and intent, and ultimately, their impact on the innovation community and its capabilities.

Report Content

- Analysis of Early-stage Capital Continuum
- Defining and Positioning the Role of Gap Funds
- Raising and Sustaining Gap Funds
- Structuring the Gap Fund Model
- Managing the Gap Fund Process
- Defining and Benchmarking Gap Fund Impact
- Interviews with Gap Fund Leaders

Report Highlights

- 141 Gap Funds Affiliated with 84 Research Institutions
- 33 US States and Seven Countries Included
- \$557M into 6,193 Gap Funded Technologies/Startups
- \$6B in Attracted Capital to Gap Funded Projects
- 1,262 Startups Created and 11,331 New Jobs
- 739 Projects Licensed to Existing Companies
- Engaging Thousands of Faculty, Students, Entrepreneurs, Investors, and Industry Members

CONTENTS

REPORT SUMMARY	13
OBJECTIVES AND METHOD	15
PARTICIPANT OVERVIEW	17
Participant List	19

IDENTIFYING THE GAP 21

INNOVATION CAPITAL LANDSCAPE	23
Venture Capital	25
Angel Capital	32
Publicly-supported Technology and Startup Funding Programs	37
Accelerators	41

DEFINING GAP FUNDING 43

THE ROLE OF GAP FUNDING	46
Emerging Innovation Capital Landscape	47

DEFINING GAP FUND TYPES 51

STRUCTURING THE GAP FUND 53

RAISING A GAP FUND 55

Fund Sources	57
Funding Cycles	61
Projects and Amounts Awarded	63
Projected Lifetime of Fund	65
Funding Vehicle and Requirements	66
Initial Size of Fund	69
Plans for Sustainability	71

MANAGING THE PROCESS 73

MANAGEMENT AND STRUCTURE 76

THE GAP FUND PROCESS 82

Communication	87
Intake	91
Evaluation and Decision-making	93
Oversight	104

THE IMPACT OF GAP FUNDING 111

DEFINING IMPACT 113

Catalyzing the Commercialization Process.....	117
Growing a Community of Innovation.....	119
Building Businesses and Creating Jobs	120
Attracting Capital and Expertise	121
Returning Capital to the Gap Fund	123

GAP FUNDING INTERVIEWS 127

Houston Methodist	129
Marquette University.....	131
Monash University	135
Michigan State University	139
North Carolina State University	141
Ohio State University	145
Texas Tech University.....	149
Polsky Center for Entrepreneurship/U Chicago.....	153
UCLA.....	155
University of Maryland	157
University of North Carolina.....	159
University of Pittsburgh.....	163
University of Utah.....	165
University of Virginia	167
University of Wisconsin/WARF	169
Washington State University.....	171
Worcester Polytechnic Institute	173

FIGURES AND TABLES

Table 1: Participant Overview by Institution Size, Region, and Vintage Year.....	18
Figure 1: VC Investment Dollars/Deals by Stage and Year.....	26
Figure 2: Visualization of Most Active Lead, Seed VC Firms.....	27
Figure 3: Map of First-Money Seed VC by State and City.....	29
Table 2: Venture Capital Seed Stage Deals by Sector.....	29
Figure 4: Angel Capital vs. Venture Capital Seed Stage Activity.....	32
Figure 5: Seed Angel Capital by Investment Tendencies.....	33
Table 3: Seed Angel Capital by Sector and Investor Age.....	34
Figure 6: Angel Groups by Number of Seed Stage Investments.....	35
Figure 7: Angel Individuals by Number of Seed Stage Investments.....	36
Table 4: Examples of State and Regional Gap Funding Programs.....	38
Figure 8: Map of US and Global Programs.....	39
Table 5: Examples of US Federal Programs.....	40
Table 6: Examples of Non-US Government Programs.....	40
Table 7: Most Active Seed Stage Accelerators by Number of Investments.....	42
Figure 9: The Emerging Innovation Capital Landscape.....	47
Table 8: Comparison Between Traditional Funding and Gap Funding.....	48
Figure 10: Defining Gap Fund Types.....	51
Figure 11: Pre-raise questions to Identify Ideal Source of Funding.....	55
Figure 12: Sources of Gap Funds.....	57
Table 9: Gap Fund Source Descriptions.....	57
Figure 13: Funding Cycles by Type.....	61
Figure 14: Fund Cycle Calendar.....	62
Table 10: Fund Cycle Advantages and Challenges.....	62
Figure 15: Amount Invested per Project or Startup by Fund Type.....	63
Figure 16: Average Number of Projects Funded Per Cycle by Fund Type.....	64

