

Research Review

Political Science

2007-2012

Quality Assurance Netherlands Universities (QANU)
Catharijnesingel 56
PO Box 8035
3503 RA Utrecht
The Netherlands

Phone: +31 (0) 30 230 3100
Telefax: +31 (0) 30 230 3129
E-mail: info@qanu.nl
Internet: www.qanu.nl

Project number: Q 454

© 2014 QANU

Text and numerical material from this publication may be reproduced in print, by photocopying or by any other means with the permission of QANU if the source is mentioned.

Report on the evaluation of research in Political Science at Leiden University, University of Amsterdam, University of Twente and VU University Amsterdam

Contents

Foreword by the Committee chair	5
1. The Review Committee and the review procedures	7
2. General remarks	11
Assessment at Institute and Programme level.....	15
3. Research review Leiden University	17
4. Research review University of Amsterdam.....	25
5. Research review University of Twente	35
6. Research review VU University Amsterdam	45
Appendices	53
Appendix 1: Curricula vitae of the Committee members	55
Appendix 2: Explanation of the SEP scores.....	57
Appendix 3: Programme of the site visit	59
Appendix 4: Quantitative data	61

Foreword by the Committee chair

This report seeks to provide an overview and evaluation of the research conducted in the period 2007-2012 in the Departments of Political Science at Leiden University (LEI), the University of Twente (UT), VU University of Amsterdam (VU) and the University of Amsterdam (UvA). Furthermore it aims to provide an assessment of the research management of these Institutes and offers some suggestions for future direction with a view to quality assurance.

At a time when the field of Political Science in the Netherlands has been judged as being exceptionally productive, and a time in which obtaining guaranteed research time is under pressure, it is a particular honour to have the opportunity to review these four departments and offer some insights. Furthermore, having a chance to work together with six colleagues of different countries to brainstorm about what are some strengths and weaknesses of the Dutch four Political Science Institutes and Programmes before us is a real privilege.

As chair of this review Committee, I would like to thank the management, faculty and PhD candidates of the Institutes and Programmes reviewed here for their cooperation throughout this process. I also thank the members of the Committee for their participation and dedication to this review. Last but not least I thank Floor Meijer and Barbara van Balen for their outstanding support and guidance throughout.

Amy Verdun
Chair of the Review Committee Political Science

1. The Review Committee and the review procedures

Scope of the assessment

The Political Science Review Committee was asked to perform an assessment of the research in Political Science at Leiden University (LEI), University of Twente (UT), VU University Amsterdam (VU) and University of Amsterdam (UvA). This assessment covers the research conducted in the period 2007-2012.

This assessment follows the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015 (SEP) for Research Assessment in the Netherlands that was developed by the Association of Universities in the Netherlands (VSNU, *Vereniging van Samenwerkende Nederlandse Universiteiten*), the Royal Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW, *Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen*) and the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO, *Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek*). In accordance with the Standard Evaluation Protocol, 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 management and the research leaders and to advise on how it might be improved.

Composition of the Committee

The Review Committee was composed of seven Political Science professors from different subfields and nationalities currently residing in six different countries (Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, the United Kingdom). All seven of them had prior experience with assessments of this nature and are familiar with the international standards in the field.

The composition of the Political Science Committee was as follows:

- Prof. Amy Verdun (chair), Professor of Political Science, University of Victoria, Canada;
- Prof. David Farrell, Professor of Politics, University College Dublin, Ireland;
- Prof. Oscar Gabriel, Professor Emeritus of Political Science, Universität Stuttgart, Germany;
- Prof. Colin Hay, Professor of Political Sciences, Sciences Po, Paris, France;
- Prof. Hubert Heinelt, Professor of Political Science, Technische Universität Darmstadt, Germany;
- Prof. Knud-Erik Jørgensen, Professor of Political Science, Aarhus University, Denmark.
- Prof. Michael Kenny, Professor of Politics, Queen Mary University of London, United Kingdom;

Short curricula vitae of the Committee members are included in Appendix 1.

Staff from Quality Assurance Netherlands Universities (QANU) supported both the review as well as the final report. Dr. Floor Meijer of QANU was appointed secretary to the Committee but was not present during most of the site visit due to illness. Dr. Barbara van Balen replaced her as secretary during this time.

