Research Review

Public Administration

2008-2013

Contents

Preface

This review has examined the quality, productivity, impact and general health (according to various criteria) of research over the past six years taking place at four institutes and in seven programmes concerned with public administration. Dutch public administration research is renowned throughout the academic world, so it has been a great privilege to chair the review of this work at four universities and to discuss past, present and future research with a variety of its creators and enablers.

The Review Committee consisted of four professors from different European countries and research traditions within public administration. We have enjoyed working together, drawing on our different backgrounds and areas of expertise to examine, debate and explore the strengths and the weaknesses of the Dutch institutions we reviewed. It has been an intellectually stimulating experience.

Our thanks go to the research leaders, the academic staff and the PhD candidates at each of the universities. They compiled detailed quantitative and narrative documentation in their self-evaluation reports, and we recognise how time-consuming it is to create such reports. On the site visits, we found our meetings with staff engaging, lively and thought-provoking, with much to discuss and explore.

Finally, we are all indebted to Floor Meijer, the secretary to the review. There is always an initial moment of nervousness in a new working partnership but Floor dispelled any concerns straight away with her knowledge of criteria, policies and procedures, her meticulous taking of notes, and her ability with logistics throughout the site visits.

The goals of the review are to contribute to the improvement of the quality of research and to provide accountability for the use of public money for the research organisation's board, funding bodies, the government and society at large. We hope that our comments on each institute and programme will be useful, in our role both as quality reviewers and as 'critical friends' to aid development for the future. We hope the four universities go from strength to strength in their public administration research.

Jean Hartley
Chair of the Committee

1. The review Committee and the review procedures

Scope of the assessment
The Public Administration Committee was asked to perform an assessment of the research in Public Administration at Erasmus University Rotterdam (EUR), University of Twente (UT), Utrecht University (UU) and VU University Amsterdam (VU). This assessment covers the research conducted in the period 2008-2013.

In accordance with the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015 for Research Assessment in the Netherlands (SEP), the Committee's tasks were to assess the quality of the institutes and the research programmes on the basis of the information provided by the institutes and interviews with the leadership, management, academic staff and PhD candidates and to advise on how it might be improved.

Composition of the Committee
The composition of the Public Administration Committee was as follows:

- Prof. J. (Jean) Hartley (chair), Professor of Public Leadership at The Open University Business School, UK;
- Prof. F. (Filip) de Rynck is Professor of Public Administration at Ghent University, Belgium.
- Prof. P. (Per) Laegreid is Professor in Public Administration and Organisation Theory at the University of Bergen, Norway.
- Prof. R. (Renate) Meyer is Professor of Public Management and Organisation Studies at WU Vienna University of Economics and Business, Austria.

Short curricula vitae of the Committee members are included in Appendix 2.

Dr. F. (Floor) Meijer of QANU was appointed Secretary to the Committee.

Independence
All members of the Committee signed a statement of independence to safeguard that they would assess the quality of the institutes and research programmes in an unbiased and independent way. Any existing personal or professional relationships between Committee members and the institutes and programmes under review were reported and discussed in the initial Committee meeting. The Committee concluded that there were no unacceptable relations or dependencies and that there was no specific risk in terms of bias or undue influence.

Data provided to the Committee
The Committee has received detailed documentation consisting of the following parts:

- Self-evaluation report of the units under review, including all the information required by the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP), with appendices;
- Copies of the key publications per research programme;
- Lists of publications per staff member.

Procedures followed by the Committee

The Committee proceeded according to the SEP 2009-2015. Each programme was assigned to two reviewers, who independently formulated a preliminary assessment. The first reviewer was chosen on the basis of his or her expertise in the domain of the programme; the second reviewer was chosen to provide a more general, complementary perspective.

Before conducting interviews with representatives of the institutes and programmes under assessment, the Committee was briefed by QANU about research assessment according to SEP, and discussed the preliminary assessments. The Committee also agreed upon procedural and other aspects of the assessment. For each university the Committee discussed the self-evaluation report, key publications and the preliminary findings for all research programmes and institutes before starting on the interviews.

The interviews took place during site visits to the University of Rotterdam (August 26th 2014), Utrecht University (August 27th 2014), University of Twente (August 28th 2014), and VU University Amsterdam (August 29th 2014). The schedule for the site visits is included in Appendix 3. The site visits consisted of 60-minute interviews with (1) the management of the research institutes, (2) the leaders of each of the research programmes (3) a selection of academic staff working in the programme and (4) a selection of PhD candidates. The first reviewers led the interviews, with the second reviewer and the other Committee members having opportunities to ask questions. After each interview the Committee took some time to prepare a preliminary assessment and there was also a detailed meeting at the end of each day to reflect on the site visit of the day.

At the end of its site visit in Amsterdam, the Committee took some extended time to discuss the comments and scores of all seven programmes and four institutes. The final assessments are based on the documentation provided by the institutes, the key publications, and the interviews. The texts for the Committee report were finalised through email exchanges. The first assessor was responsible for writing the draft assessment and for sending it to the second assessor for amendment and/or approval. After both assessors had approved it, the assessment was inserted into the report. After receiving all assessments, the Secretary compiled the report and returned it to the Committee for a final approval. The approved version of the report was presented to the Faculties for factual corrections and comments. The final report was presented to the Boards of the participating universities and was printed after their formal acceptance.

The Committee used the 5-point rating system of the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015 (SEP). The meaning of the scores is described in Appendix 2. It quickly became clear to the Committee that public administration is a field in which Dutch scholarship is of a remarkably high standard and strongly internationally competitive, implying that scores in the higher end of the scale (3-5) would be most appropriate. To allow greater differentiation in this rather narrow range, the Committee decided to extend the 5-point scale to a 9-point scale (1, 1.5, 2, ..., 4.5, 5) The .5 was used to indicate that a programme is between two integer ratings. The Committee wants to emphasise that it has taken very seriously the SEP request to consider the full range of this five-point scale and to apply the scores according to the descriptions given in the SEP. It has tried to resist the ongoing trend of score inflation, which leads to a situation wherein variation between scores is attenuated and become less meaningful (Cf. Rathenau Instituut, 'Twenty years of research evaluation', July 2013). The Committee urges institute and programme leaders, as well as others who make use of these scores, to interpret them accordingly, and, moreover, always consider the numerical score in relation to the qualitative comments.

At three out of the four participating universities (EUR, UU, VU) all Public Administration research is conducted within a single research programme. In these cases, the Committee found it appropriate to integrate the institute and programme assessment.

2. General remarks

In this section, the Committee addresses some of the common themes across the four institutes and programmes and raises some 'critical friend' challenges for consideration and debate.

Public administration in the Netherlands: more appreciated internationally than nationally?
Across the four institutions, the Committee was impressed with the quality, the quantity and the range of research being carried out in the field of public administration. The self-evaluation reports describe a range of key research themes, with both theoretical and empirical contributions being made. To make mention of particular research projects would be invidious because there is substantial research being undertaken on a range of fronts in a way which makes Dutch public administration research the envy of the world. Research from these universities has been seminal in, for example, networked governance, water governance, innovation, e-government, social media, professional participation in policy and practice, public leadership, ethics, public participation and democracy, accountability, public values, public services, and governance. Contributions are being made to a number of policy arenas including local and central government, policing, sustainable development and higher education. Small wonder that each institution has leading researchers who are widely recognised and respected, highly cited and who have shaped theories, debates and evidence in the discipline and beyond.

Furthermore, the research extends beyond the core discipline of public administration in at least three important ways. First, each institution is characterised by some research which is multi-disciplinary, sometimes inter-disciplinary and even trans-disciplinary. This is a considerable achievement. The Dutch researchers in public administration are continuing to work across disciplinary boundaries and to explore the interstices of academic disciplines – which is where interesting new societal and intellectual challenges often arise. Second, the Dutch researchers continue to undertake research in an engaged way, working with a range of stakeholders to define problems and develop solutions. The societal impact of the research ran to many pages in the self-evaluation reports and spanned local, regional, national and international spheres. Policy-makers, public managers, professionals and citizens benefit from the public value created with and through the research. Third, across the institutions, there is evidence of methodological expansion, exploring new methods of collecting and interpreting data, including analysis of twitter, visual images, field and lab experiments, the use of DataLab as a resource, and the application of Q methodology in public administration.

The productivity in the four institutions is very high and in some cases exemplary. Several publications are located in top refereed journals, shaping the debates in the field. More is said about this under each programme.

The Dutch prominence and profile internationally in the field of public administration provides a valuable source of knowledge, ideas and evidence, emanating from Europe. While contributing to and challenging the US-dominated field of public administration, the Dutch research, taken together, helps to provide theory and research within a European tradition. However, while on any metric the Dutch Public Administration research is internationally leading, this does not always seem to be recognised by the scientific communities and universities, at least as discerned by the Committee. This is a curious position in which Public Administration Departments find themselves.

There are a number of threats to the pre-eminence of the Dutch contribution to the public administration discipline. There is a decrease of first stream funding in three of the four universities the Committee reviewed. Utrecht University is the remarkable exception here. The decline has affected the availability of PhD funding, has led to further reductions in research time for many researchers, and has made researchers and research teams more dependent on second and third stream funding. The need to seek external funding (second and third stream) may in the long-term affect the range of topics being researched and the depth to which they can be researched (because researchers have to conduct research which is attractive to external funders). Will this enable sufficient fundamental research in the longer-term?

For second stream funding (and indeed for internal university competitive funding), the Committee noted the reports of greater competition for funding with other social sciences and with the scientific communities in general. In the context of that sharpened competition there is a real danger that certain epistemologies and methodologies come to dominate funding councils, to the detriment of those social sciences, such as public administration, which are concerned with complex, systemic and multi-level phenomena, and where methodologies must take account of the 'real world' with its varied stakeholders and gatekeepers. How will universities take steps to ensure that high quality public administration research proposals are recognised and given funding?

For external (third stream) funding, the balancing act between fulfilling contract research obligations for funders, writing new bid proposals, and writing up theoretical and empirical contributions in top quality journals continues to be a challenge, even for the most skilled researcher. A number of institutions comment that they will address the funding gap by taking on more third stream funding. However, there is a limit as to how far work can be intensified in this way, and the Committee did not see sufficient evidence of discussion about the trade-offs which are, to some extent, implied by these increasing pressures. Furthermore, such arrangements can be fragile – a stream of research which has yielded extensive grants may peter out, or key staff may leave for other institutions, with remaining staff having to fulfil existing obligations. PhD candidates reported that the NWO Veni grants are highly prized and they can apply themselves for these grants. However, they said that their career options were, in part, linked to whether their professor could access continued external funds which included post-doctoral funding. This seems a slightly haphazard way of holding on to high potential post-doctoral researchers. The Committee wonders if there is a way for universities, either jointly through perhaps the Netherlands Institute of Government (NIG), or on their own initiative, to examine closely the opportunities for early career researchers and establish some career paths.

External funding is becoming much more widespread, not only in public administration and not only in the Netherlands, but the Committee was not aware of active plans to capture advantages and mitigate risks related to third stream funding. Where are the plans for developing researchers so that they can manage the multiple demands of third stream funding in an efficient and effective way; are there arrangements for cross-subsidy or for accrual accounting to build up risk capital; what are the arrangements for secondments into and out of third stream funding to spread expertise and pressure; are there any arrangements for sabbatical periods for third stream researchers to enable them to write up high quality research in top journals? This may be an area for active leadership and management of opportunity and risk, with clearer research, publications and human resource strategies to address these.

The Netherlands Institute of Government (NIG), the Dutch Research School for Public Administration and Political Science, is an important national resource for all the universities and their research and PhD programmes in public administration and is potentially a model for other countries. It provides intellectual resources, cultivates inter-university collaborative networks including for PhD candidates, and enhances professional identity and socialisation across the field of public administration.

The Committee has raised some fundamental questions about the recognition and active management of the profile and prestige of Dutch public administration research internationally. The Review Committee expresses concern about the viability of public administration programmes for the next ten years unless a more assertive and active approach is taken. This could affect the international top position of the Dutch public administration schools.

Productivity: how far can we go?
Productivity in the 'American' style and culture dominated the self-evaluation reports and the environment in which the Dutch colleagues are working. By this the Committee means, a focus on quantitative bibliometrics in describing the outputs and value of the work of the programmes and institutes. Long lists of publications, ordered in Foucauldian fashion by journal rating in some cases, citation indices, the counting up of blogs and tweets: how far do these fully represent the value created by public administration researchers and how far can this quantitative race continue?

There are of course limitations in any performance indicators and measures. Citation counts are not allowed in the quality assessments of some countries because there are still idiosyncrasies in naming, topic and appeal, which have an effect on, for example, the h-index. We can use them indicatively but not definitively. One researcher noted ruefully that their h-index would stay high if they continued to plough the same furrow of research, in small variations on a theme, rather than branch out into new and relatively uncharted territory, where citation counts initially would be much lower. All credit to that researcher for moving some of their research into a new field – but how many less courageous researchers will be calculating that the best strategy is to 'stick to the knitting' and reproduce endless variations on their seam of research? How far do citation counts lead to a race for popularity, a desire to stay in main-stream areas rather than fossick around unpopular or unrecognised areas of research?

Second, the focus on quantitative metrics can lead to the substitution of quantity for real intellectual debate about ideas. It is interesting that the self-evaluation reports catalogue all the publications in the review period (rightly so) but are less fulsome about the intellectual achievements and breakthroughs in the review period.

Finally, the 'publications arms race' has to be questioned in terms of its endpoint. A number of the universities the Committee reviewed are proud to have achieved a substantial step forward in, for example, English language publications, or publications in international refereed journals of the highest quality. How far can quantitative productivity increase? What are the outcomes (not just the outputs) being sought? And, crucially, what are the perverse incentives and negative effects which can arise from the pursuit of quantitative outputs? The Committee has already referred to the incentive to stay researching in a field where researchers have already established their reputation and are mining a popular stream of research. Also, the Review Committee had to ask for revised figures in relation to employment in order to address the 'adding in' of numerous publications of those researchers

who had, say, a research appointment of less than 0.1 FTE (of which more below). In addition, it wonders what steps can be taken to prevent 'ethical fading' – where the pressures to publish are so great that the ethical guidelines and principles are relaxed, or interpreted favourably to the researcher, or where uncomfortable or unpredicted results are withheld or played down because it will damage publication potential? How far will topics be pursued because they are popular rather than important?

One approach to counter an over-emphasis on bibliometrics is to pay more time and attention in the self-evaluation report to the intellectual ideas and debates to which the research contributes and to locate that research in particular traditions, and to pay more attention to impact and added value, both in scientific and societal terms. This might involve more direct discussion with peers about their research and contribution than on a performance assessment, which focuses a lot on scores.

One interesting point the Committee commented on amongst itself was the contrasting approaches to performance management of staff used in the four universities. Each had performance norms and annual appraisal as means to performance manage staff and their outputs, but these were used in widely contrasting ways. For example, one university emphasised 'hard' targets to manage productivity – explicit norms, individualised performance analysis, a competitive culture. Another university emphasised a 'soft' culture with an emphasis on collegiality, on intellectual challenge, and the use of peer pressure as the means to achieve high outputs. Is either right or better? The Committee doesn't have the basis for knowing this, but it noted that both approaches seemed to work. The decisive factor here seems to be that the researchers involved accept the adopted approach.

Quantitative indicators of productivity are very tempting. They can appear to be commensurable across institutions and provide single measures of output. Appendix 4 sets out a table, which summarises the productivity of participating programmes in terms of publications per research FTE (PhD candidates excluded). However, the simplicity of such measures can be misleading and the Committee believes they should not be taken as a sole indicator of productivity but should be used alongside qualitative judgements about value, contribution and innovation. Other review committees have noted similar hazards. FTE may be calculated in different ways; some publications may be 'worth' more than others; the quantitative measures cannot address scientific breakthrough or the opening up of new perspectives on an intellectual issue.

Gaining a clear picture of each institute and programme
The Review Committee appreciates the considerable efforts to write the self-evaluation reports (as noted in the preface). The information was detailed, systematic and extensive. Nevertheless, the Committee struggled to understand some elements of the institutes and programmes, and requested additional information both during and after the site visits. It is worth reflecting on this and on the information which helps an international review committee.

First, information about the structure and leadership of the institute under review was limited. Some self-evaluation reports were a little sketchy about the unit of 'institute' which was under review. The Committee found that the aggregation level of the 'institute' varied considerably. Sometimes, it was a department which was more or less co-terminous with the research programme (e.g. Utrecht University School of Governance). Alternatively, the institute being reviewed was the public administration component of a much larger research institute (e.g. Institute for Innovation and Governance Studies at the University of Twente), or even an

entire faculty (e.g. Faculty of Social Sciences at VU University Amsterdam). Even at the level of the programme there were variations. Some universities presented a single research programme which functions as an umbrella structure for various smaller subgroups, while the University of Twente included four smaller and more specific research programmes in the review. These differences in scale were initially confusing for the Committee and it had to spend some time at each university location exploring structure and leadership and/or asking for organisation charts and other information to help clarify the unit of analysis.

Furthermore, where the review has a comparative element (by comparing across units in the same review with the same criteria) then it is hard to apply those criteria when the unit of analysis is very different in different institutions. However, for this approach to work effectively, more information about organisation structure, where necessary explaining the matrix organisation, or the boundaries of leadership and decision-making would be very helpful. The Committee would urge each university, in future reviews, to be more fulsome in their description of the organisational structure, leadership influences, and boundaries of decision-making.

A related issue concerning the management was the academic workload planning model used in each institute. The amount of time each researcher had available for research seemed to vary both across and within institutions. The amount of time was described in the self-evaluation reports but the basic business model (the rationale for the allocation of research time compared with teaching or administration time, whether and how research time can be increased through grant-holding etc.) would be helpful for future Review Committees.

The Committee was also intrigued by the concept, used in each unit reviewed, of 'the programme'. Those Committee members outside the Low Countries, initially had to listen actively and carefully to Dutch researchers to understand the added value of working within a programme. The researchers talked about the value of creating internal coherence, sense-making and encouraging collaboration across research teams and topics. They explained that, externally, a programme provided coherence and a thematic signature which aided collaboration with other universities and which helped in third stream grant applications.

These sound attractive and valuable reasons for designing and deploying a programme approach to research. However, in some cases the Committee felt a little frustrated that there was so little information available at the programme level, as the self-evaluation reports discussed the research at the level of subgroups rather than the overarching research strategies of the programme. In some other cases the Committee noted that the research agenda for the near future was currently under discussion, but strategy documents were not available, which impeded prospective assessment. If the universities are seeking feedback on future programme strategies, then why not give the Committee more text to help it understand the new emphasis/direction and to be able to give formative feedback?