Table 11: Lifetime by Fund Type with Descriptions.....	65
Table 12: Funding Expectations vs. Funding Vehicle by Type.....	66
Figure 17: Initial Fund Size by Type.....	70
Figure 18: Source of Capital for Sustaining Fund by Fund Type.....	71
Figure 19: Fund Management by Fund Type.....	78
Figure 20: Staffing Mix of Gap Funding Programs.....	80
Figure 21: The Gap Fund Process.....	83
Table 13: Preliminary Assessment of Gap Funding Process.....	86
Table 14: Overview of Fund Promotion Strategies.....	88
Figure 22: Communication Approaches.....	89
Table 15: Sample Format for Request for Funding Proposals.....	91
Figure 23: Examples of Developed Accelerator Support Programs.....	95
Table 16: Scorecard for Evaluating Technologies and Startups.....	98
Figure 24: Advisory Board Structure by Fund Type.....	101
Figure 25: Decision-Making Authority.....	103
Table 17: Yield Rate.....	105
Table 18: Funding Disbursement.....	105
Figure 26: Budget Allocation Breakdown by Fund Type.....	107
Table 19: Required Project Reporting.....	109
Table 20: Required Spinout Participation Rights.....	109
Figure 27: Framework for Program Planning and Evaluation.....	110
Figure 28: Gap Fund Impact Time Horizon.....	115
Figure 29: Commercialization Process Indicators.....	118
Table 21: Gap Funded Spinout Job Creation.....	120
Figure 30: Summary of Attracted Capital by Sources.....	122

OBJECTIVES AND METHOD

Report Objectives

Since 2005, the Mind the Gap Report has been the comprehensive best practices, benchmarking, and program development guide for university-affiliated gap fund and accelerator programs, with the goals to:

- Support current and aspiring gap fund managers in developing gap funding programs at, or affiliated with, research institutions
- Identify opportunities for gap funding partnerships with public agencies, industry, and the early-stage investment community
- Advocate and inform policy-makers as they weigh decisions on future innovation programs and legislation

We produce the Mind the Gap Report as a tool to support gap fund program creation and growth through a mix of data, benchmarks, strategies, impact measures, and success stories that fund managers and stakeholders can use to build towards their unique fund objectives.

Report Method

- **Call for Participation:** A call for participation was sent to historical participants from previous reports as well as active fund managers that had expressed interest from earlier iterations of the Mind the Gap report
- **Data Collection:** The participant group received access to either their previously completed fund profile for updating or edits or to a new profile. Each completed comprehensive profiles for every gap fund that they administer and manage. Each was provided with a detailed document that defined all of the items being collected
- **Fund Discussions:** Following the completion of the online profile, we held a phone conversation with fund managers to clarify entries, to collect additional information, and to listen to their experiences related to their gap funding programs. In addition to gathering extensive information on these funds, we used this as an opportunity to solicit areas of interest/possibility/concern from these managers to deliver a report that would be as much about the future as it is about the past
- **Analysis and Reporting:** A data repository was formatted and analyzed through Tableau, a data analysis and visualization program. Observations from this analysis, participant-submitted program documents and insights, and comparisons to other community-accepted data sources supported this final report
- **Participant Review:** All active participants were provided a final copy of the report for review before public release

PARTICIPANT OVERVIEW

The Mind the Gap Report would not be possible or nearly as impactful without the partnership of leading gap funding programs from across the globe. This report's sample consists of 141 distinct gap funding and accelerator programs spread across 84 research institutions and affiliated organizations.

These research institutions and organizations, which are [listed on the next page](#) and further described in Table 1, represent a broad mix of institution size, location, and vintage years of gap funding and accelerator programs, including:

- 127 gap funding programs managed by 76 research institutions
- Ten gap funding programs managed by five state or government agencies
- Four gap funding programs managed by three private venture firms

Careful consideration was placed in describing each organization and fund in the context of their historical involvement in the development of this 15 year-old, evolving resource, including:

- n=new participants in the Mind the Gap Report (10)
- u=participants in previous iteration(s) of MTG report, information updated for this report (42)
- l=legacy participants in a previous MTG report iteration, relevant historical information used where appropriate (33)
- i=international, non-US institution (10)

45% of surveyed university gap fund and accelerator programs have been started in the past five years

Table 1: Participant Overview by Institution Size, Region, and Vintage Year

Annual RE	Type of Fund				Grand Total
	Translational Research	Proof of Concept	Startup	Venture	
<\$250M	11	20	11	1	43
\$250-500M	5	19	4	3	31
\$500M+	7	27	14	5	53
NA	3	6	2	3	14

Region	Translational Research	Proof of Concept	Startup	Venture	Grand Total
Midwest	14	17	12	7	50
Northeast	4	17	3	1	25
South	3	10	9	3	25
West	3	17	4	1	25
Non-US	2	11	3		16

Vintage Year (group)	Translational Research	Proof of Concept	Startup	Venture	Grand Total
2010-Current	19	47	23	8	97
2000s	6	20	6	4	36
90s	1	2	2		5

Breakdown based on Association of University Technology Managers (2019 Annual Research Expenditures (RE)/Not Available (NA)), US Census Bureau (Region).

Participant regions are broken down as follows:

Midwest: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin

Northeast: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont

South: Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington DC, and West Virginia

West: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, and Wyoming

Non-US: Canada, France, Japan, Switzerland, Turkey, UK



DEFINING GAP FUNDING

Positioning Gap Funding and
Defining Its Purpose in Technology
and Startup Development

This lack of early-stage development capital must be recognized and addressed as a serious threat to future innovation and associated societal benefits.