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 Programme under review were reported and discussed in the 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 unit under review, including all the information required by the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP), with appendices.
- Copies of the key publications per Research Programme.

Procedures followed by the Committee

The Committee proceeded according to the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015, which uses a 5-point rating scale. The meaning of the scores is described in Appendix 2. The Committee adapted this rating scale slightly as it quickly became clear that Political Science research in the Netherlands is generally of a good to very good level, implying that most ratings involved the higher end of the scale. To allow 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. The Committee insists that the Institute and Programme leaders, as well as others who may be interested in and make use of these scores, should interpret them accordingly, and, moreover, always see them in relation to the qualitative comments.

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. Due to its size the UvA was assigned a third reviewer and in that case the role of second reviewer was shared between the second and third reviewers.

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 the preliminary assessments were discussed. It also agreed upon procedural matters and aspects of the assessment. For each university it discussed the self-evaluation report, key publications and the preliminary findings of all Research Programmes and the Institute before commencing the interview process. The Chair started the interviews followed by a sequencing of questioning whereby the first reviewers asked questions followed by the second reviewers and, where applicable, the third reviewer. Towards the end the other Committee members were given the opportunity to ask questions. After each interview the Committee took some time to prepare a preliminary assessment. After concluding the interviews at each university, it discussed the scores and comments of the Institute and Programmes.

The interviews took place during site visits to the University of Amsterdam (April 28th), VU University Amsterdam (April 29th), University of Twente (April 30th) and Leiden University (May 1st). The schedule is reproduced 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 and (3) a selection of PhD candidates.

At the end of its last site visit, the Committee discussed the results, following a process of deliberation decided on the scores, and provided comments on all four Institutes and Programmes. The final assessments are based on the documentation provided by the Institutes, the key publications, and the interviews with the management and the leaders of

the Programmes. 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 further additions and amendment. After both assessors had approved it, the assessment was inserted into the report. After receiving all assessments, the secretary compiled the text and sent it to the Chair, who added to and amended the text and produced a first draft report. Subsequently the secretary tidied up the text and returned it to the Committee for further feedback and approval (two rounds of feedback were needed before the text was finalised). 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.

Since all Political Science research at each of the participating Institutes is conducted within a single Programme, the Committee found it appropriate to integrate the Institute and Programme assessment. Accordingly, the assessments in this report cover both the Institute and the Programme level.

2. General remarks

Political Science in the Netherlands

Dutch Political Science has a strong international position. A comparative study of Dutch performance in 29 scientific disciplines commissioned by the Ministry of Education (Science, Technology and Innovation Indicators (2012)) shows that the international impact of Dutch Political Science publications is far above average, making it one of the six highest-scoring disciplines in the Netherlands. The Dutch Political Science community is generally outward looking and deeply embedded in international networks (cf. Dialogic | NIFU | CWTS, Science, Technology & Innovation Indicators 2012, publication commissioned by the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. Utrecht, December 2012, available at <http://www.dialogic.nl/documents/2010.056-1235.pdf>).

Funding

In the period under review the amount of funding made available to the four departments through direct university funding (*eerste geldstroom* or ‘first stream funding’) has declined significantly, a trend that started in 2000. As a result all four Institutes have reduced the base funding provided to faculty members for research. This has translated into a reduction in the proportion of time automatically allocated to research. The four Institutes have each found different ways to ensure that faculty members can secure more research funding than what is provided in base. They are all relying more on external funding to support research activities and ensure that time is acquired for research. In the Dutch context these external funds are further subdivided into a second and third stream: funds from grant providing research authorities, national or European, e.g., Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) or the European Research Council (ERC) or EU FP 6, FP 7, Jean Monnet or Marie Curie funds (*tweede geldstroom* or ‘second stream funding’) or funds for contract research (*derde geldstroom* or ‘third stream funding’), such as research commissioned by lower governments or industry). Second and third stream funds also typically require grant application (or time needs to be spent building the relationship with an industry partner to obtain funding for contract research).

The declining proportion of funding that is derived from base research funding (first stream funding) was noted by the Committee and met with some concern. Yet, with more limited funds from this source, the four Institutes and Programmes have been creative and successful in maintaining publication and research outputs, in the period under review, but the Committee perceives a significant risk to both if direct funding were further reduced. Likewise, with this level of base funding, should research staff have less success in attracting second and third stream funding, faculty members might not have sufficient allocated time to do high-quality research.