The Committee noted the convergence across the programmes as a whole around the somewhat ambiguous concept of 'governance'. Each institution is using this concept for its future programme. How far is this isomorphic convergence? How far does it help the public administration field to have all institutes with a similar focus – how far does it enable them to exhibit their distinctive characteristics and expertise?

Productivity: Who is in the review and who is out

The Committee also struggled initially with some of the productivity data, particularly where staff on less than 0.1 FTE employment contracts were phenomenally productive in terms of journal publications and societal relevance.

There can sometimes be important intellectual and organisational reasons for employment contracts on very low percentages – for example to be able to hire a visiting scholar to build expertise and comparative perspectives, or to be able to engage senior public managers who have an interest and expertise in research. The Committee understands and accepts that institutions may wish to engage scholars on very low percentages.

What the Committee finds more problematic is where all the publications of a very part-time scholar are counted in the publication productivity tables, even where those publications may derive primarily from other employment than the researcher holds. This can distort the mean score of outputs from researchers who are employed either full-time or for substantial time for that university. It means that the productivity tables are unreliable in terms of mean scores, and comparability across universities is compromised. Of course, the Committee argues that quantitative measures should not be the sole metric, but it is important that as metrics they are as accurate as possible.

This is a problem which has been encountered in a range of countries where bibliometric analyses predominate and there have been varied responses to setting criteria which reduce any opportunities for 'gaming' and which are seen to be fair because they can be uniformly applied. For example, in the UK, the Research Excellence Framework excludes researchers who are employed for under 20% of their time from the quality assessment. They may be listed as staff but their work is not counted in the publications outputs.

The Committee discussed how to handle the productivity data from 'small-percentage employees' in a way which was principled, consistent and fair to each and every university in the review. It came to the conclusion that it would use a cut-off which was half that used in the UK REF: that it would accept productivity data from those who were employed for 10% or more of their time at the university, but that those whose employment contracts were for less than 10% of a standard working week would be excluded. The Committee asked the universities to recalculate their productivity data. It accepts that this created further work but believes that it has created a fairer basis for comparison across institutions, even if 0.1 FTE research time is too low a threshold to completely eliminate the risk of 'double counting' of publications (i.e. publications attributed to more than one institution), as was proven in at least one case. The Committee strongly recommends that the SEP considers either this measurement or a slightly higher one for all future reviews.

Societal relevance: hard to assess and even harder to measure

It is very difficult for a committee of foreign colleagues to assess and to compare the programmes' societal relevance, based on the commentary and tables presented in the self-evaluation reports (however painstakingly they had been constructed). There is a clear need to introduce more comparable overviews of the same types of activities (perhaps using the framework described in the KNAW report *Towards a framework for the quality assessment of social science* research, 2013) and to work with more narratives (maybe narratives coming from the field as well) to describe the impact of socially relevant activities Otherwise, it is not possible to compare accurately across institutions. Furthermore, this is not an area where quantitative measures are necessarily helpful on their own.

The Committee found different universities used different categories and deployed them in different ways. Often, the section on societal relevance was a diverse compilation of a range of different activities, stakeholders, media engagement and contributions to scientific and policy and action committees. Overall, there was a lack of systematic information and relatively little basis for comparison across institutions. Some universities catalogued all their contributions (lectures, media output, policy documents, European projects etc.) while others used only their most convincing examples in an illustrative way. A systematic comparison based on this unclassified and incomplete information is therefore very challenging.

The Committee suggests that future reviews undertake more design work prior to the self-evaluation reports and visits, to ensure that there is a more systematic and logical approach to societal relevance, and that narrative as well as quantitative data are supplied. It may be that a Committee should commission some in-country experts to provide advice to the Committee as they make these crucial judgements about societal relevance. The Committee notes that the revised SEP aims to address these matters in more detail from 2015 onwards.

Having made these comments, the Committee notes the dedication with which Dutch researchers apply their work for societal benefits. This is a distinctive feature of Dutch public administration research, and is greatly to be admired and sustained.

PhD: impressive quality and high satisfaction
The Committee was impressed by the approach to developing the next generation. Its members would all like to see this standard of PhD support and activity become more widespread in other countries. It noted the high and improved quality of standard procedures, of supervising, of productivity. Completion rates had improved since the last review and there are very few drop-outs (cf. appendix 4).

The Committee also enjoyed meeting and talking with the PhD candidates in all the institutions. They displayed high satisfaction in their roles and their work in research teams (although some were slightly frustrated about career routes post-PhD) and had a high level of identification with their own institutions. The PhD candidates clearly enjoyed meeting fellow PhDs from other universities within the public administration field through the NIG. This building of both a local and a national identity can only benefit the field of public administration for the future.

The Committee noted that the routes into undertaking and completing a PhD are quite varied. The Dutch system of salaried PhDs attracts great admiration from other countries as it provides a stable base of funding for the candidate and socialises them into the expectations and standards of academic employment. The Committee noted a small but increasing number of 'external' PhDs, which are funded by the candidates themselves or by their employers (or a foreign funding body) and are often undertaken on a part-time basis alongside other employment. The Committee noted that some external candidates appeared to be less *au fait* with the activities of the programme, the research interests of staff and appeared to interact to a lesser degree with other PhD candidates. Is enough done by universities to integrate external candidates? If they are an increasing source of PhD research, this is an issue which might be addressed for the future.

There appeared to be a trend for more PhD candidates to present a thesis based on a collection of published or submitted journal papers (often in English) as opposed to the traditional monograph. This variation may be a healthy development to address varied contexts and circumstances of PhDs, but the Committee also noticed that conventions about

how much work was needed for a PhD by publication varied both within and across institutions (whether sole authorship or with a supervisor; whether article was published or in submission; quality of journal; number of papers). Those undertaking more traditional monographs seemed to have strong commitments to their stakeholders and were keen to write in Dutch for the benefit of practitioners as well as academics. How far do these different publication trajectories influence the opportunities for an academic career post-doctoral submission? These are questions which may need addressing in the longer term.

Personnel management, gender and diversity
Procedures of evaluation and assessment of performance of personnel seem to be accepted and highly internalised.

In most institutions gender policy and practice was and remains a problem. This was on two levels. First, there was the familiar problem (existing in many universities) of a good mix of gender at PhD candidate level but fewer women represented in tenure track, in tenured positions and particularly at senior levels. Indeed the prior review report also commented on this problem of gender opportunities.

However, the second level of problem was a degree of complacency about the lack of women in more senior and senior research positions. There was awareness of a problem and indeed this was mentioned in some of the self-evaluation reports. However, there was a disturbing repetition of myths 'explaining' the absence of women at senior levels and also a lack of awareness of policies and practices which can be deployed to address and to some extent ameliorate this problem. When asked what was being done to address gender inequality, one university gave an example of good practice (helping women returning to work after giving birth by reducing their teaching load for a few months) but others commented that they were not sure what to do. The Committee suggests that the institutions examine more carefully the systematic evidence which is available about gender (and other forms of diversity) and put in place some concrete HR and cultural practices, along with evaluation of progress over a defined period of time. There is plenty of good practice in both the public and private sectors on which to draw.

Future programmes and strategies
The Committee is expected to judge the future strategy on some key variables. As was mentioned above, this was quite difficult: there were no, few or limited texts dealing with possible new strategies of research, and the self-evaluation reports only delivered some general comments on this point and mainly summarised broad strategic considerations. A SWOT analysis was undertaken by each institute or programme but the implications for intellectual, financial and human resource strategic considerations were not explored. This is an important point for the next round of review. At least the Committee needs some basic documents, even if these only have the status of internal documents-in-progress. This is a missed opportunity.

Assessment of institutes and programmes

3. Research review Erasmus University Rotterdam

Programme: Lost Connections, Linking Capacities: On the Effectiveness of
                      Governance and Public Services
Programme leader: Prof. Geert Teisman
Research staff 2013: 13.2 FTE tenured, 38.0 FTE total

Assessments: Quality: 5
                      Productivity: 5
                      Relevance: 4.5
                      Viability: 4.5

Since all public administration research takes place within one single programme at Erasmus University Rotterdam (EUR), and as the self-evaluation report does not clearly separate the institute and programme level, the committee decided to integrate both levels of assessment. Accordingly, the following assessment covers both the institute and the programme.

1A. The Institute

The Department of Public Administration at Erasmus University Rotterdam (EUR) is one of four research departments within the Faculty of Social Sciences (FSS), the others being Psychology, Sociology and Pedagogical Sciences. From the interviews, the Committee concluded that there is a sense of competition with these other Departments for prestige and funding, though also a recognition that the recent reorganisation at faculty level is likely to bring closer cooperation, notably with Sociology. The self-evaluation report states that the FSS stimulates international and interdisciplinary cooperation, linking theory-driven research with real problems in societies. These problems can be local, regional, national and international and span a variety of societal and policy fields.

Although the formal responsibility for all FSS research lies with the Dean of the Faculty, in 2005, a new management model was introduced: The responsibility for the Public Administration research programme has been delegated to the Research Director of the Public Administration Department though many funds are held centrally. He is part of a management team which also includes the Chair of the Department and the Director of Education.

The main aims of the research policies of the faculty are to promote and conduct high-quality research that is internationally recognised; to stimulate comparative research and interdisciplinary cooperation; and to publish high-quality research (mainly articles and PhD theses, with books becoming less attractive as the focus on international publications and citations intensifies at Erasmus) and obtain external funding from the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO), the EU and other third-party sources.

The general environment at the university and faculty level appears to be less supportive than the Committee expected it to be, given the highly respected international status of the Public Administration Department in the field of public administration. There is increasingly centralisation of budgets across the faculty. In addition, the use of productivity standards and metrics stemming from other scientific communities can be seen as threatening for the internal position of the Department if there is insufficient recognition of the distinctive

elements which constitute productivity in public administration. This issue will be dealt with below ('4. Productivity').

The formal reorganisation and merger with Sociology has yet to fully embed but the Committee stresses that it will be important to retain the distinctive elements of public administration. The decrease of the number of students also influences the position of the department in the Faculty in relation to research. All these factors stemming from the wider university environment put serious pressure on the department and its internal cohesion and the Committee considers this as threatening the new programme strategy of the department, and the international positioning of the department. This issue will also be discussed below ('6. Viability and strategy for the future').

1B. The Programme

The current research programme (2006-2013) of the Public Administration Department is entitled 'Lost Connections, Linking Capacities: On the Effectiveness of Governance and Public Services'. It focuses on the interactions within and between modern governments, society and markets, and lost or broken connections between them, especially in societies in the developed world. The self-evaluation report describes the aim of the Programme as 'to develop new theories and knowledge on lost connections and linking capacities and to contribute to theories on governmental effectiveness, legitimacy and linking capacity'.

Two subprogrammes, 'Governance of Complex Systems' (GOCS) and 'Comparative Public Service Innovation' (CPSI) form the basis of the programme, with most staff working in one subprogramme or the other, though with inter-connections encouraged. GOCS addresses the inter-organisational aspects of governance using a network and system perspective. This includes the governance of physical systems such as water and urban development. CPSI examines primarily organisational and management perspectives on the barriers and enablers of the legitimacy and effectiveness of public services. It includes research on innovation and on policy alienation among other topics.

The Committee notes that in 2014, the current research programme will be transitioned into a new programme centred on the concept of governance capacity, which is seen as essential for meeting the grand challenges of modern societies. Its working title is 'Governance capacities; how to combine organisational accountability and (political) control competences with adaptive and innovative capacities in governance networks'. This will include a stronger emphasis on resilience and adaptive capacity. However, to the surprise of the Committee there was relatively little information about this new programme, which is imminent, or on how the transition to the new programme will take place. The Committee is therefore less able to comment on its focus and future than might have been the case with a more detailed outline.

2. Quality and academic reputation

The quality and academic reputation of this programme and the outputs of its research staff are excellent. On a range of measures, the aim of the department to be prominent in international refereed journals and in international academic networks has been successfully achieved. Members of the department have, for example, produced prominent and well cited writings on governance network, on network management, on trust in government, on the application of complexity theory, on social innovation and on e-government. There are interesting and valuable new lines of enquiry, for example about the branding of public services and about the policy alienation of professionals.

The Committee notes that publications have appeared in the top-tier academic journals (e.g. JPART, PAR, Public Administration, Governance) as well as in middle ranking journals (PMR, IRAS, ARPA) and in specialist journals. There are also academic papers in Dutch language journals.

The publications are well cited. Seven full professors have an h-index of 20 or greater. Several associate and assistant professors have an h-index of 10 or more. While h-index is not a full guide to quality and reputation (see general chapter), overall, it is a pleasing feature of this department.

The self-evaluation report expresses quality largely in a particular approach which is quite 'American' in that it focuses on publications in journals and on levels of citations. The report expresses quality less in narrative form (the intrinsic quality or value of the work). This may be a function of working in a university which was described to the Committee as more focused on a medical than a humanities model of science, and thus the currency of comparative performance within and across faculties is most commonly expressed in citations. This is understandable but the Committee hopes that the researchers do not get so caught up in external indicators of quality that they lose a sense of the intrinsic scientific worth of particular projects, some of which may not initially be high profile or popular.

An academic with a strong reputation and track record undertakes the leadership of the programme and he appears to be well supported by other senior staff and researchers in general.

The self-evaluation report describes different aspects of the quality strategy for the past and upcoming years. During the 2008-2013 period, the Department is said to have increased the quality of its research staff by appointing a number of talented new staff members, some of whom have since acquired personal NWO grants. The Committee meeting with some of the early career staff was energetic, with a real sense of engagement in scientific endeavour. Several are on a clearly indicated tenure track.

For the next four years, further increasing the quality of the output in international refereed journals and in terms of scientific impact and reputation is mentioned as an important further step towards establishing the Department as one of the leading PA groups both in Europe and internationally.

Indicators of academic esteem include the presidency of the International Research Society in Public Management (IRSPM), which helps to embed and strengthen international academic neworks, as well as the editorship of key public administration journals and wide engagement in editorial boards.

3. Resources
The research programme of the Department of Public Administration at EUR is by far the largest in the review. Over the current review period (2008-2013) it had an average of 27.2 research fte's, of which 11.3 were tenured. Especially over the last two years the number of research fte's has increased, to 38.0 in 2013. Recent hires include a mix of senior and junior researchers, with some of the latter in tenure track positions with clear performance criteria.

Diversity in terms of gender and ethnicity remains a point which requires attention. Gender was noted in the SWOT analysis and was discussed in the review meetings. While a large number of the PhDs are women, there are currently no female full professors and the

number of women in mid-ranking posts is limited. It would be helpful for the Department to pay detailed and evidence-based attention to this matter, and take steps which, on the basis of research, are known to enhance diverse participation at all levels.

The regular research time available for staff has decreased from 45% in the 2001-2007 period to 40% today. This remains higher than at some other institutions but if the Department is to maintain its prestigious position in the academic field, great care will be needed to maintain research time for staff in the programme.

The annual budget of the Department of Public Administration largely consists of direct university funding, allocated on the basis of the number of bachelor's and master's diplomas and PhD defences. In 2013, PhD premiums alone were responsible for more than 10% of the total research budget. New PhD positions, however, are paid out of second and third stream funds rather than out of direct university funding.

The Committee concludes that research funding is impressive. The annual amount of funding fluctuates substantially each year, and this must make staffing allocation a challenge. In the annual budget external funding is at the moment (still) secondary to university funding. Nonetheless, EU grants are said to have been an important source of income for some time already. There are some large-scale EU funded projects including INSPIRES and LIPSE. The success rate for applications to European funding schemes has been higher than for applications to national funding agencies and the Department has a financial reward system in place for the acquisition of such grants. It is encouraging to see that EUR has succeeded in obtaining NWO grants, including two Veni and one Vidi grants.

4. Productivity
The productivity of EUR is excellent. During the period under review, the research staff of the programme produced 2,225 publications (including conference papers).

Examining publication rates for English language peer-reviewed journal articles only for those with research contracts at 10% or over shows that there were 310 such articles, and overall representing 4.2 articles (mean score) per research FTE per year. This is prolific output and a key strength of the programme. Over the review period, the number of articles in English peer-reviewed journals has increased substantially, in line with the aim of the programme and department. The self-evaluation report mentions that this is the result of an explicit policy, aimed at achieving a more international focus. As mentioned, a considerable proportion of papers are published in high-ranking journals. This is a considerable achievement.

During the 2008-2013 period there was also a substantial output of books and monographs and book chapters. However, books are of declining interest to the programme and department and there is no reward structure in place for writing monographs and books. Many PhD candidates now produce a series of articles and/or journal submissions for their thesis submission, except where there is a strong practitioner focus in and engagement with the PhD.

A large part of the output falls into the combined SEP categories of 'professional publications' and 'publications for the general public' (6.3 publications per research FTE per year).

Over the review period, 32 PhD theses were completed, which is equal to 0.5 PhDs per year per tenured fte. The number of graduations is reported to be substantially higher than it was

during the previous review period. Detailed information on the completion rates of PhD candidates who entered the programme between 2005 and 2009 was not provided to the Committee.

As part of its personnel policy, the Department registers the productivity and impact of its individual staff members within an annual performance appraisal and measurement system. Before the annual appraisal of staff members their scores are compared with the progressive EUR norm scores (in which the score for 2013 is 30% higher than the 2011 score). Staff indicated to the Committee that they were clear about these norms and were satisfied with their use.

5. Societal relevance

The PA scholars are active in a number of fields to create social relevance, particularly in publications for general audiences, professional training and in collaborative research projects. The self-evaluation report mentions that bringing scientific knowledge on PA to the 'market' of public sector professionals is one of the main tasks of the PA Department. In cooperation with the university's Erasmus Center for Valorisation, it aims to develop high quality 'valorisation' chains to bridge the knowledge gap between academia and the field.

In order to reach its stakeholders within society, over the review period the Department has produced a range of publications and social media contributions, such as newspaper and journal articles, books, and book chapters, and blogs aimed at professional and general audiences. In their outreach activities staff members increasingly make use of social media. Additionally, staff members are said to engage in knowledge exchange by cooperating with the professional field in joint projects (e.g. the Knowledge for Climate-network), by being members of advisory- and assessment committees, by taking part in post-initial training programmes designed for professionals, and by delivering lectures to general audiences. The Rotterdam group of researchers are particularly active in international, European and Dutch activities of social relevance, especially policy networks, for example COCOPS and LIPSE.

