<u>This document contains survey responses received from universities recently reclassified to Carnegie Doctoral-Professional status and from other universities recently reclassified to Carnegie R-2 status</u>

<u>Doctoral-Professional</u>

Question One: What does your institution see as the positive aspects of being reclassified as a doctoral-professional university?

University 1: The D/PU classification recognizes our university for its success in developing compelling professional doctorate programs and training students for the professional workforce. In the 2018-2019 academic year alone, our university graduated 155 DCN, DNP, EdD, and DPT students. The M1 classification doesn't adequately reflect this kind of productivity and the level of translational and applied research that foes along with it. The D/PU classification also places our university in the list of nation universities, and provides commensurate recognition across higher education.

University 2: Being reclassified as doctoral-professional university reflects our aspiration to raise our institution's profile by offering a wider range of relevant and excellent programs for our current and future students. Moving forward, our desire is to continue to provide opportunities for our faculty to pursue research in ways that increase the potential to obtain more external funding for research.

University 3: I am not sure that there are advantages, but the classification does seem to fit both our mission as a metropolitan university and much of the applied research our faculty does.

University 4: We don't really see any major positives. We still view ourselves as a comprehensive university focused on undergraduate education.

Question Two: What does your institution see as the negative aspects of being reclassified as a doctoral-professional university?

University 1: Placement in the D/PU category, and the recognition as a national university, arguable brings with it a greater level of scrutiny and higher expectations for performance and quality. Not all members of the campus community have welcomed this, with some contending that it's preferable to be the "best" regional comprehensive than a "middling" national university. There may also be some implications in our eligibility of certain types of external funding; e.g., our PUI status could be seen as in jeopardy, increasing the competition our university will face in securing federal grants.

University 2: A move to a higher classification may result in some programs (e.g., Humanities) producing more doctorates and hiring more faculty than the market demands.

University 3: The biggest negatives are 1) the classification doesn't fit the scholarship of many of our faculty, and 2) there are still a large number of people who don't know what the classification means. The roll out was poorly explained.

University 4:
1. The reclassification has impacted our rankings. We have always used our US News (top 5 master's) and other rankings heavily in marketing. The new rankings have now resulted in new marketing strategies and discussions with alumni and other stakeholders
2. The new classification does not fit with our mission and identity as an undergraduate teaching-centered university.

Question Three: What does your institution intend to position itself for potential reclassification as an R2 university or have you embraced doctoral-professional status? Why?

University 1: Yes, our university's president has established R2 classification as a clear goal in the strategic plan, consistent with the vision of becoming a "top 100" university.

University 2: Our institution is in the process of acquiring the University of Texas Health Science Center, one of eight health institutions within the University of Texas System. This acquisition will significantly increase our research expenditures, which will automatically reclassify our institution as R2.

University 3: We have discussed doing so but have not decided. Our doctoral programs neatly fit the classification but the breadth of scholarship we produce does not.

University 4: No, we view ourselves as a teaching-focused institution and have no intention of dramatically changing our practices to increase grant-funded research among faculty.

R2

Question One: Did your institution intentionally plan and position itself to qualify for reclassification to Carnegie R2 status as took place recently?

University 1: We were intentionally planning a move to R2 – I don't know that we expected it to happen as soon as it did.

University 2: Any intentional planning and positioning on our part occurred prior to the 2015 reclassification that led to our move from an M1 to an R3. At that time, R3 was considered part of the broader Doctoral Research University classification, and that's what we wanted to achieve. Our move from R3 to R2 in the 2018 reclassification primarily resulted from a change in the definitions of classifications: now only R1 and R2 are considered to be doctoral research universities. In 2015, the key criterion for moving from M1 to R3 was to have 20 or more doctoral graduates per year. So what we did in the short term was "shine a light" on our doctoral programs to make sure that they were paying attention to progress and completion of doctoral students, with the result that we were able to make

the >20 cut for the census year prior to the 2015 classification. In the longer term, the desire to consolidate our position as an R3 (and to potentially move to R2) was a small but not insignificant contributing factor in the decision to move forward with the creation of several new doctoral programs.

Another intentional action that we took prior to the 2015 reclassification was to make sure that our reporting to NIH/NSF of the numbers of doctorally prepared research staff was as accurate as it could be. Making sure we found everyone was a challenge. Although research staff #s were not important in achieving R3, we realized that there was a possibility that we might actually achieve R2, and doing so would require robust numbers in research staff and research expenditures.

It is important to understand that reclassification to R3/R2 was not an end in itself, but was the result of (and to gain recognition of) the continued evolution of the university to achieve former president Kutra's vision to become a "Metropolitan Research University of Distinction."

Prior to the 2018 changes to definitions of R2 and R3, we had pondered what it would take to move from R3 to R2. We were near the upper edge of the R3 classification in the 2015 classifications. One way we could have increased our standing substantially would have been to create doctoral programs in the two categories which we had none: humanities and social sciences. However, the changes in definitions placed us firmly in the middle of R2, so the question of creating those new doctoral programs became moot, so far as classification is concerned. We remain interested in developing such programs for independent reasons.