Relatedly, the funding of PhD candidates is also under pressure. In the four Institutes reviewed here, base funding for PhD candidates has all but disappeared. This diminishing of university base funding for PhD candidates could, down the road, pose a threat to a Dutch iconic institution – the system of salaried PhD candidates. The Committee worries that the decision at various universities to discontinue the provision of direct funding positions to selected PhD candidates may lead to the end of the Dutch PhD system, that has been nationally and internationally acclaimed as an important strength of the Dutch university system and a vehicle for quality doctoral training. This concern was further exacerbated because some of the Institutes mentioned during the site visits that they feel that when they apply for external grants their applications could be considered less competitive due to the

cost of Dutch PhD candidates. Thus, the Committee would urge the managements of the four Institutes to consider developing a system of matching funds, so that when research staff apply for external funding they can rely on central funds to match their external fund applications for PhD candidates. The Committee understands that something along these lines is in place in each of these Institutes but that current provisions may not be sufficient to maintain competitiveness when applying for research grants. By devising such a scheme one could maintain the high Dutch standards of PhD financial support, whilst still being able to remain competitive in international grant writing.

In addition, during the site visit at one Institute the Committee learnt that small amounts of research funding (start-up funds) appear to be increasingly hard to acquire. Finally, for very senior members (for instance those who no longer qualify for VICI funds), second stream funds may be more difficult to obtain.

All of these developments are a concern to the Committee given that now, more than in years past, security in funding is a pre-requisite for university-level research, especially for more fundamental research enquiries. Also, the process of application being competitive implies that much more time than previously is devoted to applying for funds, and – by definition – not everyone will be successful. Thus a lot of time is allocated to grant writing without any guarantee that this research will be executed. Although the Committee welcomes the principle of having a more competitive system for research funding, it is concerned that further reductions in funding may undermine the core research and international standing of Dutch Political Science Departments. Add to these factors the long academic year in the Netherlands and the fact that there is not a tradition of sabbatical leaves and one can easily understand why the Committee is concerned about the reduction in research time in the four Institutes under review.

Another reflection concerns the way research Full Time Equivalent (FTE) research staff is calculated in the Netherlands, which raises questions about how one calculates productivity. If the percentage of time allocated to research officially goes down thereby reducing research FTE, then it might give the impression that staff is more productive per FTE should they produce the same amount of research with officially a smaller FTE allocation. Yet, what is being asked of staff is that they produce their research in their ‘other’ hours – those officially not allocated to research. This seems an awkward practice. Clearly the Institutes should ensure that every research active staff member has sufficient time to conduct his or her research. It also means that for productivity exercises there seems to be a perverse incentive: if a department brings the percentage of FTE research per active research staff down, the productivity per FTE for that individual would go up. As a Committee we are bound by the practices that the Dutch universities have developed over time, but we did pause to reflect. Thus, our comments below, regarding productivity, should be considered against the context that we are somewhat dissatisfied with the practice that this productivity currently is calculated per FTE, with a varying base line as to what the regular academic has in percentage of research time, and lack of clarity concerning what the total FTE actually represents per institute over the review period.

Although the Committee is aware that funding is allocated to Institutes and Programmes on the basis of student diplomas and PhD candidates rather than quality or quantity of research of any given unit, the Committee encourages senior administration (university management) to consider the success of the four Political Science Departments in their publication output and impact when determining how much funding these departments should be allocated from central funding and converted into base funding for each of these Political Science

Departments (e.g. hiring new tenure track faculty or increasing discretionary funding that could enhance research time for staff). The Committee's judgement is that Political Science in the Netherlands is performing exceptionally well in comparative international terms and in comparison with other disciplines.

Publication culture

Each of the four Institutes has increased the attention placed on publishing. The publication rate in the four Institutes is high, both in absolute terms and per Full Time Equivalent (FTE) research staff. Appendix 4 presents a table that summarises the productivity per FTE of all participating programmes in terms of publications per research FTE (PhD candidates excluded); there are a number of limitations with these kinds of metrics (as research FTE is calculated and implemented differently across universities, while the actual research time of faculty is another matter), and the Committee chose to consider these statistics as one of a number of sources when assessing the quality and quantity of publication. When considering the output per FTE in this way it becomes clear that, overall, research staff have been very productive in the six years under review. Given the points made above (page 12) about the limitations of the productivity measurement per FTE, the Committee has considered to compare the numbers of total publications (produced by all research staff) per research employee, rather than per research FTE. Yet it realises that the fact that not all research staff work in full time, or not during the entire year, or have other commitments that take time away from the 'typical' academic job, implies that such an exercise would not be a much better method to determine productivity per capita, and in any case that the Committee would not have had the complete information available to provide a better metric.