6. Viability and strategy for the future

The Department is experiencing reorganisation in the university and the competitive space is fierce, particularly in a university with strong traditional science departments. Its strategy of continuing to develop publications in English for the international academic community reinforces its aim to be internationally recognised and valued.

The new research programme, which was intended to be in place before the end of 2014, may help to enhance its visibility, reputation and contribution though the Committee notes that the programme still needs fleshing out. Discussions with research staff have made it clear that this is a programme in transition. The focus on governance is topical and the interest in capacity including control, resilience and adaptability will be important for the future. However, this might be seen as so broad and so abstract that the value of a programme as a strategic, sense-making and grant-attracting tool might be lost. The department may wish to undertake further work on how the boundaries and identity of the programme will be set in a way which gives focus to the work, encourages cross subprogramme collaboration, and attracts grants, while not being so loose that the value of a programme is lost.

The reorganisation and the consequent change of leadership and management currently appear to the Committee to represent the biggest risks to the success of this internationally focused programme. However, there are also many valuable elements in place for the continued viability of the programme: a clear set of aims and objectives about research

publication and positioning, a clear performance appraisal and management system understood by staff; an improved approach to PhD supervision and hence completion rates. Attention to gender and diversity would further enhance the programme's performance potential.

The strategy for the future focuses very much on publications, particularly publication metrics, and becoming (or perhaps rather consolidating) a leading public administration group globally. The Committee saw less attention in detail to the future programme or to other ways in which quality and relevance might be assessed.

7. PhD-training and supervision

Internal PhD candidates at the Public Administration Department are mainly financed by second and third stream financing, while external PhDs often combine PhD research with their professional work. Recently, there has also been an influx of foreign candidates from countries such as China, which is assumed to further increase because of the international collaborations of the Erasmus Graduate School of the Social Sciences and Humanities.

To reduce the number of dropouts, which was considerable during the previous review period, PhD trajectories have been streamlined. Drawing up a 'training and supervision plan', which includes making explicit mutual expectations and demands, and assigning both a supervisor and a daily mentor to each candidate has professionalised the supervision of PhD candidates. Efforts have also been made to ensure a better embedding of PhD candidates. At the local level, PhD candidates are expected to participate in a variety of meetings and workshops, while at the national level they can participate in the training programme offered by the NIG.

Aside from their own training and research, PhD candidates who are employed by the university have a teaching load equal to 20% of their appointment. External candidates do not teach. The PhD candidates that the Committee spoke to were positive about their experiences but some were uncertain about their future careers, and felt that progress into a full-time academic appointment was still more dependent on the funding found by the supervisor than on achievement. They also wanted to see more women in senior positions as role models.

The Committee notes that it is no longer customary for PhD candidates to produce a monograph. Most internal PhD dissertations consist of a collection of peer-reviewed articles published in English-language journals though some PhD candidates continue to write a monograph especially where external public services partners are engaged who would find it more valuable and socially relevant.

8. Conclusion

The 'Lost Connections' Programme at Erasmus University Rotterdam, with its two subprogrammes on governance of complex systems and on the functioning of public service organisations is a success. The quality of the scientific work is high, using a range of indicators as well as the inherent enthusiasm among the researchers themselves. The programme has succeeded in its aim of internationalising, with a higher proportion of journal articles in English language journals of high quality. The productivity of the group is very high indeed. The Committee notes that this could lead to a high level of individual competitiveness. The Committee wonders whether this level of productivity can be sustained, especially as it has increased substantially since the last period. This is something which might

bear some discussion in order to sustain this without burnout of staff or devaluing of important research which gets lower citations. Research time is going down, direct funds are declining and have to be compensated for by external funding, which increases workload, and student numbers are reducing so there are some challenges ahead, as for many universities. It looks to the Committee that the Department will continue to perform at a high level so long as it can find ways to address challenges as they arise. It will benefit from strong endorsement and recognition of value from the university as a flagship Department of public administration.

The challenges, though, need careful attention. The university environment is becoming more centralised, there is the merger to achieve with Sociology, the downturn in student numbers to manage, and the increasing dominance of metrics derived from more scientific and laboratory based disciplines rather than the social scientific and predominantly field-based discipline of public administration. These will need thoughtful leadership and management if the motivation and performance of staff is to be upheld. It is in the interests of the university to support public administration in keeping up its excellent international position and by adapting organisation, strategies and criteria for evaluation at university and faculty level to reflect the distinctive features of public administration as a discipline internationally, both in its own academic terms and in terms of valorisation and societal relevance.

4. Research review University of Twente

4A. The Institute

1. The Institute

The Institute for Innovation and Governance Studies (IGS) was established in 2001 as one of four priority research institutes at the University of Twente (UT). While the other institutes are predominantly technical, IGS adopts a primarily social and behavioural sciences perspective. Its mission is to undertake multidisciplinary research and provide postgraduate training in the field of the governance and management of social and technological innovation. In accordance with the overall strategy of UT, IGS aims to combine scientific excellence with societal relevance.

IGS is a cooperation between two Schools ('Behavioral, Management and Social Sciences' and 'Engineering Technology') and fourteen different departments. The Institute's research programmes and strategy are managed by an Institute Council and a Programme Council, and is headed by a Scientific Director. Amongst the eight research programmes affiliated with IGS are four programmes in the domain of public administration and therefore covered by this review. These are:

- Innovation of Governance (IoG, UT1);
- Governance of Knowledge and Innovation (GKI, UT2);
- Innovation and Governance for Sustainable Development (SUI, UT3);
- Higher Education and Research in the Knowledge Society (HERinKS, UT4).

During the review period, all IGS researchers covered by the review were employed by the School of Behavioural, Management and Social Sciences.

The multidisciplinary matrix structure of the organisation, involving fourteen multidisciplinary departments (which cover disciplines such as sociology, law, economics, political science as well as public administration and technical disciplines) and the cross-cutting programmes, seems quite complex. The functioning of the management, and especially the relationships between the programme Council, the Institute Council, the Dean, the Chairs of the Departments and the Scientific Director of IGS, appear somewhat ambiguous. Moreover, the Committee identified substantial PA components, but these were scattered and the Committee would have liked to see a stronger centre of gravity in relation to PA. As PA scholars and research are divided between different departments and programmes the Committee wondered whether this was giving the strongest or clearest profile of the valuable and innovative work taking place in the public administration field at Twente. There are different resource arrangements for the different PA-relevant programmes within the institute and this seems to be characterised by historical explanations for the more specific arrangements rather than a current strategic logic (for example, whether different elements of the institute are heavily funded by teaching or by external grants). The Committee wonders how easy it is to build synergies and collaboration where such path dependencies are so prominent.

Regarding the organisational structure one advice could be to simplify the organisational structure and the management arrangements somewhat and to bring the organisation and management of the PA research more up front and coherent. The current state of things

seems a bit too fragmented and some programmes might lack a critical mass for research (this will be dealt with further below, under 'Quality' and 'Resources').

2. Quality and academic reputation

Because the scope of IGS is much wider than Public Administration (PA), the Committee is not authorised to assess the academic quality of the institute as a whole. Apart from the joint mission statement, there is no overall research programme. IGS claims to have formulated a 'strategic research orientation' aiming at combining focus, quality and staff.

The Committee notes that the PA component within IGS is spread out over four different programmes. Dutch PA research originated at the University of Twente and the university has pioneered elements of PA. Nowadays Twente's position is distinctive in the Netherlands because its PA research is located intellectually in a technical university with a very practical and technological orientation. Twente is at the forefront of multidisciplinary and indeed trans-disciplinary approaches, particularly the intersection between governance issues and technological innovations. The Committee concludes that this multi/trans-disciplinary approach is stimulating but also demanding.

The four research programmes seem to overlap at least on an overall level. Concepts such as 'governance' and 'innovation' appear in the headings of three of the four programmes of IGS and 'knowledge' appears in two. It is not always clear to the Committee how these programmes interrelate or build on synergies between them. There might be a need for stronger collaboration and integration across groups, as was noted in the self-evaluation report. The management indicated to the Committee that they might consider greater fragmentation (e.g. base evaluation on the research around each chair) or go in the other direction and create stronger synergies across programmes. The Committee wonders how far synergies can be undertaken without at least some degree of organisational restructuring (and financial alignment) to support this. It welcomes the steps that are being taken by the chairs of the four groups, along with directors of IGS and teaching programmes, to develop a joint strategic research agenda under the title of 'Public Governance and Responsible Innovation'. The Committee did not see details of this strategy in written form, and so cannot comment in detail, but during the visit it was said that the strategy focuses on stimulating research on the increasingly blurred boundaries between private sector and public sector with regard to governance and management, and with special concern for technological developments. This may be a useful first outline but it would benefit from sharper focusing and greater clarity.

The Committee notes that IGS actively supports the organisation of scientific conferences and provides professional communication services for attracting publicity for research results, the acquisition of funds, and personal successes of its researchers. A facility that should be mentioned in particular is *IGS Datalab*, which started in 2011 in UT1 (Innovation of Governance) but is now used across IGS in order to promote standards of excellence in data collection, analysis and storage/archiving. Currently, Datalab is preparing to take on the analysis of big data, e.g. in a Twitter Data Grant project. The Committee considers this a promising research tool for use by researchers across IGS.

3. Resources

IGS is staffed by over 400 researchers from the Schools of Behavioral, Management and Social Sciences and Engineering Technology. Roughly 20% of these researchers could be classified as PA scholars. The institute does not employ these researchers itself, but rather redistributes direct research funding over its affiliated research programmes.

As elsewhere, the higher (tenured) ranks of the staff are male dominated. However, a promising practice to enhance equality and diversity is that women who have just returned to work after giving birth are exempted from teaching for a few months to enable them to focus initially on their research. The university-wide Female Faculty Network Twente (FFNT), which aims to support the careers of female academics, is currently chaired by a female professor associated with the HERinKS programme (UT4).

In the School of Behavioral, Management and Social Sciences the Dean, the Scientific Director of IGS, and the Department Chairs allocate the research, teaching and management time for each individual staff member on an annual basis. Within fulltime employment (1.0 FTE) the minimum research time is 0.2 FTE. Research time is not provided unconditionally, but depends on individual performance on a set of indicators (i.e. external funding, research output, PhD supervision, teaching tasks). To expand the percentage of their time dedicated to research, staff members need to acquire external funding so that they can 'buy out' of teaching time. IGS provides administrative support for grant applications to NWO or the EU and for contract research collaborations with governments or private companies.

The size in terms of FTE's of the four programmes in public administration hosted by IGS varies considerably. The Innovation of Governance programme (UT1, 14.1 research FTE's in 2013) is by far the largest and the Higher Education and Research in the Knowledge Society programme (UT4, 3.2 research FTE's in 2013) is the smallest. The Committee wonders whether the smaller programmes lack critical mass for the future.

IGS programmes all have different funding structures – and different accounting criteria for keeping track of first, second and third stream funding – making comparison difficult for the Committee and presumably making it difficult internally as well. When comparing the four PA programmes, the Committee noted that the highly specialised programmes UT3 and especially UT4 are much more reliant on external sources of income than UT1 and UT2. A dilemma these programmes face is how to combine academically interesting research with acquiring the much needed research contracts. In the case of UT4, direct funding is virtually absent as regular teaching activities only account for around 5% of staff time. All researchers, even the tenured staff, are predominantly paid out of external funds. By contrast, UT1 is very much dependent on teaching, causing an imbalance in the relation between teaching and research. In the self-evaluation report and during the interview with the institute management the imbalances in the funding base of the IGS programmes were described as one of the biggest challenges. The Committee agrees that they are a major concern.

4. Productivity
The self-evaluation report does not describe an overall productivity strategy or an enumeration of outputs at the institute level. In practice, the productivity of the four PA programmes varies. Productivity by total output creates one particular ranking while examination of refereed journal articles produces a different ranking (cf. Appendix 4), showing the variety of approaches of the different programmes to productivity. There are clearly tensions to be managed between overall output and output focused on refereed journals. Also in terms of PhD's some programmes are more productive than others, with UT2 and UT3 scoring higher on annual PhD defences per tenured FTE than UT1 and UT4.

5. Societal relevance
Overall the societal relevance of the research groups at Twente is very good. The documentation provided to the Committee states that 'the search for added value' is a common characteristic of all IGS activities, but it does not explicitly mention policies or

strategies to enhance the societal relevance of the research at the institute level. However, there is considerable information about the actual outputs and contributions made across the four programmes and thus the contribution of IGS. Some contributions are narrow but in depth (e.g. UT4); some contributions involve active engagement in international networks (e.g. UT2 focusing on technology and knowledge policy, and UT3 and UT4 in EU projects); some engagement is extensive at the local level (e.g. UT1 involvement in networks of Dutch cities such as KISS and NICIS); some have a high involvement in official policy committees (e.g. UT3 and UT4); and some are scoring high on professional publications and publications for the general public (e.g. UT3 and UT4).

6. Viability and strategy for the future
The documentation provided to the Committee describes the position of social scientists within the essentially technological University of Twente as both a challenge and an opportunity. The Committee notes that the dominance of the engineers within the university is very evident, for example in UT's financial regime which is less favourable to the social sciences. At the same time, however, the university's profile ('high tech, human touch') highlights the positive side of the connection between technology and society. During the interviews, institute and programme representatives mentioned that because of this ingrained cooperation between social and behavioural scientists and engineers, IGS is ideally placed to write proposals for funding schemes such as Horizon2020. IGS Research Programmes are well equipped to respond to the grand societal challenges of today and tomorrow. Because of their links with local and regional stakeholders, researchers can offer new perspectives on the often decentralised implementation of new regulatory and policy initiatives from EU and national governments.

In order to face some of the issues that threaten the health of PA research in Twente, the Chairs of the four PA research programmes, the Director of IGS and the Directors of the relevant BA and MA teaching programmes have recently drawn up a joint strategic research agenda ('Public Governance and Responsible Innovation'). This agenda aims to address threats such as the new strategic research orientation of UT that puts stronger emphasis on the integration of the social and behavioural sciences and technology, the problems in acquiring sufficient external funding, and the imbalances in the funding base of the different programmes. To help develop that closer collaboration across the IGS PA programmes, the Committee would like to encourage IGS to undertake a SWOT analysis (and use other strategic analysis tools) at the institute and not just the programme level, in order to identify the synergies across programmes and common threats and opportunities.

With regards to the institute's viability, the move of the Netherlands Institute of Government (NIG) to Twente and the success of *IGS Datalab*, which enabled, for example, the acquisition of a large Twitter-data grant, are positive indicators. To strengthen the viability, the Committee would also recommend assessing further the possibility of merging or integrating programmes and/or further developing a joint strategy for strengthening the contribution to theoretical development and empirical research about public administration.

It is clear from the Committee's discussions at UT that a merger of the four programmes is neither desirable nor feasible and the Committee can see the logic of this. However, the efforts at greater joint strategy, closer content collaboration and exploration of synergies are to be welcomed, both for internal reasons but also to present a less mystifying and less complex external face to the world. The Committee wonders whether integrating elements of the four research programmes with a PA component would be valuable for IGS, how far it would help to build and promote the contribution of public administration as a field,

particularly given its pioneering and distinctive contributions at Twente. In considering synergies and collaboration, the Committee would like to suggest reviewing whether the repetition of particular words in programme titles (innovation, knowledge, governance) is enhancing identity-building and reputation.

7. PhD-training and supervision

IGS currently hosts around 50 PhD candidates, whose training takes place at the Twente Graduate School (TGS). As part of the TGS graduate programme, most PhD's also participate in the educational programmes of the inter-university graduate school for Political Science and Public Administration (NIG) or the Dutch national Graduate School for Science, Technology and Modern Culture (WTMC). The Committee was pleased to hear that Twente's Department of Public Administration currently hosts the NIG directorate, while the programme leader of UT2 is chair of WTMC's Research Committee.

The PhD candidates that the Committee spoke to described IGS mostly as an organisational umbrella structure. Their own affinity seems to lie mostly with the research group of which they are part. Although they mentioned an annual 'PhD day' organised by IGS, they confirmed that most other activities for PhDs take place within the boundaries of their respective programmes and or departments.

Thesis supervision is conducted in supervision teams, which consist – at least – of the main supervisor (a full professor) and a second or 'daily' supervisor (usually an associate or assistant professor). The supervision team meets with the PhD candidate on a monthly basis, while contacts with the second or 'daily' supervisor are expected to be more frequent. At the beginning of a PhD trajectory, a training and supervision plan (TSP) is drafted. This plan, which is submitted to the NIG for approval, contains the training and supervision rights and duties of both the PhD candidate and the supervisors. After nine months, the PhD candidate presents his/her research progress to the programme staff, after which a go/no-go decision is made on the continuation of the project. Over the review period, two IGS professors were honoured (2009 and 2013) with the annual NIG supervisor of the year award. Both PhD training and supervision seem very well organised to the Committee. In general, it feels that PhD candidates are well cared for. One concern is that Twente University, like an increasing number of Dutch universities, does not provide first stream funding for PhD positions.

As a result of the low inflow of students, the research master's programme run by the Innovation of Governance group (UT1) that functioned as a breeding ground for the PhD programme was discontinued in 2011. This will be remedied when UT joins the two-year research master's programme in Public Administration and Organisational Science based in Utrecht. This arrangement seems promising to the Committee.

8. Conclusion

The public administration elements of the institute are structured in a matrix way, which is not always easy to discern and brings the risk that efforts are spread over a number of differentiated programmes. The leadership at institute level recognises this and is seeking ways to strengthen synergies between the different elements, both for internal capacity and for external presentation and grant-winning. The review happened at a crucial time for the institute, since it is considering some strategic choices and changes. The Committee would like to be able to advise further but the strategic choices are still at an early stage of development. Tackling different funding structures might also be beneficial.

Valuable and socially relevant research is being undertaken at Twente, some of which is pace-setting, both in its own terms and in terms of collaborations between social scientists working in innovative technological contexts. The Committee would like to see greater contributions being made in mainstream public administration journals as well as in specialist journals. The PhD programme is well structured and productive.

4B. Programme level

Programme UT1 Innovation of Governance

Programme leaders: Prof. Bas Denters
Research staff 2013:   5.54 FTE tenured, 14.12 FTE total

Assessments: Quality: 4
                 Productivity: 4
                 Relevance: 4
                 Viability: 4.5

Brief description

The research programme Innovation of Governance (IoG) addresses changes in the relationship between citizens and government by focusing on a) How do the institutional structures and the decision-making process in public governance systems affect innovations in governance? and b) What are the effects of such innovations on legitimacy, efficiency and effectiveness and how can such effects be explained? To answer these questions a multi-level approach that integrates politics, administration, self-regulations and networks is applied. Also, a multidisciplinary and an interdisciplinary perspective including law, sociology and political science as well as public policy and public management is used. The programme aims at applying this knowledge in practice-oriented activities and in training the next generation of governance researchers.

