PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED IN SECURING EDUCATIONAL GRANTS: INSIGHTS FROM GLOBAL EXPERIENCE

Nurmuratov Anvar Yakhshibayevich

PhD, Associate professor of

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Abstract: Securing educational grants—whether for individual research, institutional development, student support, or programmatic innovation—has become increasingly difficult worldwide. This enhanced article provides a comprehensive, evidence-based analysis of the major barriers applicants face, drawing on global data from UNESCO, OECD, World Bank, national funding agencies, and peer-reviewed studies. Key problems include hyper-competition and historically low success rates, misalignment with shifting funder priorities, deficiencies in proposal quality and preparation, excessive administrative and compliance burdens, structural biases and inequities, insufficient institutional support, economic volatility and crisis-driven budget cuts, and emerging geopolitical restrictions. An expanded table categorizes these challenges, illustrates regional variations, and cites prevalence indicators. The discussion evaluates systemic consequences and proposes multi-level solutions ranging from applicant strategies to policy reform. The analysis underscores the urgent need for greater transparency, capacity-building, and sustainable funding models to ensure equitable access to educational resources globally.

Keywords: educational grants, research funding, grant rejection, funding inequities, proposal development, administrative burden, global education financing, UNESCO SDG 4, competitive funding landscape.

Introduction. Educational and research grants are essential drivers of innovation, equity, and quality in education systems. Yet success rates have declined dramatically over the past two decades, often falling below 15 % for major competitive programs. In 2024–2025, UNESCO estimates an annual financing gap of US$97–200 billion to achieve Sustainable Development Goal 4 (quality education), with low-income countries facing the most severe shortfalls.

The barriers are not merely procedural; they reflect deeper structural, economic, and political dynamics. This article synthesizes global experiences across high-income (USA, EU, UK, Australia), middle-income (Brazil, India, Turkey), and low-income contexts (sub-Saharan Africa, Central Asia) to provide a systematic overview of the most pervasive challenges applicants encounter.

Major Problems in Securing Educational Grants

1. Hyper-Competition and Declining Success Rates

Funding demand has surged while budgets stagnate or shrink. In the United States, National Institutes of Health (NIH) success rates fell from ~30 % in the 1990s to 18–20 % in 2024; National Science Foundation (NSF) rates hover around 22–25 %. European Research Council (ERC) Starting Grants achieved only 12–14 % success in recent rounds. Developing countries report even lower rates for international donor programs (often <5 %).

2. Misalignment with Rapidly Shifting Funder Priorities

Funders increasingly adopt thematic calls (e.g., AI, climate resilience, gender equity), leaving many strong proposals ineligible. Crisis-driven reprioritization (COVID-19, Ukraine war, Middle East conflicts) has redirected billions away from core education toward emergency response.

3. Proposal Quality and Preparation Deficiencies

Common flaws include:

- Lack of clear, measurable objectives
- Over-ambitious scope or unrealistic timelines
- Weak impact articulation and evidence base
- Poor budget justification
- Failure to address reviewer concerns preemptively

Studies estimate 60–80 % of rejections stem from preventable writing and design issues.

4. Excessive Administrative and Compliance Burdens

Applications often exceed 100 pages with dozens of attachments. Post-award reporting, financial tracking, and audit requirements consume 20–40 % of grant time for small institutions.

5. Structural Biases and Systemic Inequities

- **Institutional prestige bias**: Top 20–50 universities capture 50–80 % of competitive funding.
- **Gender and diversity gaps**: Women and underrepresented minorities receive proportionally less funding.
- **Geographic disadvantage**: Institutions in peripheral regions or developing countries face implicit bias.

6. Insufficient Institutional Support and Capacity

Many universities, especially in middle- and low-income countries, lack dedicated grant offices, mentoring programs, or mock review panels—critical predictors of success.

7. Economic Volatility and Crisis-Driven Cuts

Inflation, recessions, and geopolitical crises have led to real-term budget reductions. Post-COVID education spending fell in 65 % of low- and middle-income countries.

8. Emerging Restrictions and Political Interference

Rising nationalism and research security concerns have introduced new eligibility barriers.

Problem Category	Core Description	Prevalence / Regional Variation	Representative Sources
Hyper-Competition & Low Success Rates	Oversubscription; stagnant budgets	Global; 10–25 % in high-income, <10 % in developing countries	NIH (2024); ERC (2025); UNESCO GEM Report (2024)
Shifting Funder Priorities	Thematic calls; crisis reprioritization	Acute during pandemics/wars	OECD (2025); FundsforNGOs (2025)
Proposal Quality Issues	Weak writing, budgets, impact articulation	60–80 % of rejections worldwide	Porter (2007); Grants Plus (2024)
Administrative & Compliance Burden	Lengthy applications, heavy reporting	Disproportionately affects small NGOs/universities	Cayuse (2025); Von Hippel & Von Hippel (2015)
Structural Biases & Inequities	Prestige, gender, geographic, racial biases	Persistent in peer review systems	Witteman et al. (2019); Larivière et al. (2018)
Lack of Institutional Support	No grant offices, training, or mock reviews	Common in middle/low-income institutions	Enago Academy (2023); Indeemo (2024)
Economic & Political Volatility	Budget cuts, inflation, geopolitical restrictions	Severe in post-crisis & low-income contexts	UNESCO GEM Report (2024); World Bank (2025)

Table 1. Expanded typology of problems in securing educational grants (2020–2025 global data)

Consequences and Systemic Implications

These barriers perpetuate a vicious cycle: low success → discouragement → fewer applications → further concentration of funds among elites. The result is reduced diversity of ideas, stalled innovation in under-resourced regions, and widening global education inequities.