Notwithstanding these observations, each of the Institutes is grappling with how to measure both quality and quantity in its published outputs, for instance how much to encourage publications in international refereed journals versus the publication of monographs. Likewise there are questions for each of these Institutes about whether PhD candidates in their Programmes should publish together with their supervisors (and if so whether those publications should form part of their dissertation work). Furthermore, there has been a change in culture around whether PhD candidates graduate on the basis of a monograph or a collection of articles. Again, the Committee noted a variety of models and clearly it is no longer the case that all PhD candidates in Political Science in the Netherlands write monographs as the basis of their dissertation work. Finally, it was established that PhD candidates are likely to contribute to a larger project. The Committee noted that there is a tension between having PhD candidates fit into an existing project versus enabling them to design their own research project. The Institutes find different ways to ensure sufficient amount of independent research among the PhD candidates.

PhD training

Internal PhD candidates of half of the Political Science Departments in the Netherlands reviewed here (but not those of Leiden University and the University of Amsterdam: the two biggest Political Science Departments) participate in the educational Programme of the KNAW accredited Dutch-Flemish graduate school for Political Science and public administration, the Netherlands Institute of Government (NIG). This Institute was established in 1993 by the Universities of Twente, Leiden and Rotterdam, and has since expanded to include nine Dutch and two Flemish universities. It has a senior staff of more than 200 researchers and more than 100 PhD candidates. Currently the Twente Department of Public Administration hosts the NIG directorate. The research school seems to present PhD candidates with a wonderful opportunity to obtain training, get feedback from and meet other PhD candidates. Yet, each of the Institutes that the Committee visited also offers local

graduate PhD candidate training and facilitates their studies in various ways (i.e. by providing funding for research trips and conference attendance). In some cases there are formal sessions that enable PhD candidates to present their work to their peers and so on.

The Dutch PhD funding system, in which PhD candidates are employees of the university, thereby treated as direct colleagues of research staff is, in the opinion of the Committee, superior to many that exist abroad. This system enables PhD candidates from the start of their studies to feel like fully integrated staff members of their Departments. They appreciate this status as it ensures them a sense of belonging, their opinion is valued, they could participate in administration and, if they so choose, can take up modest teaching duties. The salary provided by the university enables the PhD candidates to concentrate on their research rather than worrying about where the next term's funding is going to come from – a concern that is more apparent in universities elsewhere. But the Committee noticed that this model is currently at risk and would encourage these Institutes to try to ensure that the funding system, including the unique and high-quality graduate training Programme offered by the NIG and the local graduate schools (and the academic 'citizenship' of PhD candidates as part of the academic unit), stay intact even in the face of funding restrictions and challenges.

The Committee noticed that in some cases, to make up the numbers, external PhD candidates join the Institutes. In the Political Science Evaluation Protocol 2007-2012 (PEP, p. 13) these are defined as 'PhD candidates without employee status, formally admitted to a 3/4-year PhD trajectory with external funding from international higher education foundations like Nuffic, WOTRO/NWO, National Academies of Sciences'. These (foreign) scholarship PhD candidates (*beurspromovendi*) receive a monthly stipend from the Institute which administrates the awarded funds. External PhD students who work on the PhD in their own time and do not receive any form of financial compensation had been disregarded in the self-evaluation reports. Although it is clear that all parties benefit from the presence of these external PhD candidates, in some cases they seem not equally well integrated into the body of PhD candidates and the department at large. The Committee encourages all Institutes to find ways to avoid a 'two-tier' PhD candidate status and to integrate external PhD candidates into the regular PhD community, ensuring they enjoy the same rights and opportunities as their colleagues.