Quality

The outline of this programme's field of research is rather spare, abstract and broad in the self-evaluation report but the research team in interview pointed to particular strengths in conceptualising and analysing multi-level governance, the role of co-production and the role of citizens in their research. The overall quality of the research is very good and the number of refereed journal articles is high. The academic reputation of the staff is also generally good. Two leading researchers have an H-index of 16 and the indexes of most of the remaining staff are above 10. Some of the sample publications were published in journals with a high rating, but only one is a general PA journal.

The group uses multilevel, multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches and the research group includes not only PA scholars but also academics with a background in sociology and law. This broad approach might bring synergy where the additional perspectives are deployed to address PA questions. There are some new appointments in the group, including staff with prominent links to JPART, a top-ranked journal. This is promising for the future.

Research grants have increased from 7% of total funding of research FTE's in 2008 to 20% in 2013, while contract research funds increased from 17% in 2008 to 21% in 2013. Direct funding has declined from 76% to 59% in the same period. In general there seem to be many small and short term projects and fewer long term projects. However, the researchers are participating in international research consortia such as Connex, Local Councillors in Europe, EU Cost Local Public Sector Reform, Comparative Study of Electoral Studies and the European Social Survey.

Productivity

The productivity of the group is high, especially the number of refereed articles in international journals (3.34 per research FTE annually), book chapters and books. The output of professional publications and publications for the general public is, however, small, and the category of 'other output' was omitted from the productivity table provided by the programme (cf. appendix 4), so the total overall output and efficiency per research FTE is rather low. The output of PhDs (on average 0.4 per tenured FTE per year) is reasonable. The completion rate and drop-out rate of PhD candidates are, however, very good: all five standard PhD candidates who entered the programme between 2005 and 2009 graduated within five years. Overall, the Committee could not discern a clear productivity strategy.

Societal Relevance

Members of the research group have extensive interactions with various stakeholders, including professionals, public and voluntary organisations. The researchers are also active in general public debates. They participate in a number of professional boards and advisory councils and committees, conduct commissioned applied research, and contribute to practitioner-oriented conferences and professional training programmes. Activities in the National Democratic Audit, regional knowledge centres such as KISS and the Academic Workshop Twente show active engagement in local government and other networks. Compared to the other research groups UT1, however, scores lower on EU projects, contract research and professional outputs as well as publications for the general public. Also the involvement in official policy committees is relatively low compared to UT3 and UT4.

Viability

The vitality and feasibility of the programme is very good, with new staff adding to the existing group, bringing new interests and engagements. One concern might be the dependence on teaching-related sources of funding, which seem to be declining but the group intends to compensate for this through a stronger emphasis on external funding, particularly with larger grants and projects. The research time available to the researchers is also under pressure. The transfer of the directorate of NIG to Twente and its links with this group are promising. The position of the programme has been strengthened by the appointments of new chair-holders in sociology of public governance, public management and innovation and regional governance which is favourable for the future. The multidisciplinary approach, while challenging for PA, is likely to be ultimately helpful, consolidating the focus on political steering in multi-level governance arrangements.

Conclusion

The scientific relevance of the research is very high and the group has made a significant contribution to the study of the legitimacy of governance, multilevel governance and of coproduction. The research group is internationally known for a strong methodological component and its international comparative perspectives. In its best areas it is internationally competitive. Its productivity is also good, particularly in relation to refereed journal articles among the four UT programmes, though its productivity in terms of publications for non-academic audiences could be higher. The group has a bright future if it can address the decline in teaching resource and the shift to a greater reliance on external funding. Another challenge is to ensure that the public administration focus and implications are not diluted by too great a degree of multidisciplinarity.

Programme UT2 Governance of Knowledge and Innovation

Programme leader: Prof. Stefan Kuhlmann
Research staff (2013):   1.95 FTE tenured, 6.77 FTE total

Assessments:	Quality:	4
	Productivity:	3.5
	Relevance:	4
	Viability:	3.5

Brief description
The research programme Governance of Knowledge and Innovation (GKI) aims to better understand the conditions of change in research and innovation systems. The main research questions are: a) How are research and innovation systems being governed and how can transformations be guided?; b) What is the role of knowledge and advisory systems in public policy making?; c) How can innovations linked to new technologies be assessed and governed? The research is theory based and conceptually oriented and also aims at using the research insights in the practical context of policy making.

Quality
The research staffing is on the small side, consisting primarily of two chairs along with associated non-tenured staff and PhD candidates. The academic reputation of the two chairs is high. While they have H-indexes of 21 and 25, the rest of the group is below 10. One of the programme leaders is co-editor of *Research Policy*. Researchers in the group are members of scientific boards and chairmen of international research committees. Their international networks are strong.

The number of articles in international refereed journals is rather low. Most of the chapters in the edited books are written by researchers outside of the group. The submitted articles are published in *Science and Policy, Research Policy and Technological Forecasting and Social Change*. None of these are core PA journals.

In general the research of the group is multidisciplinary, it is an integral part of the Department of STePS and, as such links up to the Institute of Governance Studies, and to the Institute of Nanotechnology. It extends beyond PA and involves perspectives from science, technology and the governance of emerging technologies. It is not entirely clear to the Committee how this multidisciplinary collaboration is organised and the PA component is only one element in this complex landscape. Technology policy analysis is particularly prominent, which makes sense in a technological university. There is perhaps less which is directly in the central field of public administration.

Research grants have increased from 10% of total funding of research fte's in 2008 to 40% in 2013, while contract research funds fluctuated throughout the review period (between 0% and 16%). Direct funding has declined from 74% to 46% in the same period.

Productivity
The output and efficiency per research FTE is moderate for refereed articles (an annual average of 3.3 per research FTE), but lower when it comes to book chapters, books, professional publications and publications for the general public. There are few articles in high rated international PA journals. However, the group performs well where the efficiency of dissertations (1.3 PhD defenses per tenured FTE per year), completion rates and drop-out

rates of PhD candidates who entered the programme between 2005 and 2009 are concerned; all four affiliated standard PhD candidates graduated within five years. The Committee did not discern a clear publication strategy.

Societal Relevance

The research group is to a great extent providing expertise to policy makers in the Netherlands, in the European Union and beyond. They are active in European expert groups and advisory boards, councils and committees. They also conduct quite a lot of applied commissioned research, participate in the public debate and are running professional training courses. Compared to UT3 and UT4 the level of contract research is lower. The same goes for professional outputs and publication for the general public as well as for involvement in official policy committees.

Viability

The Committee's assessment of viability is limited to the Governance of Knowledge and Innovation programme. The group's embedding within STePS is beyond the scope of this review and has therefore not been specifically considered. This said, it is not quite clear to the Committee what the longer-term strategy of UT2 is, other than that the group outlined broad abstract intentions and the need to convince the university regarding investments. How the group will fit into the overall future strategy of the university is open. There are two chairs who are both due to retire in the relatively near future, and it is not clear whether IGS or the research team have a succession plan. This is a big concern because the research very much depends on these two scholars. About two-thirds of the funds come from research grants and one concern is how the programme will manage peaks and troughs and hold on to non-tenured staff. The unit is effective in its throughput and success of PhDs but the SWOT analysis refers to the problem of finding and funding excellent PhD candidates.

Conclusion

A main academic contribution of the group is generating knowledge about governance in conditions of uncertainty created by emerging and innovative technologies. The research is based on a number of different theoretical approaches along with the deployment of mixed methods. A strength of the group is that it is well connected to technical schools at the university. Its multidisciplinary approach is also promising, but this is making the direct PA contribution less clear. The group's reputation is rather good but there are some challenges to be addressed in order to find renewal in the group and develop stronger synergies with other programmes within IGS. The research group is rather small, key scholars will soon be retiring and a major concern is how to rejuvenate the group and retain a critical mass of high level researchers. A further concern has to do with the overlap of content between this group and with the Innovation of Governance group (IoG, UT1) and how the collaboration functions in practice.

Programme UT3 Innovation and Governance for Sustainable Development

Programme leaders: Prof. Hans Bressers
Research staff (2013): 1.85 FTE tenured, 7.34 FTE total

Assessments: Quality: 4
                 Productivity: 4
                 Relevance: 4.5
                 Viability: 4

Brief description

A main aim of the research programme Innovation and Governance for Sustainable Development (SUI) is to investigate how sustainable development can be supported by various governance approaches in public and private spheres. The programme has four main research themes: (1) energy and climate change, (2) water governance, (3) sustainable production and consumption, and (4) local and regional sustainability. Theories of policy processes, network analyses, multi-level governance, innovations and diffusions (as well as other theories) are utilised. Methodologically the programme combines qualitative and quantitative methods.

Quality

This group has shaped theory about multi-level governance which has been picked up in mainstream public administration. However, the research is not published in core PA journals. The group leader is a leading figure in Dutch public administration and he has an H-index of 24, three members of the staff are between 10-12 and the rest are below 10). It is also a concern that about two-thirds of the fte's are PhD candidates. Another concern is that the research time for some of the tenured staff is very low which is somewhat surprising given the fact that the research group is not involved in regular teaching (although it is involved in an international master's programme, which is fully accredited but not yet subsidised by the Ministry for Education).

The research mainly depends on direct funding (42% of the annual budget in 2008 and 33% in 2013), but contract research is also quite considerable (43% of the annual budget in 2008 and 32% in 2013). The share of research grants in the programme budget is, however, low (15% in 2008 and 34% in 2013). The staff is involved in several EU projects.

Productivity

Overall the output and efficiency of journal articles per research FTE is high and seems to have increased over time (the annual average is 7.5 articles per research FTE). Only a moderate proportion is in high ranking PA journals. The programme is also productive with regard to book chapters, somewhat less so for books and publications for the general public and professional audiences. Efficiency in terms of completed PhD dissertations is very high (1.6 PhD graduations per year per tenured FTE). The completion rates of PhDs who entered the programme between 2005 and 2009 are reasonable, but lower than for most other programmes in the review; after four years 22% of the standard PhD candidates had graduated, while after five years this was 67% and after six years it was 89%. There were no drop-outs.

Societal Relevance

The societal relevance of the research is very high. The staff members are involved in various engagements across levels of governance, across sectors and across countries. One example is the Dutch Water Governance Centre. They are members of national advisory boards and committees, such as the Advisory Committee on Water and the Visitation Committee on the Water Chain. They have developed a 'governance assessment tool', which is being used in a variety of settings and sounds interesting. Compared to the other Twente programmes (especially UT1 and UT2), UT3 scores high on contract research, professional publications and publications for the general public. It is also part of an impressive number of EU projects and scores high on participation in official policy committees.

Viability

There is only one full professor in the group and it would be good to see a higher proportion of chairs in the future, given the prominence and contribution of this group. It is also a concern to the Committee that tenured staff have to use an increasing part of their time for attracting external funding. The group has limited access to teaching-related direct funding. How to balance identity towards the PA discipline and towards the policy arena of sustainable development is a challenge. The appointment of a new chair in Law, Governance and Technology with thematic focus on energy might strengthen the viability.

Conclusion

This is a rather specialist programme strongly dependent on external funding. One strength of the research group is that it links PA with sustainable development. Further strengths are successful evaluation research and analysing the conditions for policy implementation. Another is the focus on institutional economics in an interdisciplinary context. The group is well connected to the international research community and has a high standing in water management, and this reputation is growing in energy and sustainable production and consumption. It is somewhat ambiguous what angle is taken on governance more generally and how innovation fits into the research programme. The group has a good record and efficiency when it comes to PhD supervision. A future opportunity is the collaboration with the other three groups and also with the engineering sciences.

Programme UT4 Higher Education and Research in the Knowledge Society

Programme leaders: Prof. Jurgen Enders (up to 2013)
Research staff (2013):   1.85 FTE tenured, 3.29 FTE total

Assessments: Quality: 4
                            Productivity: 3.5
                            Relevance: 4.5
                            Viability: 3.5

Brief description

The research programme Higher Education and Research in the Knowledge Society (HERinKS) focuses on the foundations and effects of higher education and research policies. Three main research questions are addressed: a) How and why are the institutional contexts within higher education operating and changing?; b) What are the responses of the main actors to these institutional contexts?; and c) What are the effects of the actors' responses for education, research and society? Four research areas are examined: First, the social contract and corporatisation of higher education and research; second, organisational fields, stratification and networking; third, professional organisations and their strategies and interaction; and fourth, coordination in a multi-level and multi-actor system.

Quality

The research programme is specialised, coherent and with solid scientific relevance. It has a reputation as a leading centre for research in higher education policy in Europe, but its strength has declined somewhat following the departure of some senior staff to other universities. It seems to have moved more in the direction of applied research at the expense of fundamental research. The programme's main contribution is empirical rather than theoretical and the Committee would have liked to see more publications in which the empirical research has a stronger theoretical fundament and relevance.

This trend might in part be linked to a move from institutional funding towards external funding. In 2008, 32% of the funding came from the university itself, while research grants and contract research were responsible for 9% and 59% of the total budget. In 2013, the share of contract research had grown to 81%, mostly at the expense of direct funding. The dependency on contract research, which tends to be small short time applied projects, is a concern. There is, however, also funding coming in from NWO and EU sources.

The publications listed in the self-evaluation report appendix are published predominantly in journals in the field of higher education and the Committee would like to encourage the researchers to strengthen the intellectual links to the broader field of PA.

Several of the researchers have a strong international reputation. Their citation indexes are rather high (31, 24 and 21 are the top h indices) and some of them have a strong public administration/political science profile. The replacement of a leading scholar who left in 2013, and is author or co-author of three of the submitted articles, has not yet been undertaken. Another leading scholar has moved into an administrative role. In its current state, the programme lacks a clear formal leader. The relation between IGS, HERinKS and CHEPS is also somewhat unclear to the Committee.

Productivity

The overall output and efficiency regarding publications per research FTE is very good and is the most productive of the UT programmes in this respect, especially with regard to book chapters. The programme is less productive as judged by refereed journal articles (2.05 per research FTE) so there is scope to strengthen this aspect of productivity in the future. The productivity in terms of PhDs (0.2 graduations per tenured FTE per year) is low. The completion rate of PhD's who entered the programme between 2005 and 2009 is very good, but somewhat lower than that of UT1 and UT2; after five years three out of four standard PhD candidates had graduated. The publication strategy is not very well developed.

Societal Relevance

The group scores fairly well on professional publications and publications for the general public (3.5 per research FTE per year). The researchers are active in commissioned research, practitioner-oriented conferences and workshops. They are member of several advisory committees and councils and are well linked to higher education policymakers. They are active in the public debate and contribute to professional training programmes. The creation of the 'U-Multirank' tool has contributed substantially to the debate on the ranking of higher education institutions internationally. The group also seems to be well embedded in international and professional networks. It is also involved in an impressive number of EU-projects and official policy committees.

Viability

The Committee is seriously concerned about the unfilled professorial position (although it was informed that the dean has recently stated that the chair will be filled soon), the dependence on external funding and the declining of internal funding for long term basic research. The research staff is declining numerically and the high number of part-time researchers raises the issue of whether there is a sustainable critical mass of research capacity. In addition to this, a considerable proportion of researchers are not linking their work to theories and debates in the mainstream PA discipline.

Conclusion

The research group has a strong record in the field of higher education policy research, but this record is under pressure. There is a lack of long-term research funding which could enhance the development of theory and conceptual frameworks. The group is quite small, many of its members are involved in research only on a part time basis and senior researchers have not been replaced. The lack of a chair and programme leader leaves the group in a vulnerable position. The attenuated research capacity also raises the question of reorganisation and stronger collaboration with other research groups.

5. Research review Utrecht University

Programme: Public Matters
Programme leaders: Prof. Mark Bovens (until 2012), Prof. Paul Boselie
Research staff (2013): 11.23 FTE tenured, 20.86 FTE total

Assessments: Quality: 5
                      Productivity: 5
                      Relevance: 4.5
                      Viability: 4.5

At Utrecht University (UU) all public administration research takes place within one research programme, which means that the institute and the programme overlap in most aspects (only the consultancy wing of the institute is not included in the programme). Since the self-evaluation report only distinguishes between the level of the institute and the programme where this is relevant, the Committee has, likewise, decided to integrate both levels of assessment. Accordingly, the following assessment covers both the institute and the programme.

1A. The Institute

The Utrecht University School of Governance (USG) is one of the three Departments of the Faculty of Law, Economics, and Governance (LEG) of Utrecht University and provides a range of degree programmes, research, and consultancy in the areas of Public Administration and Organisation Science. USG is a medium sized institute, which hosts one comprehensive research programme, entitled 'Public Matters'.

Formally, the responsibility for the research lies with the Dean. In practice, however, this responsibility is delegated to the heads of the Departments, who are assisted by their respective boards. Within the general parameters set by the Board of Studies of the faculty's Graduate School and the Board of Utrecht University, the USG Board has considerable autonomy in drawing up its research strategy. The implementation of research strategies and policies is left to the leaders of the two chair groups 'Public Governance & Management' and 'Organisation Science'.

The USG participates in several research focus areas ('Institutions', 'Coordinating Social Change', 'Cultures & Identities') established by Utrecht University. Additionally, in 2013 its staff was involved in the proposal and development of two further university-wide research areas: 'Professional Performance' (in collaboration with researchers at the University Medical Centre Utrecht, UMCU), and 'Sport & Society'. The Committee highly appreciates the strategic alliance with the life sciences, which provides USG with extra funding and support, and further strengthens its position within the faculty.

From a range of factors, some of which will be discussed further below (under 'resources'), the Committee concludes that USG offers a supportive and protective environment to its research programme. The most tangible evidence of this is the USG building that creates an open atmosphere in which staff and students easily interact. The Committee was pleased to find that, notwithstanding the trend of centralising the support infrastructure (facilities, buildings, student support), USG has maintained a large amount of autonomy for its own policy and management.

1B. The Programme

In order to boost the profile, coherence and international visibility of USG's research, the two former research programmes in organisation studies and public administration were merged into the current research programme Public Matters in 2008. The single programme focuses on the interactions between societal transformations and organisations with public functions, and studies how these organisations make sense of and react to the consequences of these transformations from a public (governance) perspective. Its three research lines combine approaches from public administration, political and organisational science, and public management:

1. *Public Governance*, which focuses on accountability and transparency issues, crisis management, and leadership in a context of multilevel governance;
2. *Public Management*, which focuses on public managers, professionals and professionalisation, transparency and technology.
3. *Managing Social Issues*, which focuses on public service motivation and strategic human resource management, sports policy and management in a context of multi-actor public value creation;

The Committee noted that research agendas and proposals that do not fit within these research lines are not eligible for funding, while themes and activities that contribute to strengthening USG's profile are prioritised. Accountability, transparency and technology, strategic human resource management, crisis management and leadership, professionalisation of public management and public professionalism, sustainable employability, and sports management and policy are identified as core themes within the programme.

