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Overview: These pros and cons are based on published articles and dissertations that are relevant to the charge of the Carnegie Classification Ad Hoc Committee. The pros and cons list was developed by the External Source Subcommittee of the Ad Hoc Committee. Sources were identified via an ERIC database search, and then the articles were read and relevant portions summarized by subcommittee members. Summaries of the articles cited below appear in an attached document.

Potential Advantages of moving from DP to R2 Status
1. R2 generally confers more prestige than DP (Kelderman, 2018; Olson, 2018; McClure & Titus 2018)
2. May be easier to attract grant money (Kelderman, 2018; Olson, 2018; McClure & Titus, 2018)
3. Easier to get industry partnerships (Olson, 2018)
4. Might attract more talented researchers (Iglesias, 2014; Kelderman, 2018; Olson, 2018)
5. May lead to admissions of students with better academic preparation (Iglesias, 2014; Kelderman, 2018; Olson, 2018; McClure & Titus, 2018)
6. May increase outside money that pays for salaries and facilities instead of its own money (Kelderman, 2018)
7. May lead to higher research expectations and better research output for faculty (Iglesias, 2014; Olson, 2018).
8. May increase faculty focus on rigor (Iglesias, 2014)
9. May lead to higher faculty salaries (Iglesias, 2014; Olson, 2018)

Potential Disadvantages
1. Requires a big investment of money and other resources (Iglesias, 2014; Kelderman, 2018). For example, likely to lead to increased spending on infrastructure and other costs, such as lab space, recruiting and keeping higher quality faculty, paying for doctoral assistantships (Kelderman, 2018).
2. Administrative costs per FTE enrollment are likely to increase, at least in the first few years (McClure & Titus, 2018).
3. Spending increase might be part of a useless “cost spiral” (p. 981), whereby moving up to an R2 increases prestige and allows the institution to procure more resources, but instead of the resources being used to survive, they are spent to maintain their legitimacy in the institutional hierarchy (McClure & Titus, 2018).
4. Related to the above points, it may lead to shift in resources from instruction to admin (Iglesias, 2014)
5. May lead to shift in emphasis from remedial programs to honors programs (Iglesias, 2014).
6. May reduce instructional quality across the institution, especially of undergraduate education, as teaching becomes de-emphasized and institutional identity moves toward research rather than teaching and graduate education is prioritized (Brawner et al,

7. May lead to higher workload for faculty (Henderson, 2013), and higher research expectations (Iglesias, 2014).

8. May not fit the mission of the university (Henderson, 2013; Kelderman, 2018; Olson, 2018).

9. In particular, in terms of mission, it might be inconsistent with the diversity mission of the University: A more pressing need for this geographic area and for the nation might be improving the quality of undergraduate and professional education and increasing retention and graduation of underrepresented students (Henderson, 2013).

10. Might lead to awarding more doctorates than the market needs, especially in the case of humanities, where a glut of PhDs has led to students accruing a lot of debt and being unable to get a job (Mendenhall, 2018)

11. Competition for research dollars is increasing, and we may be less able to compete than we expect (Henderson, 2013; Kelderman, 2018)

12. Might lead to increased scrutiny of programs (Kelderman, 2018)

13. May lead to elimination of programs that don’t get research funds (Iglesias, 2014)

14. May lead to less affordability, as the institution tries to control increased costs by increasing tuition and fees (McClure & Titus, 2018).

15. May not lead to greater prestige or more research productivity (Henderson, 2013).

How to do it well:

1. Find niche research opportunities (Kelderman, 2018)
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