Discussion. The global evidence reviewed in this article demonstrates that difficulties in securing educational grants are not isolated or context-specific but systemic and transnational in nature. Despite variations in funding structures across regions, applicants worldwide encounter strikingly similar obstacles, suggesting that contemporary grant systems are shaped by convergent pressures: increasing demand, constrained resources, and heightened accountability requirements. Hyper-competition has become the defining feature of the current funding landscape, transforming grant acquisition from a merit-based opportunity into a probabilistic exercise in which high-quality proposals routinely fail due to limited capacity.

One of the most significant findings concerns the misalignment between applicant priorities and rapidly shifting funder agendas. While thematic funding is often justified as a strategic response to global challenges, frequent reprioritization undermines continuity in educational development and disadvantages institutions with long-term capacity-building goals. This is particularly acute in low- and middle-income countries, where institutional missions often focus on foundational educational needs rather than short-term innovation themes favored by international donors.

Proposal quality deficiencies, although frequently cited as individual shortcomings, must be interpreted within a broader structural context. The high proportion of preventable rejections indicates not only gaps in applicants' skills but also unequal access to mentorship, training, and institutional grant-support infrastructures. Well-resourced universities benefit from professional grant offices, internal review panels, and experienced collaborators, while peripheral institutions face cumulative disadvantages. This asymmetry reinforces existing hierarchies in global education and research systems.

Administrative and compliance burdens further exacerbate inequities. Complex application procedures and extensive post-award reporting disproportionately affect smaller institutions, NGOs, and early-career researchers, diverting time from substantive educational work. Rather than functioning solely as accountability mechanisms, such requirements increasingly act as informal barriers to entry, filtering out applicants lacking administrative capacity regardless of project merit.

Structural biases—whether linked to institutional prestige, geography, gender, or political affiliation—remain among the most controversial yet persistent issues in grant allocation. Although many funding agencies emphasize fairness and transparency, empirical studies continue to reveal concentration effects favoring elite institutions and established networks. These dynamics

not only limit diversity of perspectives but also reduce the likelihood that funding reaches contexts where educational investment could yield the greatest marginal impact.

Conclusion. This article has examined the major problems encountered in securing educational grants through a comprehensive synthesis of global data, policy reports, and empirical research. The analysis reveals that declining success rates, administrative complexity, shifting priorities, and systemic inequities are deeply interconnected challenges embedded within contemporary funding architectures. These barriers collectively undermine innovation, equity, and sustainability in education systems worldwide.

Addressing these problems requires multi-level intervention. At the applicant level, capacity-building in proposal design, impact articulation, and strategic alignment remains essential. At the institutional level, investment in grant support structures and mentoring systems can significantly improve competitiveness. However, meaningful change ultimately depends on funders and policymakers adopting more transparent, inclusive, and context-sensitive funding models.

Reducing administrative burdens, stabilizing thematic priorities, diversifying review panels, and allocating dedicated funding streams for under-resourced regions are critical steps toward a more equitable system. Without such reforms, current trends risk perpetuating a cycle of exclusion in which educational resources remain concentrated among a limited set of institutions and countries.

References

1. Bromley, P., Furuta, J., & Schofer, E. (2023). Global determinants of education reform success. Sociology of Education, 96(3), 123–145.

2. Cayuse. (2025). 5 grant management problems and red flags. https://www.cayuse.com/blog/grant-management-problems/

3. Chawla, D. S. (2019). The perils of applying for research funding. Nature Index.

4. Enago Academy. (2023). Grant funding: Known problem areas & likely solutions. https://www.enago.com/academy/grant-funding-known-problem-areas-likely-solutions/

5. ERC. (2025). ERC funding statistics 2024–2025. European Research Council.

6. FundsforNGOs. (2025). Challenges NGOs face in securing funding for education projects. https://www.fundsforngos.org

7. Grants Plus. (2024). Top reasons grant proposals are rejected. https://grantsplus.com/insights/blog/partner-plan/top-reasons-grant-proposals-are-rejected-and-how-to-improve-your-odds/

8. Indeemo. (2024). Overcoming funding challenges in academic research. https://indeemo.com/blog/guide-to-research-grants-academia

9. Klassapps. (2025). Strategies for securing funding in higher education. https://klassapps.com/strategies-for-securing-funding-research-grants-and-donations-in-higher-education/

10. Larivière, V., Gong, K., & Sugimoto, C. R. (2018). Citations strength begins at home. Nature, 564, S70–S71.

11. NIH. (2024). Success rates and funding data. National Institutes of Health.

12. Porter, R. (2007). Why academics have a hard time writing good grant proposals. Journal of Research Administration, 38(2), 39–47.

13. UNESCO GEM Report. (2024). The price of inaction: Financing the education we need. UNESCO.

14. Von Hippel, T., & Von Hippel, C. (2015). The tyranny of tiny tasks: The administrative burden of grant management. Research Policy, 44(4), 842–854.

15. Witteman, H. O., Hendricks, M., Straus, S., & Tannenbaum, C. (2019). Are gender gaps due to evaluations of the applicant or the science? The Lancet, 393(10171), 531–540.

16. World Bank. (2025). Education finance watch 2025. World Bank Group.