The Committee was initially a bit sceptical about the added value of the unified programme concept, which is an intellectual unit rather than a formal entity. After speaking to programme representatives, however, it acknowledged that the overarching theme of Public Matters does encourage the research staff to focus and identify topics for research. In a general sense the umbrella structure helps to connect the three research lines, by bringing people together and creating a common language and framework that generates internal discussion and reflection. There are indeed signs of exchange and cooperation. Even so, the Committee notes that achieving complete coherence and cross-fertilisation between the research lines might be an issue, also because the programme consists – rather confusingly – of three research lines and just two chair groups.

The Committee was pleased to find that the strategic plan drawn up in 2008 on the occasion of the merger was almost fully realised. It notes that a new programme for the years 2014-2019 is currently being discussed, potentially under a new label but that there was no English text available for the Committee during the site visit.

2. Quality and academic reputation

The sample publications, the high h-indices and citations of leading researchers, the increasing number of publications in top journals of the field and in excellent journals of related fields (e.g. *Organization Studies*, *Human Relations*) and books published by top publishers all testify to the excellent quality of the research and the impressive progression on the international forum. The Committee concludes that this very high quality is not limited to key researchers, but is fairly evenly spread over the research staff. In comparison with the previous review period, the current research is internationally more visible and better embedded in academic networks. Nationally, the high academic quality is reflected in the consistent top ratings received in the *Elsevier Faculty Rating* (2008-2013). The Committee also

appreciates the encouragement of interdisciplinary research and the breadth of methods used (*qualitative, quantitative, mixed*).

One consideration is whether the programme has been equally successful with regard to all core themes. While USG has made large international contributions to topics such as accountability, transparency, eGov, crisis management, professionalism, and public service motivation, the Committee found it more difficult to assess whether USG is internationally leading in the specialised niche field of sports management and policy.

The Committee is impressed by the high quality of organisation and management, both at the level of the institute and of the programme. Over the review period, programme leaders have been able to make a strong impact, not least by developing a clear strategy and setting clear goals. The leadership has actively managed the tensions between academic and professional activities and outputs, and nurtured the collective nature of the programme. The evidently strong spirit of collaboration and mutual interest seems an effective counterbalance to the perverse effects of academic competition. Although it might be too early to assess the effects of the 2012 leadership change, the transfer of authority appears a gradual and well-prepared transition. The Committee hopes that the excellent, inspirational leadership shown in the past will be continued by a new generation of leaders.

The Committee notes that a quality strategy is evidently in place. As part of this policy, staff members are stimulated to be more quality conscious in their publication strategy and to aim for high impact ISI journals and international top publishers. Also, following a number of cases of fraud and plagiarism by Dutch researchers, the Department has taken a proactive approach to the scientific integrity of researchers, which has become a specific point within USG's quality policy.

3. Resources
USG is a medium size academic institute. Over the review period, its staff increased slightly, from 17.2 research FTE's in 2008 to 20.7 in 2013. Especially the number of tenured FTE's grew steadily. The proportion of employed PhD candidates remained stable at about 45% of the total research staff.

The overall funding of the Department has generally kept up with the increase of the research staff, although table 2a (cf. appendix 4) shows some fluctuations between successive years and the relative proportions of funding streams. On average, direct funding made up 51% of the total budget, which is higher than elsewhere, while second stream funding (research grants) and third stream funding (contract research) were responsible for 9% and 40% respectively.

The Committee has established that a main aim of the USG Research Strategy 2008-2013 has been to consolidate research funding from various sources. This has, first and foremost, been achieved by securing additional direct university funding through the research focus areas (especially the 'Institutions' focus area) established by Utrecht University. Direct funding increased from €1.2M in 2008 to €1.6M in 2013, which is rather exceptional in the Netherlands. The revenues from contract research directly related to the Public Matters research programme have remained stable over the review period. The self-evaluation report points out that, considering the austerity measures in the public and private sector, this is quite a remarkable achievement.

The Committee has established that there are clear staff policies in place. One of the measures taken by the management was the establishment of a tenure track, which seems to be appreciated by staff members but does so at the expense of the number of open vacancies. The Committee supports additional mobility measures such as strengthening the exchange programme, facilitating research sabbatical leaves abroad and looking for international academics who can be invited on fellowships.

The Committee concludes that currently there is a good mix of more senior, established scholar and young upcoming scholars at the Associate and Assistant Professor level. As elsewhere, however, the academic staff is predominantly male and the number of women in senior positions has in fact decreased in recent years. In recognition of this issue, diversity and affirmative action have been put on the agenda of the faculty and support is available for female talents who wish to apply for (Veni) scholarships or look for opportunities abroad. While the Committee appreciates these efforts, it feels that they only partly address the issue. To counter the trend of just promoting internal males, which is a side effect of the tenure track system, it suggests creating more job openings for external candidates and encourage women to apply for these.

4. Productivity

During the review period the research staff of the programme produced a total of 1624 publications, with an annual average number of refereed journal articles per research FTE (excluding PhD candidates) of 4.95, and a steady increase over the review period. The increased productivity since 2008 is impressive and suggests to the Committee that the programme is excellent in productivity. Compared to the other programmes in the review, the USG staff was especially productive in the categories of refereed book chapters, and books. Additionally, it produced a substantial number of professional publications and/or publications for the general public in the review period.

Over the review period, there were 26 PhD graduations at USG, which is equal to 0.4 PhDs per year per tenured FTE. Staff members of USG were furthermore involved in the supervision of 8 PhD candidates who graduated at other universities. Considering the ambitions of the programme and the close relations with the PA research master's programme, one would expect rather more PhD candidates. Completion times are quite good. Of the six regular PhD candidates who entered the programme between 2004 and 2008 none finished within four years but after five years 83% had graduated, and after six years all candidates had completed their projects. There were no dropouts.

When considering the USG's productivity strategy and policies for allocating research time, the Committee found that not all staff members can devote the same portion of their appointment to research. Above a standard minimum research capacity the USG Board has chosen to implement a flexible system of research allocation, which is linked to the 'hard' productivity criteria for individual staff members set by the Netherlands Institute of Government (NIG). Programme representatives assured the Committee that all staff members easily attain these criteria. In theory, not publishing (enough) could result in research time being cut. By contrast, transcending the set publication quota does not lead to an increase of research time. Softer productivity targets are set during annual appraisal meetings and can be more ambitious.

The Committee concludes that USG's productivity criteria are effective. Staff members have internalised and committed themselves to the criteria, but this has not resulted in an overly individualistic attitude. In fact, the USG model shows that in a supportive atmosphere

productivity does not need to be enforced by stringent performance targets; despite reasonably mild productivity criteria, USG's staff is highly productive and internationally competitive. The strategy for 2008-2013 has been realised nearly completely where productivity is concerned.

In practice, the Committee found that most staff members, even at professorial level, can devote up to 40-50% of their appointment to research, which is a pleasing percentage.

5. Societal relevance

The Committee was informed that USG's commercial consultancy activities are housed in a separate unit (*USBO Advies*) that is not part of this review. *USBO Advies* charges commercial rates and has to be self-sufficient; it receives no direct university funding. They are excluded from this review accordingly, although the Committee was given some examples of activities of USBO Advies, performed by USG-scholars, which could be regarded as societally relevant outputs comparable to other outputs of USG.

The Committee recognises that the demands on researchers have increased and USG makes an effort to integrate these demands in a smart way, combining work that is both academically and societally relevant. Several examples of this smart policy were presented in the self-evaluation report and during the discussions.

After reviewing the material, the Committee has established that, with the exception of articles in the media, the productivity with regard to professional products has increased. The annual average of publications for professional audiences and the general public was 5.0 per research FTE. Furthermore, it remarks that USG organises training sessions for executives and professionals with a considerable financial return (mainly on professionalisation and management). USG provided an overview of high citations in policy papers and active involvement of scholars in national policymaking, e.g. by government commissioned research projects, involvement in seminars for top-level politicians and policymakers, and membership of high-level committees. The amount and especially the societal impact of these are very hard to assess for an international Committee. The main societal focus of USG is on national politics and national administration (related to the research topics) and public professionals in several domains. The Committee agrees with the institute management that internationally USG's public visibility could be enhanced. The documentation refers to European projects but these do not seem to be the strongest examples of societal relevance.

6. Viability and strategy for the future

The Committee considers USG a viable and robust research institute. It is impressed by USG's steady access to first stream funding, partly due to its prominent role within university wide research focus areas and its strategic partnership with the UMCU. By contrast, the currently rather limited share of second stream funding in its annual budget is somewhat worrying, especially in view of the ever more fierce competition for research grants. The faculty's support for USG and the constructive atmosphere within USG add to the institute's viability and the success of its research strategy. Especially the new chair position in the area of 'Public Institutions' (one of seven extra chairs which will be established in 2014) is promising. The Committee also notes that surveys show a high job satisfaction amongst staff members and talent recruitment is fruitful. Finally, the committee wants to stress the positive effects of USG's involvement in the Utrecht based research master's programme, which should ensure a steady flow of new talent towards the PhD programme.

After studying the 2008-2013 strategy document the Committee concludes that overcoming vulnerability has been a central theme over the review period. USG recognised that its research programme would benefit from connecting staff members with complementary knowledge and interests on a limited number of themes. Exploratory meetings with all researchers were held in 2013 to identify new innovative research themes. In addition, the institute has given priority to looking for strategic partnerships outside of USG. The participation in research focus areas and investment themes was rightfully seen as a source of new initiatives (and funding) for multidisciplinary research.

Whether the strategy for the coming period will be equally sensible was a source of discussion within the Committee. It is still too soon to tell what kind of impact the recent leadership change will have on the management style, the culture and external positioning of USG and the research programme Public Matters, though the transition has been carefully planned and mentored. Furthermore, the institute was not yet able to present the committee with an official strategy document, while the goals identified in the self-evaluation report seem pragmatic and instrumental rather than mission driven or linked to content.

On the positive side, the Committee did note that there is an informal internal discussion going on about strategy and the development of a new research programme. In any case, the Committee trusts that the informal discussion on the strategy and research agenda will soon be formalised in an official strategy document. Issues that this document should urgently address are the small number of PhD positions, the number of women in senior academic positions, the international visibility and profile of USG, and the limited revenues from external (NWO and EU) grants. Notwithstanding these concerns, the Committee's general impression is that USG's changing but overall constructive context and environment offers a lot of potential for developing research topics and a promising new programme.

7. PhD-training and supervision
The Committee notes that USG is in a comfortable position with regard to the recruitment of PhD candidates. Not only is USG allowed to select its bachelor's students (a rare accomplishment in the Netherlands), it is also home to (and driving force behind) a two-year research master's programme in Public Administration and Organisational Science. This programme originated in 2005 and is currently run in collaboration with the PA Departments of Erasmus University Rotterdam, Tilburg University and VU University Amsterdam. Negotiations with additional universities are being conducted. According to the self-evaluation report, the programme can be considered a success: 31 of the 69 graduates have obtained PhD positions, 7 of them at USG itself. The Committee considers this joint research master's programme an effective platform for collaboration across the universities and believes that USG should be able to reap the rewards of its proximity to the programme with a stream of PhD candidates. It is therefore somewhat surprising that PhD numbers at UU are reasonably low, especially those of internal PhD candidates. At the time of the site visit, there were 17 PhD candidates. Finding the funds to keep up the number of internal PhD candidates is clearly a challenge at USG.

The selection of PhD candidates is supported by a *PhD-assessment* tool. The results of this assessment provide input for the individual 'training and supervision plan' that is drawn up at the start of the project. PhD candidates commonly have two supervisors, usually a professor and a more junior daily supervisor. Appraisal interviews are held once a year. As elsewhere, the overall responsibility for PhD training and supervision lies with the Board of Studies of the Graduate School of the faculty.

The Committee established that, apart from taking skills courses at the local level, all internal PhD candidates are also able to take part in the training programme offered by the national research school NIG. As of 2012, external PhD candidates can take part in a special USG PhD track which consists of taught courses and presentation workshops. The Committee applauds the overall high quality of the PhD training for internal PhDs. Furthermore, it believes that the special track for external PhD candidates is a first step towards ensuring an equally professional and supportive environment for both the internal candidates and the rising number of external PhD candidates, many of whom are mature professionals who combine their employment elsewhere with a (part-time) PhD project. The Committee recommends that the programme leadership takes regular stock of the external PhD activities to ensure that any gaps between internal and external PhD candidates are addressed, as this was mentioned as a challenge in the self-evaluation report.

The Committee learned that standard PhDs are entitled to financial support for attending two conferences a year and for publishing costs. Furthermore, there is a bimonthly PhD platform where they can present their work and receive feedback. A 'PhD Dean' is responsible for counselling PhD candidates in all phases of their appointment, and a professional career coach is available to candidates in their final year. Three USG researchers received the NIG supervisor of the year award (2008, 2011, 2012). During the site visit, the PhD candidates that the Committee spoke with confirmed that USG provides a stimulating and friendly environment to its population of internal PhD candidates. Because of their limited number, almost all of them hold administrative functions within the institute, for example one is on the Research Board, and therefore they report feeling very much involved in USG and the research programme. The Committee was especially pleased to note that PhDs have been active partners in the internal discussions on the current and future strategy for the research programme.

The completion rates of internal candidates are high: after five years 83% of the candidates that entered the programme between 2005 and 2009 had finished. After six years this was 100%. The majority of dissertations appears to be article based, although the interviewed PhD candidates indicated that monographs are also welcome. The Committee found that there are no internal guidelines on the minimum number of articles and their required status (*reviewed, published?*). Developing such guidelines should be considered.

The self-evaluation report states that many of the internal PhD candidates who defended their thesis in the period under review have continued their career within Dutch academia.

8. Conclusion
The strategy behind the programme reviewed by the Committee has been realised nearly entirely and this is a major achievement. The main effects are significant increases of the academic productivity and the international visibility. USG has managed to counterbalance the negative side effects that could occur due to this competitive atmosphere, keeping up an informal culture and a supportive approach to human resource management. USG has also been able to keep the balance between academic and professional outputs, although it is difficult for an international Committee to assess the impact of the societal outputs. The Committee has formulated some critical remarks regarding the level of international recruitment of new (temporary) scholars; the low level of second stream funding; the relatively low number of PhD's given the interaction between USG and the Research Master; the need for some guidelines for PhD's published on articles; as well as the gender policy.

The Committee was not able to give a judgment on the quality of the future strategy, due to a lack of texts. The Committee noted that the strategy at the moment of the visit was rather

instrumental and operational and it would have liked to see more elaboration of the next strategy on content and ambitions though it noted that dialogue had been initiated with the research groups to start this journey. The external environment and especially the policy of the UU seem very supportive for the USG strategy and offer new windows of opportunities for the new leadership of the programme.

6. Research review VU University Amsterdam

Programme: New Public Governance
Programme leaders: Prof. Willem Trommel, Prof. Leo Huberts
Research staff (2013):   3.76 FTE tenured, 8.04 FTE total

Assessments: Quality: 4
                    Productivity: 4
                    Relevance: 4.5
                    Viability: 4

At VU University Amsterdam (VU) all public administration research takes place within one comprehensive research programme, which means that the institute and the programme overlap in most aspects. Since the self-evaluation report only distinguishes between the level of the institute and the programme where this is relevant, the Committee has – likewise – decided to integrate both levels of assessment. Accordingly, the following assessment covers both the institute and the programme.

1A. The Institute
The Faculty of Social Sciences (FSS) at VU University is comprised of six disciplines (anthropology, communication science, organisation science, political science, public administration, sociology), each with its own research programme.

Towards the end of the review period, in 2013, the two relatively small Departments of Political Science and Public Administration merged into one Department to enhance effectiveness and encourage cooperation. The two respective research programmes continue to function independently, but in the near future PA and PS researchers will meet in the yet to be established Centre for Governance. The Committee was informed that although the Faculty Board initially proposed the merger, the implementation was deliberately a bottom-up process that took two years to complete and received broad support from the research staff. As yet, it is too early to assess the effects of the recent merger. Even so, the Committee would have preferred it if the self-evaluation report had contained more detailed information on the management of the unified Department, the relationship between the Dean, the Chairman of the Department and the Research Groups, and the initiatives to strengthen the collaboration potentials between Political Sciences and Public Administration.

The six Department heads and programme leaders share the responsibility for the research in their respective disciplines. Formally, they fall under the direction of the Faculty Board, which consists of the Dean, Directors for Education and Research, and the Managing Director. Monthly meetings aim to ensure that faculty and department policies remain closely aligned. During the site visit it was explained that the FSS is responsible for the allocation of resources. The departments are autonomous with regard to handling their budget and setting research topics. Annual discussions between FSS and the research programmes serve to set targets for the coming years and monitor progress.

As part of the faculty's new research strategy, interdisciplinary research that transcends programme boundaries is supported. Like other FSS researchers, public administration staff members take part in Inter-Faculty Research Institutes, more specifically the Talma Institute for the Study of Work, Care and Welfare, the Phoolan Devi Institute on Security and Policing

and CLUE on heritage and values, as well as with the recently (2013) established Amsterdam Centre for Contemporary European Studies (ACCESS EUROPE), a joint initiative of VU and the University of Amsterdam (UvA). Cooperation across Departments, Faculties and even Universities is not only considered essential for bringing in external funding, but is also thought to boost the prominence of the FSS. The Committee established that the university-wide research priority area on governance (and one of four priority themes) is seen as a window of opportunity to make the research of the Public Administration group more visible within the university and to encourage collaboration within, but also across, the FSS.

1B. The Programme
The Programme in Public Administration originally consisted of three research groups: The Integrity of Governance, the Governance of Security, and the Governance of the New Welfare. Over the review period steps were taken to develop a more integrated research perspective, and in 2012 the programme was renamed New Public Governance (NPG). This theme was strategically chosen; it reflects the university wide interest in governance (one of the four research priorities for the coming period) and is thought to enhance the visibility of Public Administration research within the faculty and the university at large. Currently, the NPG Programme is divided into two groups: (1) *Governance of Quality* (led by Willem Trommel), which hosts the groups that conduct research on welfare and security (the latter led by Hans Boutellier), and (2) *Quality of Governance* (led by Leo Huberts), which focuses on ethics and public values. During the evaluated period, the three (and later on two) lines of research still worked mostly independent from each other.