University 3: Yes, sort of. We intentionally made efforts about 6 years ago to move from Masters Large to Doctoral Research. At that time, we were an R3. The jump to R2 came purely incidentally when Carnegie changed their classifications for the last cycle.

Question Two: What does your institution see as the benefits and opportunities of reclassification to Carnegie R2 status?

University 1: The University would like to have a higher national profile. We also want to create more research opportunities for our students from undergraduate through graduate. Our location in Southeast Michigan is also a driver. We want to serve our community and have many partnerships with local companies and communities. We are right in their backyard and a better national recognition helps us as we reach out. We have been on the cusp for many years. It would be nice if the work we do also led to increased state funding. This has not been a major driver.

University 2:
   A. The reclassification to a doctoral research university put us on the same footing as two sister universities in the state and has resulted in us being treated as deserving of state resources devoted to research and as being a semi-equal partner in collaborations among universities (e.g., EPSCoR grants).
   B. The reclassification as a doctoral research university provided solid evidence that we made significant process in achieving former President Kustra's vision of a "Metropolitan Research University of Distinction."
   C. Although the evidence is largely anecdotal, the reclassification as a doctoral research university apparently has resulted in an increase in the quality of faculty applicants and an increase in success in hiring them. And an indirect impact is an increase in grant funding that results from hiring highly qualifies faculty members.

D. The city has apparently increased success in recruiting companies to the are because there is now a "doctoral research university" in town.
E. The "shining a light" on doctoral programs mentioned above has led to a change in the mindset of those programs: progress and completion is important.

University Three: In our case, the TN higher education funding formula awarded us with over $2M in recurring funding for the higher Carnegie classification. We certainly also see it as a significantly superior designation for reputational value, in general.

Question Three: What does your institution see as the challenges and costs of reclassification to Carnegie R2 status?

University 1: We are looking at promotion and tenure guidelines to be sure that the are appropriate to an R2. We have invested a lot in our research enterprise as part of our strategic plan. A few years ago, we created several research centers and provided seed funding to get them going (total investment was $450,000). We have a cluster hire RFI out right now. We have increased stipends as much as we can. We have added 2 research developers who work with faculty and added a couple of other grant related positions. We also have based funded a position committed to continuing the work of our ADVANCE grant and we have supported training and development of new faculty. In addition, we are beginning to add research faculty to our medical school – this is a major investment. We also are investing in a computer cluster to support our big data folks. The challenges are typical. Where to find the money – especially in the current environment, inadequate space and infrastructure issues within the space we have and the accompanying issues, research faculty need grad students and post docs we have limited $$ for both. Another concern is that our state performance funding compares us to our research peers. We are now at the bottom of the R2 category and will take a hit for that. Fortunately, this does not represent a significant part of our budget.

University 2:
A. With recognition of being a "doctoral research university" comes the responsibility to actually be a "doctoral research university." And in terms of "Metropolitan Research University," that means that we need to work to fulfill the research needs of the community and the state. Fortunately, doing so aligns with the broader set of goals that we are trying to achieve.
B. Had we initiated doctoral programs for the sole reason of gaining/maintaining R3/R2 status, we'd count resources invested as "costs" associated with reclassification. However, as noted above, reclassification was the result of (and in recognition of) our evolution to become a Metropolitan Research University of Distinction.

University 3: In our case, the cost was pretty minimal. We were already very close to the cut-off for Doctoral Research. Our research members were already there. We just needed to consistently graduate 20+ doctoral students per year. Strategically increasing some focus on PhD programs and adding some assistantship funding was all that was necessary. Obviously, it took a few years due to the lag time with graduations.

Question 4: Where have you found the funding and approximately how much money are you investing to nurture and support Carnegie R2 status?

University 1: I will need to connect you to our Assistant VP – she is away this week. What I can tell you is it is significant. The computer cluster is more than $500,000 just in equipment and doesn't count the two additional staff positions for central IT.

University 2: As noted above, no funds have invested in nurturing and supporting our R2 status. Instead our investments have been in doctoral programs and research endeavors that help us to become a metropolitan university of distinction. The R2 status recognizes our success in that endeavor.

University 3: Most of the additional funding is being provided from externally funded research grants. We have invested approximately $500k per year in doctoral assistantships from university funds.

Question 5: If you have gone through an internal reallocation process, which of your programs or initiatives have gained significantly from the reclassification to R2 and which have not?

University 1: The sciences and engineering are getting the most from this but some of the initiatives have benefitted faculty more broadly. An example is our PI Academy that is targeted toward untenured faculty. Our reclassification is really quite new and comes at a time when our engineering school has been growing rapidly. It may be hard to sort out what is because of the R2 classification and what is because of the growth and decline of patterns across campus. Another issue is that we do not have a centralized mechanism for understanding the productivity of all our faculty on an annual basis. We are implementing Digital Measures to resolve that issue. Right now, we can track grant submissions and awards reliably.

University 2: See #4.

University 3: Any new university $ invested has gone directly to PhD programs supporting the R2 classification.