Equity and Diversity

In years gone by there have been concerns about whether research teams at Political Science Institutes in the Netherlands were sufficiently balanced in terms of age, gender, race, ethnicity and rank. Although the Committee notes that there is still a preponderance of white men in senior positions, this issue appears to be being addressed through new hires and promotions. Certainly the PhD candidates represent a more diverse population. A number of the Institutes reviewed here have explicit policies that seek to promote equity and diversity among their research teams.

Assessment at Institute and Programme level

3. Research review Leiden University

Programme: The Institutions of Politics: Design, Workings, and Implications
Programme leaders: Prof. Petr Kopecný and Prof. Ingrid van Biezen
Research staff 2012: 4.46 FTE tenured, 17.95 FTE total

Assessments: Quality: 4.5
 Productivity: 5
 Relevance: 4
 Viability: 4.5

1A. The Institute

The Institute of Political Science is a broad, medium-sized department situated within the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences. The Institute's research mission is 'to conduct research at the highest possible level in all subfields of Political Science, with a particular focus on the analysis of political institutions in the broadest sense of the term, and to disseminate its results in high quality venues of publication'. Furthermore, the Institute 'aims to conduct its research with academic integrity and without prejudice to any political, theoretical, or methodological paradigm'.

An Executive Board, which consists of a Scientific Director (appointed from the professors of the Institute) and, at most, two other members (appointed from the faculty), manages the Institute. It supervises the workflow of employees and stimulates the connection between education and research in the field of Political Science.

The Institute plays a key role in the university-wide Research Priority Area (RPA) on Political Legitimacy, which is a collaborative interdisciplinary project of the Faculties of Social and Behavioural Sciences, Law, Humanities, and Campus The Hague. The Institute also takes part in the Jean Monnet Programme Key Activities and has contributed to the establishment of the Centre for Political Philosophy (CPP) at Leiden University, an interdisciplinary platform for political thought sponsored by the Institutes for Philosophy and Political Science.

1B. The Programme

The Institute of Political Science hosts a single Research Programme entitled 'The Institutions of Politics: Design, Workings, and Implications'. This Programme was created as a result of an earlier research assessment, in which the Committee at the time advised that the Institute should merge its three existing Programmes. The resulting Programme has a very broad thematic focus on institutions, which are defined as providing the 'rules and pay-off structures that shape or constrain individual behaviour and that contribute to the formation of political preferences'. Within the broadly themed Programme cross-cutting research ventures (both empirical and normative) are encouraged.

During the site visit the Institute management explained that there are three main reasons to maintain the current Research Programme. First, it is thought to reflect the internationally well-known research strengths of the Institute, while second, it also fits current trends in international Political Science research, most notably the prominence of neo-institutionalist theories and approaches as well as societal developments such as globalisation and Europeanisation. Third, there are administrative reasons to maintain the current structure. The Committee was left unsure whether this commitment to an overarching research focus is advantageous to this Programme. Indeed, it is noted in the self-assessment report that this

might prove disadvantageous in a climate in which research funders are looking for dedicated research clusters. It noted too that the publications policy may well be generating some important, unintended consequences – for instance a reduction in the number of monographs being written – which might need to be addressed by the managers of the Programme.

2. Quality and academic reputation

Political Science in Leiden is undoubtedly a very strong brand. Both the Institute itself and its leading staff members have a long and well-deserved international reputation as one of Europe's leading Political Science Departments. A major strength of this unit is its broad coverage of the discipline of Political Science, with high-quality scholarship in the range of sub-fields that are housed within it. There is a healthy output of high quality publications, with a portion that are internationally outstanding (as evidenced by the sample publications). There is also good evidence of active engagement in seeking research grants of different scales.

Senior members of this department are actively engaged in leadership roles in the profession both nationally and internationally, as shown for instance by the management of, or heavy involvement in, internationally renowned research projects; leadership roles in Political Science associations such as the European Consortium of Political research (ECPR); and the editorships of journals and book series. Additionally, recent years have seen an influx of ambitious early career researchers, who have brought new research themes, possibilities for collaboration and funding opportunities into the Institute.