The Committee notes that, beyond a common primary goal and broadly phrased research question (SER, p. 11), no specific outline of the *overall* programme is presented in the documentation. Details on the research are discussed only at the level of the subgroups. Because of this, the Committee found it difficult to assess in what way the overall programme consists of more than the three subgroups. Programme representatives mentioned that the thematic 'superstructure' of New Public Governance mainly serves 'branding' purposes, although from an organisational perspective it also replaces the former PA Department and helps to forge synergies and links between researchers of the subgroups. The Committee also discussed whether the labelling of the two subgroups (different combinations of 'quality' and 'governance') is capable of conveying their distinctive work.

2. Quality and academic reputation
The Committee notes that the research of the subgroup *Quality of Governance* (QoG), on integrity and public values, has a high international visibility and reputation. Researchers from this group have been leading figures of the field and have published in top international journals. The *Governance of Quality*-group (GoQ) and the two research lines it is composed of (welfare and security) is also very active and innovative, but more oriented towards local and specialist audiences. Researchers from these two lines in welfare and security frequently publish in Dutch. Consequently, the international reputation and impact is not as high as that of the *Quality of Governance*-group.

Only a limited number of staff members publish in international journals. The self-evaluation report also mentions that the programme's objective is to keep societal relevance high on the agenda so the programme is aiming to achieve rigour and relevance. The contribution is stronger on the empirical and also methodological (e.g. Q-methodology) level than the theoretical. H-indices of the researchers within the programme are below 20 (average of 8). The impact is generally higher in the QoG group than in the GoQ group. Some of the younger researchers are already internationally active and very promising.

The effect of the new programme in terms of cross-fertilisation and collaboration across the three lines of research and of the merger with Public Policy is yet to be seen.

The faculty has new leadership, with a recently arrived Dean. This and the recent merger give a sense that the leadership is reviewing strategy and focus and it will be interesting to see how this develops, both within FSS and in the wider university.

The Committee has established that, as part of its quality strategy, the FSS has drawn up criteria for promotion and tenure to provide incentive for personal academic success, and for Departments to successfully promote the careers of their talented researchers. In the future, these measures will be applicable to all positions.

3. Resources

Over the review period, research FTE's at the programme level have fluctuated. After a peak in the 2009-2011 period (11.58 FTE in 2010), research FTE's have decreased to 8.04 in 2013. This mostly seems to have to do with bringing down the percentage of research time per individual staff member. In the period under review, the proportion of first stream funding received from VU University did not keep up with the growing number of students at FSS and as a consequence the time available for research has decreased. The total number of staff members, especially that of tenured staff, has remained more or less constant after 2008. That the overall research capacity, and most notably the tenured research capacity, went down in terms of FTE's is a concern for the Committee, as it shows that there is considerable pressure on researchers in the programme. The programme representatives that the Committee spoke to confirmed this. The self-evaluation report mentions that the FSS will take measures to protect substantial research time for staff members, but it is not quite clear to the Committee what these measures will entail and the Committee encourages the FSS to make these plans explicit.

The general ratio between teaching and research is now 70:30 (or 57:43 when external money flows are added in). At FSS, research staff and PhD candidates are increasingly financed through grants and contract research. This certainly holds true for the programme in PA, which – compared to the previous period – has become more reliant on external income, especially on (third stream) funding from industry, governmental ministries, the European Commission and charity organisations. In 2012, 47% of the programme's income was derived from the university, 16% from research grants and 36% from research contracts. The overall FSS budget for that same year consisted of 56% direct funding, 23% research grants and 21% contract research.

The Committee notes that the programme has obtained some important external grants in the review period (e.g., FP7, SIG) and the sponsored chair has been continued for another five-year term. However, the overall funding has declined after 2010. The self-evaluation report mentions that the increase of international orientation in grant submission is a strategic priority of the research programme in the coming years and this seems an important issue given the sharp decrease in the current climate of accessibility to research funds. Various measures (e.g. Research Stimulation Fund) are in place to continue or increase the acquisition of external funds.

The Faculty Board allocates teaching and research budgets to the departments on a competitive basis. Factors that are taken into consideration when distributing funds over the departments are the number of courses taught in the preceding year, the research output of staff, the number of completed PhD projects, and the proceeds from research grants and

contract research. Productive departments can deploy additional central funding, which can be used to create strategic chairs, to award faculty fellowships for extra research time, to invite visiting professors, and to stimulate the writing of research grant applications and contract research tenders (in particular for PhD projects). These central funds were designed to supplement external funding to the value of one third of the cash flow generated. Recently, the power to make policy decisions on stimulating research was partially transferred to Departments.

4. Productivity

The self-evaluation report points out that over the past decade the research productivity of FSS has risen sharply. FSS introduced a minimum productivity strategy (on average one peer reviewed English language publication per year) and now only funds the research time of scholars who publish at a certain level. According to the institute management this policy has encouraged staff members who previously only published in national outlets to move on to international journal publications. Over the review period existing productivity policies have, according to the documentation, become more targeted on seeking and rewarding talent by setting ambitious criteria for professorship appointments, tenure tracks and (temporary) promotions. There is a specific budget to support talented female researchers by funding extra time for writing grant proposals and publishing.

During the review period the research staff of the programme produced a total of 667 publications, especially 2010 was a very productive year. The number of peer-reviewed articles is quite high at VU Amsterdam (annual average of 4.7 per research FTE, excluding PhD candidates), especially during the last half of the review period, which – perhaps – reflects the FSS's stringent publication criteria. There was also a substantial output of publications aimed at professional audiences and/or the general public. The research staff, by contrast, published relatively few books and book chapters.

The Committee assesses the overall productivity in terms of quantity as very good, with publications in top-rated journals such as JPART, PAR and Public Administration, as well as other high quality journals. Only some researchers in the programme publish in the leading journals of the field or with the most renowned book publishers. High impact publications are unevenly distributed within the research programme. The Committee encourages that more researchers target outlets with high academic impact.

Over the review period, there were 12 PhD graduations at the PA Department, which is equal to 0.5 PhDs per year per tenured FTE. PhD completion rates are low: of the 8 standard PhD candidates who entered the programme between 2005 and 2009, none finished within four or five years. After six years, only 13% had graduated, while after seven years this was 25%. According to Table 5.5 (cf. appendix 4), 75% of these candidates is still working on their projects. The new policy for PhD candidates (see below) is expected to have a positive effect on the completion time: a sharp increase in the number of PhD defences is expected for 2014 and 2015.

5. Societal relevance

The self-evaluation report presents illustrative examples rather than a full catalogue of social engagement and relevance. However, this information clearly indicates that all FSS programmes have active links to societal institutions. The research staff report that they deliver input in societal debates by appearing in the media, delivering lectures to lay audiences, participating in public debates and policy committees, and by engaging in contract research for private and public organisations. Furthermore, FSS has accepted sponsored

chairs (*bijzondere leerstoelen*, 15 in 2012) from various types of societal organisations. According to the self-evaluation report, FSS has by far the greatest media exposure of all VU faculties. The self-evaluation report does not indicate a strategy for social engagement and the Committee wonders if it would be helpful to have one.

Public Administration researchers at VU collaborate with municipal organisations, have been members of public and governance committees, have written reports for the government and also participated in the public debate and discourse. During the interviews programme representatives stressed the importance of co-creation; working with societal partners and jointly phrasing research questions. Research fellows and external PhD candidates, who are employed elsewhere, are thought to play a key role in this.

The Committee established that there is a very high number of publications for a non-academic audience. Additionally, contract research is an important source of income for the programme (over the review period it amounted to almost one-third of the programme's annual budget, which is high compared to some other FSS programmes).

The Committee concludes that the societal relevance of all three research groups seems very good, especially on the local level, although the information provided in the self-evaluation report is very condensed and related only to the most convincing examples for most types of activities. This issue is also addressed in the 'General Remarks'-section of this report (p. 16-17).

6. Viability and strategy for the future

According to the self-evaluation report, over the review period FSS has taken various steps to ensure the quality, productivity and societal relevance of its research. Furthermore, the research structure has been reorganised by merging departments into 'larger, better equipped and stable entities'. Over the next years, the faculty plans to consolidate policies that have proven successful in the previous period. Anticipated adaptations include the strengthening of the focus and visibility of research themes such as governance at the university level, the increase of the international orientation in grant writing and talent recruitment, the reinforcement of administrative and finance support and improvement of procedures to ensure research integrity. Strategies on the programme level include measures to maintain the balance between academic performance and societal relevance, encourage the acquisition of external projects, and keep attracting highly talented PhD candidates.

The documentation has made it clear to the Committee that, like elsewhere, direct funding is under pressure at VU. Securing enough external funding to keep up the research time of staff members is a considerable challenge. During the interview programme representatives stressed that their research is under pressure due to a scarcity of means. Which measures will be taken to protect the research time of staff members, is not quite clear to the Committee, although it was told that there are plans to redistribute research resources by allocating more research time to productive, high-quality researchers and by bringing in more teaching assistants. The Committee would like to encourage FSS to consider the synergies between teaching and research and find ways to tackle them in ways which strengthen research.

The decision to stop appointing department/faculty funded PhD candidates is also of concern to the Committee. Compared to previous periods, the number of internal PhDs is already greatly reduced and the Committee therefore encourages the institute to gain PhD students through second and third stream funding.

The Committee notes that the self-evaluation report does not address potential management challenges at the interface between FSS, department, overall programme management, and the research groups. During the interviews, however, programme representatives, shared their concerns about centralising efforts from the part of the faculty with regard to HR and resources. The Committee established that there is also quite a bit of reluctance amongst staff towards the planned move to a new building, where flexible office space will be the norm.

With respect to viability, the programme management sees great opportunities in the recent research focus of VU University on governance and on the creation of a Centre of Public Governance, which will receive some faculty funding. However, it is not quite clear to the Committee how the new Centre of Public Governance will relate to the university-wide initiative of the Amsterdam School of Governance. The Committee wishes to encourage the FSS, the programme and the subgroups to proactively engage in discussion and plans about how best to capitalise on this development to strengthen further the intellectual contributions and opportunities for the programme.

7. PhD-training and supervision
In 2012, the Graduate School of Social Sciences (GSSS), which is formally responsible for PhD training and supervision at FSS, hosted 13 standard PhD candidates and 35 external candidates. In this year, FSS staff supervised a total of 230 PhD researchers. The research programme in PA hosts a small and decreasing number of internal PhD candidates, as well as a growing number of external PhD candidates. The internal PhD candidates form a close-knit group; they share offices and consider themselves well embedded in the department. Their contacts with external PhD candidates – most of whom are mid-career professionals who are employed elsewhere – are less frequent. Even so, the Committee notes that these external PhDs are highly valued, particularly for their professional input and are thought to add to the programme's societal relevance.

Because the VU's own research master's programme was considered too fragmented and suffered from a lack of student interest, in 2013, the research programme decided to join the research master's at Utrecht University. It now recruits talented PhD candidates from this programme, which the Committee regards as a promising step.

The Committee notes that in the past completion rates and duration of Public Administration PhDs have not been favourable. To counter this trend, PhD training and supervision, especially of external PhDs, have been tightened. All external PhD candidates are members of the GSSS and their progress is now monitored in a similar way to that of internal PhDs. PhD researchers follow a programme of 30 credits within the Graduate School or a national disciplinary Research School. While the GSSS provides general and methodology courses for all PhD candidates of the faculty, discipline specific courses are provided by the Netherlands Institute for Government (NIG). There is a budget available for training purposes, conference attendance and other project costs. Previously this was an individual budget, but as of 2011 the budget is managed by the GSSS. Since 2012, there is a new policy for PhD training that includes more time allocation for supervisors and more funds for conferences. GSSS also hosts a PhD platform (organised by the candidates themselves) and supplies it with a budget to organise courses and (informal) events.

The Committee has established that upon the start of the appointment, a 'training and guidance plan' is drawn up. This includes work appointments (including teaching – not exceeding 5% of the total workload), a work plan for the first year, a training programme, and the supervision structure. PhD researchers normally have one co-supervisor in addition to

their own supervisor, in some cases there are three supervisors, of which one acts as 'daily supervisor'. Employed PhD candidates receive a 12-month contract; extension depends on a positive outcome of assessment after eight months that is based on a detailed research proposal and a literature review or first paper. Each year progress reports are submitted to the Academic Director.

The PhD candidates that the Committee spoke to are pleased with the PhD facilities at the department and faculty level. They appreciate the freedom they enjoy as PhD candidates and feel that they are assisted in developing their own research interests, but not restricted. Supervisors also help them in building their network and developing career perspectives.

With regard to dissertations, half of the PhD candidates the committee interviewed reported that they were working on monographs and the other half on article-based dissertations. Publishing with the (co)supervisor is allowed, but at least one of the dissertation articles should be single-authored.

8. Conclusion

The research programme New Public Governance at the Faculty of Social Sciences at VU University is a strong programme with high academic reputation and productivity. It is very well anchored in society and contributes highly relevant output.

The programme, with its two distinctive and complementary themes of governance of quality and the quality of governance are interesting and productive, and have potential for collaborative future research. The research is particularly strong empirically and methodologically. Some research is getting exposure in high rated journals. Productivity is very good and the focus on improving quality and amount of publications appears to be paying off. The task for the future is to spread the contribution to high-rated journals more widely across the group. The societal relevance is strongly evident. The PhD programme appears to have improved since the last review.

At this point in time, the research programme serves as an umbrella for the three quite distinct research groups. A future challenge will certainly be to encourage coherence and cross-fertilisation among the three groups, but also with the political scientists in the newly merged department. A moment of strategic choice and synergy is presented by the planned Centre for Governance. The Committee agrees that the new interdisciplinary focus of VU University on Governance is certainly a great opportunity to increase the visibility of the programme's research. However, the Committee is not quite sure how the new Centre for Governance, which intends to build bridges to adjoining disciplines within FSS such as Organisation Studies and Sociology, will relate to the much larger Amsterdam School of Governance, which will link different Faculties, but in which the department of Public Administration does not seem to play a leading role. To avoid any risk that the department is swallowed up in the university-wide initiative, the Committee suggests that it develops some clear plans and ideas for this future programme, both intellectually and organisationally, so that the department can play a proactive rather than a reactive role in the shaping of the new initiative.

In addition, the Committee noted that the faculty and university plans could, if not managed carefully, lead to a 'top-down' approach to the development of public governance research, rather than enabling ideas and proposals from staff to shape the agenda sufficiently. Getting the right balance between centralising and decentralising tendencies is therefore something which may need to be kept under constant review. Vigorous, imaginative and well-executed

research requires the commitment and engagement of researchers as well as the strategic plans of leaders.

Challenges come mainly from the overall trends in higher education – the increase in teaching obligations of staff and the difficulties to secure first stream funding. The Committee is convinced that the research programme has a very good ability to react to adequately to important changes in the environment, both internally regarding personnel and research focus and externally to development in the field and in society.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Curricula vitae of the Committee members

Prof. Jean Hartley (Chair) is Professor of Public Leadership at The Open University Business School (UK), Fellow of the British Academy of Management and Fellow of the British Psychological Society. She has contributed to the field of public leadership and management for two decades through research, teaching and development work. This has shaped some of the thinking and ideas in the field, for example the value and use of political astuteness skills among public servants, the interplay between political and managerial leadership, and the leadership of innovation in public services. Her core discipline is organisational psychology but most of her research is cross-disciplinary with a focus on public leadership and management. Hartley's recent publications include 'Feeling the squeeze: The experience of ongoing change and innovation in UK public sector organizations (with T. Kiefer, N. Conway and R. Briner, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 2014); 'Collaborative innovation: A viable alternative to market-competition and organizational entrepreneurship' (with E. Sørensen and E. Torfing, *Public Administration Review,* 2013) and 'Public and private features of innovation' (in: *Handbook of Innovation in Public Services*, 2013) and 'Learning in the whirlwind: politicians and leadership development' (*Public Money and Management*, 2011), In 2012 she co-authored the monograph *Leadership For Healthcare* (with John Benington, Bristol, Policy Press).

Filip De Rynck is a full professor in public administration at the Faculty of Political Sciences at University Ghent (Belgium). He teaches several public administration courses in the bachelor and master of public administration and public management. He was a professor in public administration at the University of Antwerp (1998-2007). He worked for more than 15 years in several positions in the field of public administration before entering academics. He has a track record in commissioned research in the public sector, by the OECD, EU, Flemish, provincial and local governments. He coordinated for the last 15 years the Ghent – research programmes on public administration in the consortium of universities (Leuven, Antwerp, Ghent), established by the Flemish government. His main research topics are local government, decentralization and intergovernmental relationships; citizen participation; urban policy and the functioning of local networks. He widely published on those topics. De Rynck presided a lot of official advisory committees for the Flemish government. He was the project leader or the coach of several longstanding programmes in the nexus between academia and public administrations.

Per Lægreid is a full professor at the Department of Administration and Organisation Theory at University of Bergen (Norway) and Senior Researcher at the Uni Rokkan Centre. He is fellow at the Norwegian academy of Science and Letters. His research includes studies of public administration and public management from a broad institutional perspective combining political science and organisational studies, with a special focus on New Public Management reforms as well as post-NPM reforms, regulatory policy arrangements and studies of multi-level governance systems. Recent research projects include "Reforming the Welfare State. Democracy, Accountability and Management", "Organizing for Societal Security and Crisis Management", "Coordination for Cohesion in the Public Sector of the Future (COCOPS) and "The Comparative Public Organization Data Base for Research and Analysis (COBRA). He is a Co-convenor of the EGPA Study Group on "Governance of Public Sector Organizations, member of the executive board, IPSA Research Committee on the Structure and Organization of Government (SOG) and member of the Board, International Public Management Network (IPMN). Recent co-authored and co-edited books include *Transcending New Public Management, Organization Theory and the Public Sector, Governance of*

Public Sector Organizations, The Ashgate Research Companion to New Public Managemen, Government Agencies: Practices and Lessons from 30 Countries and Organizing for Coordination in the Public Sector.