Left without a solution, many promising technologies and startups will struggle to develop on a path of least resistance towards a sub-optimal end.

Research institutions and partners have created gap funding programs as a capital and innovation support mechanism to address this challenge.

THE ROLE OF GAP FUNDING

The early-stage capital sources that were identified in the previous section are vital to ultimately transitioning university innovation to the marketplace. However, they exhibit inherent conflicts that inhibit their ability to invest and provide reliable and well-positioned assistance for university technology development and startup formation. The outcome is a capital and support gap that forms from the misalignment between the expectations and funding capabilities of outside commercialization/capital sources and the needs of research institution technologies and startups.

This lack of early-stage development capital and support must be recognized and addressed as a serious threat to future innovation and associated societal benefits. Left without a solution, many promising technologies and startups will be stunted or will struggle to develop on a path of least resistance towards a sub-optimal end.

Moving forward, an excellent strategy to address this capital gap is either to incent the aforementioned private and public forms of early-stage capital into this space, or to invest directly into models that are better structured, positioned, and motivated to fund these technologies and startups. The best strategy is to support a solution that accomplishes both, like university technology and startup gap funding and accelerator programs.


Over the past 20 years, research institutions and partners have evolved gap funding programs as a capital and innovation support mechanism that is uniquely positioned to address the critical elements of technology development and startup formation from research institutions, while also attracting additional capital and participation from the technical, investment, and corporate communities.

Emerging Innovation Capital Landscape

A realistic look at the early-stage capital landscape uncovers a significant innovation capital and support gap between the transition of basic research through commercialization — an area that research institutions directly address through different [gap fund types](#) (Fig.9). In this view, it becomes clear that research institution-affiliated gap funding and accelerator programs are uniquely capable from a funding approach, operational positioning, and motivation standpoint to address this challenge. (Table 8)

Figure 1: [The Emerging Innovation Capital Landscape](#)

Table 2: [Comparison Between Traditional Funding and Gap Funding](#)



	Traditional Sources	Gap Funding
Funding Structure	More substantial investments in fewer deals in sectors that may not fully address technology with longer development timelines	Targeted, grants or relatively smaller investments per project, but fund more projects often in areas with longer development timelines typical in academic environments
Operational Positioning	Aversion to fund pre-revenue or early-stages of business formation due to investment risk preferences, management restrictions, and uncertainty	Focus on translational research, proof of concept, and startup development and are positioned in academia at the nexus of faculty, students, and innovation networking
Motivations/Expectations	Risk profile at this stage may make it difficult to justify the investment. Also, typical ownership vehicles like equity or collectible debt are less available in early-stage technology development	Mission-driven to innovate, educate, job create and attract outside capital, with the a secondary goal of longer-term ROI through licensing royalties and equity positions

NOTE: Not pictured are government-supported programs, as they often work in concert with university gap funding programs and align well with each of the gap fund types displayed

DEFINING GAP FUNDS

The “gap” in gap funding refers to a vast shortage of capital and other commercialization support to identify, to evaluate, and to deliver research institution technology and startups to the marketplace. Defining this “gap” too broadly (e.g., “Valley of Death” or “between basic research and the market”) oversimplifies the complexities of the situation and clouds the path to resolution. It masks the unique function and intent of different gap funding programs and leads to confusion from the support community,

Therefore, we propose the adoption of a shared set of descriptors for gap funding programs, by focus area, that is based on observing these programs over the past 15 years and the realities of the [early-stage capital landscape](#).

Gap funding approaches to the larger “gap” can be broken down into four primary gap fund types, each with individual characteristics, structures, and commercialization priorities that are functional as standalone funds or as contributors to a broader systematic approach depending on the needs of the operation¹. This view leads to an actionable and segmented view of gap funding programs ([Fig.10](#)) with three main advantages for fund managers:

- **Scalable:** Aligns with existing university technology commercialization processes, and other early-stage technology and product development processes
- **Customizable:** Opens up the opportunity for universities to create an individual approach based on the specific needs and capabilities of their institutions at each stage of the innovation process
- **Relatable:** Establishes a system that is identifiable by all stakeholders of early-stage innovation (public and private), and allows them an opportunity to identify their role as a partner in the process

This segmented approach to gap funding will play a prevalent role in the remainder of the report. We will detail the inner workings of each fund type and encourage you to view this as a necessary, interconnected university innovation, technology, and startup support system.

¹ Nearly 42%(35) of the surveyed institutions managed more than one gap fund type, usually through a staged combination of a proof of concept and startup accelerator type gap fund

The “gap” in gap funding refers to a vast shortage of capital and other commercialization support

to identify, to evaluate, and to deliver university technology and startups to the marketplace.


Defining this “gap” too broadly (e.g. “Valley of Death” or “between basic research and the market”)

oversimplifies the complexities of the situation and clouds the path to resolution.

The larger “gap” can be broken down into four primary gap fund types, each with individual characteristics, structures, and commercialization priorities.

Defining Gap Fund Types

Figure 2: Defining Gap Fund Types



PRESENTED BY

innovosource

To access full report additional resources please visit www.universitygapfunding.com

or contact us at connect@innovosource.com