Renate Meyer is a full professor in public management and organisation studies at the WU Vienna University of Economics and Business (Austria). Between 2004 and 2014 she has been the Head of the Institute for Public Management and Governance. Currently, she is Chair of Organisation Studies and Co-Director of the Research Institute for Urban Management and Governance at WU. She is also a permanent visiting professor at the Department for Organisation at Copenhagen Business School. Since 2008, she serves on the Executive Board of the European Group of Organization Studies (EGOS); between 2011 and 2014, she was Chairperson of EGOS. Current research focuses on changing governance structures and institutional transformation in public sector organisations. Her work has been published in leading journals such as *Academy of Management Journal, Academy of Management Annals, Public Administration, Journal of Management Studies, Organization Studies, Critical Perspectives on Accounting,* or *Organization.*

Appendix 2: Explanation of the SEP scores

Excellent (5)	Research is world leading. Researchers are working at the forefront of their field internationally and their research has an important and substantial impact in the field.
Very Good (4)	Research is nationally leading. Research is internationally competitive and makes a significant contribution to the field.
Good (3)	Research is internationally visible. Work is competitive at the national level and makes a valuable contribution in the international field.
Satisfactory (2)	Research is nationally visible. Work adds to our understanding and is solid, but not exciting.
Unsatisfactory (1)	Work is neither solid nor exciting, flawed in the scientific and/or technical approach, repetitions of other work, etc.

Quality is to be seen as a measure of excellence and excitement. It refers to the eminence of a group's research activities, its abilities to perform at the highest level and its achievements in the international scientific community. It rests on the proficiency and rigour of research concepts and conduct; it shows in the success of the group at the forefront of scientific development.

Productivity refers to the total output of the group; that is, the variegated ways in which results of research and knowledge development are publicised. The output needs to be reviewed in relation to the input in terms of human resources.

Societal relevance covers the social, economic and cultural relevance of the research. Aspects are:
- societal quality of the work. Efforts to interact in a productive way with stakeholders in society who are interested in input from scientific research, and contributions to important issues and debates in society.
- societal impact of the work. Research affects specific stakeholders or procedures in society.
- valorisation of the work. Activities aimed at making research results available and suitable for application in products, processes and services. This includes interaction with public and private organisations, as well as commercial or non-profit use of research results and expertise.

Vitality and feasibility. This dual criterion regards the institute's ability to react adequately to important changes in the environment. It refers to both internal (personnel, research themes) and external (developments in the field, in society) dynamics of the group. On the one hand, this criterion measures the flexibility of a group, which appears in its ability to close research lines that have no future and to initiate new venture projects. On the other hand, it measures the capacity of the management to run projects in a professional way. Policy decisions and project management are assessed, including cost-benefit analysis.

Appendix 3: Programme of the site visit

Tuesday	August	26th		Rotterdam, Campus Woudestein, H-Building, Faculty Club, Capellezaal (H17-18)	
	8.30	12.30		Introduction / Preparatory committee meeting	
	12.30	13.15		lunch	
	13.15	14.00		preparation EUR	
	14.00	15.00	EUR	Institute management EUR	• Prof. dr. ing. Geert Teisman (research director) • Prof. dr. Victor Bekkers (former research director)
	15.00	16.00		Programme EUR	• Prof. dr. Erik Hans Klijn • Prof. dr. Steven Van de Walle • Dr. Arwin van Buuren • Dr. Lars Tummers • Dr. ir. Jasper Eshuis • Dr. Menno Fenger
	16.00	16.15		break	
	16.15	17.15		PhD students EUR	• Jolien Grandia MSc MA • Rianne Dekker MSc • Wouter Spekkink MSc • Jitske Verkerk MSc • Ingmar van Meerkerk MSc • Ilona van Breugel MSc
	17.15	18.00		committee meeting	
Wednesday	August	27th		Utrecht, USBO, Bijlhouwerstraat 6, Utrecht, room 0.20	
	9.00	9.45		preparation UU	
	9.45	10.45	UU	Institute management UU	• Prof. Maarten van Bottenburg, vice-dean LEG, head of USG • Prof. Paul Boselie, research director • Prof. Mark Bovens, research director till 2012 • Prof. Peter Leisink, board member research institute, chair USG Board • Prof. Mirko Noordegraaf, professor PA and OS
	10.45	11.00		break	

	11.00	**12.00**		Programme UU	• Dr. Stephan Grimmelikhuijsen, assistant professor • Dr. Eva Knies, assistant professor • Prof. Albert Meijer, professor (public innovation) • Prof. Sebastiaan Princen, professor (governance and policy-making in the European Union) • Prof. Sandra Schruijer, professor (multi party cooperation) • Dr. Margo Trappenburg, associate professor • Dr. Wouter Vandenabeele, assistant professor
	12.00	**13.00**		lunch, room 1.19	
	13.00	**14.00**		PhD students UU	• Corine Buers MSc (2nd-3rd year), • Marlot Kuiper MSc (1st year) • Nina van Loon MSc (3rd-4th year) • Jan-Willem van der Roest MA (4th year)
	14.00	**15.00**		committee meeting	
Thursday	**August**	**28th**		**Enschede, Campus Universty of Twente, Ravelijn building, RA 2334 and RA2336**	
	9.00	**9.45**		preparation UT	
	9.45	**10.45**	**UT**	Institute management UT	• Kees Aarts, Scientific Director Institute for Innovation and Governance Studies (IGS); • Ariana Need, Vice Dean School of Behavioral, Management and Social Sciences; • Sjoerd van Tongeren, Executive Director IGS
	10.45	**11.00**		break	
	11.00	**12.00**		Programme UT1	
	12.00	**13.00**		lunch	• Bas Denters, Professor of Public Governance; • René Torenvlied, Professor of Public Management; • Marcel Boogers, Professor of Innovation and Regional Governance and Senior Advisor BMC; • Ramses Wessel, Professor of International and European Institutional Law; • Henk van der Kolk, Associate Professor

	13.00	14.00		Programme UT2	• Stefan Kuhlmann, Professor of Foundations of Science, Technology and Society; • Rob Hoppe, Professor of Policy and Knowledge; • Peter Stegmaier, Assistant Professor
	14.00	15.00		Programme UT3	• Hans Bressers, Professor of Policy Studies and Environmental Policy; • Frans Coenen, Senior Research Associate; • Maarten Arentsen, Associate Professor; • Thomas Hoppe, Assistant Professor (tenure track) • Kris Lulofs, Senior Research Associate • Cheryl de Boer, Postdoctoral Researcher
	15.00	15.15		break	
	15.15	16.15		Programme UT4	• Hans Vossensteyn, Senior Research Associate and Professor Fachhochschule Osnabrück; • Ben Jongbloed, Senior Research Associate; • Paul Benneworth, Senior Research Associate; • Harry de Boer, Senior Research Associate; • Don Westerheijden, Senior Research Associate.
	16.15	16.30		break	
	16.30	17.30		PhD students	• Ewert Aukes (2nd year) • Norma Contreras (2nd year) • Kira Killermann (2nd year) • Wouter Jans (4th year) • Bart Walhout (3rd year) • Leon Cremonini (4th year)
	17.30	18.30		committee meeting	
Friday	**August**	**29th**		**Amsterdam, Metropolitan building, Buitenveldertselaan 3, room Z-113**	
	8.00	10.30		transfer to Amsterdam	
	10.30	11.30	**VU**	Institute management VU	• Prof. dr. Karen Oudenhoven – van der Zee, Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences VU • Prof. dr. Leo Huberts, Portfolio holder research and vice-dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences VU

	11.30	12.30		Programme VU	• Mr. dr. Hans Bosselaar, Academic manager research programme Governance of Activation • Prof. dr. Hans Boutellier, Professor in Safety and Citizenship • Dr. Gjalt de Graaf, Associate Professor Public Administration and research manager of the Department B&P • Mr. dr. Willem-Jan Kortleven, Assistant Professor Public Administration • Prof. dr. Willem Trommel, Professor in Public Policy and Governance
	12.30	13.15		lunch	
	13.15	14.15		PhD students VU	• Renske van der Gaag, MSc, First-year Phd student • Leonie Heres, MSc, Manuscript submitted to reading committee • Drs. Tom van Oosterhout, External PhD student • Hester Paanakker, MSc, Lecturer and second- year PhD student • Dr. Anne-Marie Reynaers, Defended thesis successfully in April 2014 • Dr. Judith van der Veer, Defended thesis successfully in December 2013
	14.15	18.30		committee meeting: 0,5 hours per programme and 2 hours general discussion	

Appendix 4: Quantitative data

A Comparative table *Total research fte's (excluding PhD candidates and <0.1 research appointments) and output 2008-2013[1]*

	FTE total[2]	Total publications	Refereed Articles	Book Chapters	Books[3]	Professsional publications[4]	Dissertations
EUR	73,26	2061	310	336	112	461	32
UT1	53,07	449	177	165	37	32	15
UT2	12,15	175	40	32	4	8	11
UT3	15,80	648	119	73	9	59	21
UT4	24,87	710	51	120	7	87	3
UU	61,47	1624	304	276	70	309	26
VU	34,11	667	159	85	21	220	13

1. The output figures include output by standard PhD candidates.
2. The FTE total excludes research staff with <0.1 FTE research appointments and PhD candidates.
3. This category includes both edited volumes and monographs.
4. This category includes both professional publications and publications aimed at the general public.

B Comparative table *Efficiency per research FTE (excluding PhD candidates and <0.1 research appointments) 2008-2013*

Programme	Total Publications *per research FTE*	Refereed articles *per research FTE*	Book chapters *per research FTE*	Books total[1] *per research FTE*	Professional publications[2] *per research FTE*	Dissertations *per tenured FTE[3]*
EUR	28,13	4,23	4,59	1,53	6,29	0,47
UT1	8,46	3,34	3,11	0,70	0,60	0,44
UT2	14,40	3,29	2,63	0,33	0,66	1,27
UT3	41,01	7,53	4,62	0,57	3,73	1,56
UT4	28,55	2,05	4,83	0,28	3,50	0,20
UU	26,42	4,95	4,49	1,14	5,03	0,44
VU	19,55	4,66	2,49	0,62	6,45	0,45

1. This category includes both edited volumes and monographs.
2. This category includes both professional publications and publications aimed at the general public.
3. For this indicator only tenured FTE's have been taken into consideration.

C Comparative table *Completion rates of standard PhD candidates who entered the programme between 2005-2009[1]*

Programme	Number	(<)4 years	(<)5 years	(<)6 years	(<)7years	not finished	dropped out
EUR	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
UT1	5	40%	100%	100%	100%	0%	0%
UT2	4	0%	100%	100%	100%	0%	0%
UT3	9	22%	67%	89%	89%	11%	0%
UT4	4	0%	75%	100%	100%	0%	0%
UU	6	0%	83%	100%	100%	0%	0%
VU	8	0%	0%	13%	25%	75%	0%

1. For PhD candidates who entered the programme in 2009, the 5-year period is not yet complete, which means that numbers for this category can still go up.

Erasmus University Rotterdam

Table 5.2 *Research time of research staff[1] at programme level*

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Tenured staff	11.1	10.9	10.7	10.9	11.8	13.2
Non-tenured staff	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.9	0.8	1.0
Standard PhD candidates	9.4	12.5	12.7	14.0	17.7	23.8
Total research time of Research staff	**21.5**	**24.4**	**24.4**	**25.8**	**30.3**	**38.0**

1. Includes research staff with a minimum of 0.1 FTE appointments.

Table 5.3 *Main categories of research output at programme level*

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
English reviewed articles	48	41	48	61	44	68	310
Non-English articles	42	53	60	52	45	21	273
Books (monograph/editorials)	14	15	12	14	33	24	112
Book chapters (English/Non-English)	49	62	48	33	91	53	336
Conference papers	108	73	73	83	102	98	537
Professional publications	40	47	35	36	42	28	228
Publications aimed at a general public and others	13	34	30	42	58	56	233
PhD theses	5	2	9	6	8	2	32
Total publications	**319**	**327**	**315**	**327**	**423**	**350**	**2061**

Table 5.4 *Funding of research capacity at programme level*
This table was not provided to the Committee

Table 5.5 *PhD theses at programme level*

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Standard PhD internal defense	2	1	4	2	3	-
External PhD defense	3	1	5	5	5	2
External; (co)promoter of PA Rotterdam	-	-	1	2	2	-
Total	5	2	10	9	10	2

University of Twente

UT1: Innovation of Governance

Table 5.2 *Research time of research staff[1], 2008-2013*

	2008		2009		2010		2011		2012		2013	
	fte	*n*	*fte*	*n*	*fte*	*n*	*fte*	*n*	*fte*	*n*	*fte*	*n*
Tenured staff[2]	5.43	16	6.48	20	6.21	17	4.74	14	5.53	15	5.54	17
Non-tenured staff[3]	3.38	9	4.13	9	3.48	9	3.06	7	2.88	6	2.21	4
PhD candidates[4]	4.39	6	4.68	11	5.23	9	7.7	10	8.3	11	6.37	8
Total research staff	**13.2**	**31**	**15.29**	**40**	**14.92**	**35**	**15.5**	**31**	**16.71**	**32**	**14.12**	**29**

1. *Includes research staff with a minimum of 0.1 FTE appointments.*
2. *Comparable with 'WOPI'-categories HGL ('professor'), UHD ('associate professor'), UD ('assistant professor').*
3. *Comparable with 'WOPI'-category 'Onderzoeker', including post-docs.*
4. *Standard PhD's (employed) and contract PhD's (externally or internally funded but not employed).*

Table 5.3 *Main categories of research output at programme level*

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Refereed articles (academic)	32	26	38	22	29	30	177
Non-refereed articles (academic)[1]	3	1	2	5	6	9	26
Books: Monographs (academic)	2	5	4	1	2	1	15
Books: Edited volumes	3	3	1	10	3	2	22
Book chapters (academic)	30	32	16	42	19	26	165
PhD-theses	4	5	1	2	2	1	15
Professional publications[2]	5	1	1	10	5	2	24
Publications for general public[3]	0	3	0	1	2	2	8
Total publications	**79**	**75**	**63**	**92**	**68**	**72**	**449**

1. *Articles in academic journals that are non-refereed, yet deemed important for the field*
2. *Publications aimed at professionals in the public and private sector (professionele publicaties), including patents and annotations bookchapters and reports (e.g. law)*
3. *Also known as "populariserende artikelen" (can also include bookchapters aimed at a more general public)*

NB: the category 'other publications is not taken into account in this table. Output of this category is provided in Appendix 4.1.2.

Table 5.4 *Funding of research capacity at programme level[1]*

	2008		2009		2010		2011		2012		2013	
	fte	*%*	*fte*	*%*	*fte*	*%*	*fte*	*%*	*fte*	*%*	*fte*	*%*
Direct funding	9.99	76	10.01	65	7.15	48	8.63	56	7.82	47	8.28	59
Research grants	0.66	5	2.07	14	1.78	12	3.73	24	4.02	24	2.00	14
Contract research	2.55	19	3.21	21	5.98	40	3.13	20	4.88	29	3.83	27
Total research staff	**13.20**	**100**	**15.29**	**100**	**14.92**	**100**	**15.50**	**100**	**16.71**	**100**	**14.12**	**100**

1. *The presented staff fte's are an estimate. All staff are expected to do all types of work – this may differ in groups and by person. IGS does not ask to keep time unless it is needed due to external obligations.*

Table 5.5 Standard PhD candidates[1]

Enrolment			Success rate								Total					
Start year	Enrolment male/female	Total male + female	Graduated after (≤) 4 years		Graduated after (≤) 5 years		Graduated after (≤) 6 years		Graduated after (≤) 7 years		Total Graduated		Not yet finished		Dis-continued	
	#M	#F	#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2003	1	2	3	-	-	1	33	1	33	1	33	1	33	-	-	2	66
2004	-	1	1	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100	-	-	-	-
2005	2	2	2	1	25	3	75	4	100	4	100	4	100	-	-	-	-
2006	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2007	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2008	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-									
2009	1	4	5	-	-	-	-	3^2	60^2	3^2	60^2	3^2	60^2	2	40	-	-
Total	**5**	**9**	**14**	**2**	**15**	**8**	**57**	**10**	**71**	**10**	**71**	**10**	**71**	**2**	**14**	**2**	**14**

1. *Standard PhD candidates with employee status and conducting research with primary aim/obligation to graduate (AiO, promovendus)*

2. *5-year period of these candidates is not yet completed, so graduation rate can go up.*

UT2: Governance of Knowledge and Innovation

Table 5.2 *Research time of research staff[1], 2008-2013*

	2008		2009		2010		2011		2012		2013	
	fte	*n*	*fte*	*n*	*fte*	*n*	*fte*	*n*	*fte*	*n*	*fte*	*n*
Tenured staff[2]	1.82	5	1.55	6	1.07	5	1.15	5	1.15	5	1.95	6
Non-tenured staff[3]	-	-	-	-	0.42	2	0.45	2	1.28	3	1.31	3
PhD candidates[4]	3.43	6	3.88	5	2.36	5	2.04	4	3.42	4	3.51	6
Total research staff	**5.25**	**11**	**5.43**	**11**	**3.85**	**12**	**3.64**	**11**	**5.85**	**12**	**6.77**	**15**

1. *Includes research staff with a minimum of 0.1 FTE appointments.*
2. *Comparable with 'WOPI'-categories HGL ('professor'), UHD ('associate professor'), UD ('assistant professor').*
3. *Comparable with 'WOPI'-category 'Onderzoeker', including post-docs.*
4. *Standard PhD's (employed) and contract PhD's (externally or internally funded but not employed).*

Table 5.3 *Main categories of research output at programme level*

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Refereed articles	8	4	5	9	7	7	40
Of which international refereed articles	7	4	4	9	6	6	36
Non-refereed articles[1]	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
Books, academic refereed	-	-	3	-	-	1	4
Book chapters, academic refereed	3	6	10	3	6	4	32
Of which int. refereed book chapters	3	6	10	3	6	4	32
PhD-theses	2	1	2	4	-	2	11
Professional publications[2]	-	-	-	2	-	2	4
Publications for general public[3]	-	-	1	-	2	1	4
Other research output[5]	7	5	15	28	20	8	83
Total publications	**18**	**16**	**35**	**46**	**35**	**25**	**175**

1. *Articles in academic journals that are non-refereed, yet deemed important for the field*
2. *Publications aimed at professionals in the public and private sector (professionele publicaties), including patents and annotations bookchapters and reports (e.g. law)*
3. *Also known as "populariserende publicaties".*
4. *Other types of research output such as editorships, inaugural lectures, official reports and non-refereed academic books & book chapters (also invited lectures and papers and posters presented at conferences were taken into account, as well as contributions to conference proceedings.*

Table 5.4 *Funding of research capacity at programme level[1]*

	2008		2009		2010		2011		2012		2013	
	fte	*%*	*fte*	*%*	*fte*	*%*	*fte*	*%*	*fte*	*%*	*fte*	*%*
Direct funding	3.86	74	3.01	55	2.28	59	1.91	52	2.55	44	3.15	46
Research grants	0.53	10	1.97	36	1.43	37	1.73	48	2.37	41	2.72	40
Contract research	0.86	16	0.44	8	0.15	4	-	-	0.93	16	0.91	13
Total research staff	**5.25**	**100**	**5.43**	**100**	**3.85**	**100**	**3.64**	**100**	**5.85**	**100**	**6.77**	**100**

1. *The presented staff fte's are an estimate. All staff are expected to do all types of work – this may differ in groups and by person. IGS does not ask to keep time unless it is needed due to external obligations.*

Table 5.5 *Standard PhD candidates[1]*

Enrolment			Success rate								Total					
Start year	Enrolment male/female	Total male + female	Graduated after (≤) 4 years		Graduated after (≤) 5 years		Graduated after (≤) 6 years		Graduated after (≤) 7 years		Total Graduated		Not yet finished		Dis-continued	
	#M	#F	#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2003	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	100	1	100	1	100	-	-	-	-
2004	1	1	2	-	-	1	50	1	50	2	100	2	100	-	-	-	-
2005	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2006	1	1	2	-	-	2	100	2	100	2	100	2	100	-	-	-	-
2007	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2008	-	1	1	-	-	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100	-	-	-	-
2009	0	1	1	-	-	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100	-	-	-	-
Total	**3**	**4**	**7**	**-**	**-**	**5**	**71**	**6**	**86**	**7**	**100**	**7**	**100**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**

1. *Standard PhD candidates with employee status and conducting research with primary aim/obligation to graduate (AiO, promovendus)*

UT3: Innovation and Governance for Sustainable Development

Table 5.2 *Research time of research staff[1], 2008-2013*

	2008		2009		2010		2011		2012		2013	
	fte	*n*	*fte*	*n*	*fte*	*n*	*fte*	*n*	*fte*	*n*	*fte*	*n*
Tenured staff[2]	2.65	12	2.42	12	2.54	11	2.19	11	1.85	9	1.85	9
Non-tenured staff[3]	0.10	1	0.10	1	0.10	1	0.10	1	0.30	2	1.60	4
PhD candidates[4]	5.07	11	6.57	11	6.83	10	5.64	10	4.96	8	3.89	7
Total research staff	**7.82**	**24**	**9.09**	**24**	**9.47**	**22**	**7.93**	**22**	**7.11**	**19**	**7.34**	**20**

1. *Includes research staff with a minimum of 0.1 FTE appointment.*
2. *Comparable with 'WOPI'-categories HGL ('professor'), UHD ('associate professor'), UD ('assistant professor').*
3. *Comparable with 'WOPI'-category 'Onderzoeker', including post-docs.*
4. *Standard PhD's (employed) and contract PhD's (externally or internally funded but not employed).*

Table 5.3 *Main categories of research output at programme level*

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Refereed articles	17	12	16	20	22	32	119
Of which international refereed articles	17	12	12	18	20	29	108
Non-refereed articles[1]	-	-	-	1	1	1	3
Books, academic refereed	2	2	2	1	1	1	9
Book chapters, academic refereed	12	13	20	3	8	17	73
Of which int. refereed book chapters	9	13	19	3	8	16	68
PhD-theses	3	1	-	1	3	3	11
Professional publications[2]	2	4	7	14	14	6	47
Publications for general public	1	1	4	2	2	2	12
Other research output[3]	77	64	75	54	53	51	374
Of which article in proceedings	11	1	9	5	15	5	46
Total publications	**114**	**97**	**124**	**96**	**104**	**113**	**648**

1. *Articles in academic journals that are non-refereed, yet deemed important for the field*
2. *Publications aimed at professionals in the public and private sector (professionele publicaties), including patents and annotations bookchapters and reports (e.g. law).lso known as "populariserende publicaties".*
3. *Other types of research output such as editorships, inaugural lectures, official reports and non-refereed academic books & book chapters (also invited lectures and papers and posters presented at conferences were taken into account, as well as contributions to conference proceedings.*

Table 5.4 *Funding of research capacity at programme level[1]*

	2008		2009		2010		2011		2012		2013	
	fte	*%*	*fte*	*%*	*fte*	*%*	*fte*	*%*	*fte*	*%*	*fte*	*%*
Direct funding	3.26	42	3.80	42	4.74	50	3.92	49	2.72	38	2.45	33
Research grants	0.45	6	0.94	10	0.67	7	0.63	8	0.57	8	1.73	24
Contract research	4.11	53	4.35	48	4.06	43	3.38	43	3.82	54	3.16	43
Total research staff	**7.82**	**100**	**9.09**	**100**	**9.47**	**100**	**7.93**	**100**	**7.11**	**100**	**7.34**	**100**

1. *The presented staff fte's are an estimate. All staff are expected to do all types of work – this may differ in groups and by person. IGS does not ask to keep time unless it is needed due to external obligations.*

Table 5.5 *Standard PhD candidates[1]*

Enrolment			Success rate										Total					
Start year	Enrolment male/female	Total male + female	Graduated after (≤) 4 years		Graduated after (≤) 5 years		Graduated after (≤) 6 years		Graduated after (≤) 7 years		Total Graduated		Not yet finished		Dis-continued	
	#M	#F	#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2003	2	1	3	-	-	3	100	3	100	3	100	3	100	-	-	-	-
2004	1	1	2	-	-	1	50	2	100	2	100	2	100	-	-	-	-
2005	2	-	2	-	-	2	100	2	100	2	100	2	100	-	-	-	-
2006	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	100	1	100	1	100	-	-	-	-
2007	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	100	1	100	1	100	-	-	-	-
2008	-	2	2	1	50	2	100	2	100	2	100	2	100	-	-	-	-
2009	1	2	3	1	33	2^2	67^2	2^2	67^2	2^2	67^2	2^2	67^2	1	33	-	-
Total	**7**	**7**	**14**	**2**	**14**	**10**	**71**	**13**	**93**	**13**	**93**	**13**	**93**	**1**	**7**	**-**	**-**

1. *Standard PhD candidates with employee status and conducting research with primary aim/obligation to graduate (AiO, promovendus)*
2. *5-year period not completed, graduation rate can go up.*

UT4: Higher Education and Research in the Knowledge Society

Table 5.2 *Research time of research staff[1], 2008-2013*

	2008		2009		2010		2011		2012		2013	
	fte	*n*	*fte*	*n*	*fte*	*n*	*fte*	*n*	*fte*	*n*	*fte*	*n*
Tenured staff[2]	2.60	7	2.65	9	3.00	9	2.65	9	2.06	9	1.75	9
Non-tenured staff[3]	3.06	8	1.20	5	2.70	7	1.55	7	1.10	4	0.55	5
PhD candidates[4]	1.60	2	1.35	2	1.27	2	0.80	1	0.9	1	0.85	1
Total research staff	**7.26**	**17**	**5.2**	**16**	**6.97**	**18**	**5.00**	**17**	**4.06**	**14**	**3.15**	**15**

1. *Includes research staff with a minimum of 0.1 FTE appointments.*
2. *Comparable with 'WOPI'-categories HGL ('professor'), UHD ('associate professor'), UD ('assistant professor').*
3. *Comparable with 'WOPI'-category 'Onderzoeker', including post-docs.*
4. *Standard PhD's (employed) and contract PhD's (externally or internally funded but not employed).*

Table 5.3 *Main categories of research output at programme level*

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Refereed articles	10	8	12	8	5	8	51
Of which international refereed articles	9	7	12	8	5	7	48
Non-refereed articles[1]	3	2	4	1	2	7	19
Books, academic refereed	-	3	-	-	4	-	7
Book chapters, academic refereed	14	24	17	15	39	11	120
Of which int. refereed book chapters	14	24	17	15	39	11	120
PhD-theses	-	-	1	-	1	1	3
Professional publications[2]	3	6	5	22	3	12	51
Publications for general public[3]	-	-	1	10	12	13	36
Other research output[5]	72	55	78	44	97	77	423
Total publications	**102**	**98**	**118**	**100**	**163**	**129**	**710**

1. *Articles in academic journals that are non-refereed, yet deemed important for the field*
2. *Publications aimed at professionals in the public and private sector (professionele publicaties), including patents and annotations bookchapters and reports (e.g. law)*
3. *Also known as "populariserende publicaties".*
4. *Other types of research output such as editorships, inaugural lectures, official reports and non-refereed academic books & book chapters (also invited lectures and papers and posters presented at conferences were taken into account, as well as contributions to conference proceedings.*

Table 5.4 *Funding of research capacity at programme level[1]*

	2008		2009		2010		2011		2012		2013	
	fte	*%*	*fte*	*%*	*fte*	*%*	*fte*	*%*	*fte*	*%*	*fte*	*%*
Direct funding	2.04	28	1.27	24	1.39	20	0.69	14	0.42	10	0.46	14
Research grants	2.05	28	2.25	43	1.94	28	1.69	34	0.58	14	0.74	22
Contract research	3.17	44	1.68	32	3.64	52	2.65	53	3.11	76	2.10	64
Total research staff	**7.26**	**100**	**5.20**	**100**	**6.97**	**100**	**5.03**	**100**	**4.11**	**100**	**3.29**	**100**

1. *The presented staff fte's are an estimate. All staff are expected to do all types of work – this may differ in groups and by person. IGS does not ask to keep time unless it is needed due to external obligations.*

Table 5.5 _Standard PhD candidates[1]_

Enrolment			Success rate									Total					
Start year	Enrolment male/ female	Total male + female	Graduated after (≤) 4 years		Graduated after (≤) 5 years		Graduated after (≤) 6 years		Graduated after (≤) 7 years			Total Graduated		Not yet finished		Dis-continued	
	#M	#F	#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2005	-	1	1	-	-	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100	-	-	-	-
2006	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	100	1	100	1	100	-	-	-	-
2007	-	1	1	-	-	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100	-	-	-	-
2008	1	-	1	-	-	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100	-	-	-	-
2009	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	**2**	**2**	**4**	**-**	**-**	**3**	**75**	**4**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**

1. _Standard PhD candidates with employee status and conducting research with primary aim/ obligation to graduate (AiO, promovendus)_

Utrecht University

Table 5.2 *Research time of research staff[1] at institutional level, 2008-2013*

	2008		2009		2010		2011		2012		2013	
	Fte	N	Fte	N	Fte	N	Fte	N	Fte	N	Fte	N
Tenured staff	8.31	23	8.32	27	9.49	27	10.19	25	11.06	26	11.16	27
Non-tenured staff	0.70	1	0.50	1			0.23	1	0.76	1	0.75	1
PhD candidates	8.15	10	6.39	10	7.12	10	8.76	11	9.20	10	8.88	10
Total research time of research staff	17.16	34	15.21	38	16.61	37	19.18	37	21.02	37	20.74	38

1. *Includes research staff with a minimum of 0.1 FTE appointments.*

Table 5.3 *Main categories of research output at institutional level*

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
A. Academic Publications	**85**	**91**	**116**	**119**	**107**	**103**	**621**
Refereed	**43**	**40**	**56**	**43**	**63**	**59**	**304**
- English refereed journals	27	27	46	35	50	51	236
- refereed journals in other languages	16	13	10	8	13	8	68
Non-refereed	**6**	**4**	**10**	**10**	**6**	**5**	**41**
- English non-refereed journals	1	2	3	4	1	1	12
- non-refereed journals in other languages	5	2	7	6	5	4	29
Book Chapters	**36**	**47**	**50**	**66**	**38**	**29**	**276**
- Book chapters in English	29	28	30	31	30	28	176
- Book chapters in other languages	7	19	20	35	8	11	100
B. Books	**19**	**11**	**8**	**14**	**11**	**7**	**70**
C. PhD theses[1]	**7**	**3**	**8**	**2**	**7**	**3**	**30**
D. Professional publications and products	**47**	**27**	**27**	**22**	**21**	**35**	**179**
- Professional Publications	33	15	18	9	12	12	99
- Reports	14	12	9	13	9	23	80
E. Publications aimed at the general public	**36**	**25**	**17**	**26**	**20**	**6**	**130**
F. Presentations aimed at the general public	**88**	**92**	**89**	**105**	**124**	**96**	**594**
Total	**282**	**249**	**265**	**288**	**290**	**250**	**1624**

1. *This includes external promotions.*

Table 5.4 *Funding of research capacity at institutional level*

	2008		2009		2010		2011		2012		2013	
	€	%	€	%	€	%	€	%	€	%	€	%
Direct funding	1.210.142	47	1.573.471	54	1.691.848	50	1.660.204	57	1652.982	46	1.610.291	51
Research grants	184.333	7	614.610	21	174.713	5	189.119	6	278.103	8	228.850	7
Contract research	1204.337	46	734.602	25	1.507.300	45	1.068.494	37	1.643.722	46	1.315.877	42
Total	**2.598.812**	**100**	**2.922.683**	**100**	**3.373.860**	**100**	**2.917.817**	**100**	**3.574.807**	**100**	**3.157.031**	**100**

Table 5.5 *Standard PhD candidates[1]*

Enrolment			Success rate								Total					
Start year	Enrolment male/female	Total male + female	Graduated after (≤) 4 years		Graduated after (≤) 5 years		Graduated after (≤) 6 years		Graduated after (≤) 7 years		Total Graduated		Not yet finished		Dis-continued	
	#M	#F	#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2004	2	-	2	-	-	1	50	1	50	2	100	2	100	-	-	-	-
2005	1	1	2	-	-	2	100	2	100	2	100	2	100	-	-	-	-
2006	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2007	2	1	3	-	-	2	67	3	100	3	100	3	100	-	-	-	-
2008	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2009	-	1	1	-	-	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100	-	-	-	-
Total	**5**	**3**	**8**	**-**	**-**	**6**	**75**	**7**	**88**	**8**	**100**	**8**	**100**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**

1. *Standard PhD candidates with employee status and conducting research with primary aim/obligation to graduate (AiO, promovendus)*

VU University Amsterdam

Table 5.2 *Research time of research staff[1], 2008-2013*

	2007 fte	2007 n	2008 fte	2008 n	2009 fte	2009 n	2010 fte	2010 n	2011 fte	2011 n	2012 fte	2012 n	2013 fte	2013 n
Tenured staff[2]	2.90	13	4.58	16	5.25	18	4.73	18	4.05	18	3.66	17	3.76	16
Non-tenured staff[3]	-	-	0.10	1	0.30	1	0.50	2	1.16	4	1.56	5	1.56	5
PhD candidates[4]	1.73	3	1.82	4	4.92	10	6.35	10	5.40	7	4.57	7	2.72	6
Total research staff	**4.63**	**16**	**6.50**	**21**	**10.47**	**29**	**11.58**	**30**	**10.61**	**29**	**9.79**	**29**	**8.04**	**27**

1. Includes research staff with a minimum of 0.1 FTE appointments.
2. Comparable with 'WOPI'-categories HGL ('professor'), UHD ('associate professor'), UD ('assistant professor').
3. Comparable with 'WOPI'-category 'Onderzoeker', including post-docs.
4. Standard PhD's (employed) and contract PhD's (externally or internally funded but not employed).

Table 5.3 *Main categories of research output at programme level*

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Refereed articles	16	24	19	27	26	24	23	159
Of which international refereed articles	15	15	11	19	16	13	16	105
Non-refereed articles[1]	1	2	4	4	5	4	4	24
Books, academic refereed	3	5	4	4	2	2	1	21
Book chapters, academic refereed	8	13	10	17	11	11	15	85
Of which int. refereed book chapters	6	9	7	14	6	8	14	64
PhD-theses	2	2	1	1	2	3	2	13
Professional publications[2]	20	30	35	40	19	29	15	188
Publications for general public[3]	2	-	2	8	8	6	6	32
Other research output[5]	22	16	31	25	20	17	14	145
Total publications	**74**	**92**	**106**	**126**	**93**	**96**	**80**	**667**

1. Articles in academic journals that are non-refereed, yet deemed important for the field.
2. Publications aimed at professionals in the public and private sector (professionele publicaties), including patents and annotations bookchapters and reports (e.g. law).
3. Also known as "populariserende publicaties".
4. Other types of research output such as editorships, inaugural lectures, official reports and non-refereed academic books & book chapters (also invited lectures and papers and posters presented at conferences were taken into account, as well as contributions to conference proceedings.

Table 5.4 *Funding of research capacity at programme level[1]*

	2007 fte	2007 %	2008 fte	2008 %	2009 fte	2009 %	2010 fte	2010 %	2011 fte	2011 %	2012 fte	2012 %	2013 fte	2013 %
Direct funding[1]	3.02	65	4.33	67	4.93	47	5.53	47	5.23	49	4.70	47	4.46	55
Research grants[2]	0.80	17	0.80	12	1.20	11	1.53	13	1.60	15	1.60	16	1.40	17
Contract research[3]	0.85	18	1.37	21	4.46	42	4.59	39	3.90	36	3.60	36	2.26	28
Total funding	**4.67**	**100**	**6.50**	**100**	**10.59**	**100**	**11.65**	**100**	**10.73**	**100**	**9.90**	**100**	**8.12**	**100**
Expenditure	*K€*	*%*	*K€*	*%*	*K€*	*%*	*K€*	*%*	*K€*	*%*	*K€*	*%*	*K€*	*%*
Personnel costs[4]	305.2	85	459.2	85	673.0	85	707.7	85	674.4	85	658.8	85	601.9	85
Other costs[5]	53.9	15	81.1	15	117.6	15	115.2	15	116.1	15	116.1	15	106.1	15

1. Direct funding by the university/KNAW/NWO
2. Research grants obtained in national and international scientific competition (e.g. grants from NWO, KNAW and European Research Council
3. Research contracts for specific research projects obtained from external organisations, such as industry, governmental ministries, European Commission and charity organisations.
4. Costs for research FTE posts as presented above.
5. Estimate

Table 5.5 *Standard PhD candidates*[1]

Enrolment			Success rate								Total					
Start year	Enrolment male/ female		Total male + female	Graduated after (≤) 4 years		Graduated after (≤) 5 years		Graduated after (≤) 6 years		Graduated after (≤) 7 years		Total Graduated		Not yet finished		Dis-continu ed
	#M	#F	#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2005	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2006	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100	1	100	-	-	-	-
2007	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	100	1	100	1	100	-	-	-	-
2008	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2009[2]	2	4	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	100	-	-
Total	**3**	**4**	**8**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**1**	**13**	**2**	**25**	**2**	**25**	**6**	**75**	**-**	**-**

1. *Standard PhD candidates with employee status and conducting research with primary aim/ obligation to graduate (AiO, promovendus)*
2. *5-year period not completed, graduation rate can go up.*