The Committee concluded that there is good management practice relating to the monitoring and promotion of high quality research – in particular the publication policy, which frames annual review discussions, and provides a clear and widely understood framework for all research-active staff. As part of its quality strategy, the Institute aims for those research outputs that enable the highest impact within and outside the academic community, including peer-reviewed English-language journals and university presses. It is also commendable that the Institute focuses on quality over quantity and resists, as much as possible, what it calls 'perverse incentives'. The Committee noted the large amount of publications that are single authored (more than half of all indexed publications being single authored, see section 4 below). In the period under investigation, the number of articles published in the top 25 journals of the Institute for Scientific Information (ISI) index has increased from 4 in 2007 to 7 in 2012; the number of publications in the top 10 journals has increased from 0 (between 2007-09) to a total of 4 (in 2010-12).

As mentioned above, the Committee is not completely sure that the broad thematic focus of the Programme will remain viable in the longer term. Also, there are concerns about pressures upon staff research time and administrative support in research-related areas, which could impact negatively upon research quality. These issues will be discussed below.

3. Resources

During the period under review, the funding received by the Institute has increased. Direct government funding, which is driven by undergraduate student numbers, was the largest source of income for most of the review period except for the last year under review (2012). During the first five years direct funding constituted 60% or more, whereas at the end of the period (2012) the share of overall funding was more heavily determined by research grants with internal funds constituting only 38.4% of all funding. During the interviews it became clear that the low percentage of direct funding in the last year under review was due to the

success in attracting second and third stream funding. The national Dutch policy is to reduce the first stream funding in favour of second stream money. Apparently the Institute of Political Science of Leiden University was successful in attracting second and third stream money, and it appears that in 2012 the first stream monies were reduced by the same amount that had been secured by way of those second and third stream funds.

Competitive funding received from the NWO and EU funding schemes became an ever more prominent source of income, its share rising from 39% in 2011 to 59.8% in 2012. Amongst the grants received were early career (Veni) and mid career (Vidi)-grants from NWO, grants from the Belgian Federal Science Policy Office (BELSPO), the Danish Agency for Science, Technology and Innovation, and the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW). Members of staff at all levels of seniority have also successfully generated income from EU sources, including a large ERC grant and grants from the FP6, FP7, Jean Monnet and Marie Curie Programmes. By contrast, tertiary funding from contract research occupies a relatively marginal position at the Leiden Institute of Political Science.

The increased earning capacity from second stream funding is, according to the self-evaluation report, consistent with the Institute's own strategy as well as with Leiden University's broader policy to secure more external funding for research activities. Part of the Institute's quality strategy is to ensure a high level of research income and to invest the resources thereby generated in postdoctoral research fellows, PhD candidates and the support of other early career researchers. This policy is translated into collective activities such as the annual retreat and increased collaboration with the University's Research Office (LURIS), which assists with the practicalities of external fundraising. To underline that external fundraising is also an essential part of individual careers, opportunities and strategies for securing external research funding are discussed on an individual basis during annual performance reviews. Although this increased earning capacity seems an improvement over the past period, the Committee notes that the number of PhD candidates is low relative to the size of the Institute. The Committee encourages the Institute to secure more PhD positions through funds from NWO and the EU, and encourages the University to provide direct funding for PhD positions. The Committee also advises the Institute to integrate further the external PhD candidates within its Programme.

Although confident in its future fundraising success, the Institute recognises that applying for external grants increases the considerable administrative burden placed on staff members. It has been investigating ways to 'square the circle to provide a more structural solution to the more contingent but increasingly onerous demands imposed by research grant management'. The Committee recommends that the Institute consider finding ways to make application for external grants easier and more rewarding, for instance by increasing the incentives for winning grants and increasing the resources dedicated to grant writing (such as more administrative support to grant applications).

The increasing revenues generated from external funding sources are paralleled by an exponential increase of the research staff, both in the number of people and the number of research FTEs. The total number of FTEs started at 9.41 FTE in 2007, grew to a peak of 22.53 FTE in 2010 and then fell back to 17.95 FTE in 2012. Much of this growth can be attributed to increasing numbers of PhD candidates and other non-tenured staff members. The number of tenured staff remained more or less stable around 4 FTE. One new professor was appointed during the review period.

While the Programme generally appears to be well resourced, there are concerns about pressures upon staff research time (in the context of growing student numbers in particular) and administrative support in research-related areas. New university regulations have lowered the allocated nominal percentage of research time within the appointment of regular research staff from 35% to 27.5% – which is lower than in some other Political Science Institutes in the Netherlands. The Committee discussed with staff and management the worrying implications of this decision for research quality and productivity. Management informed the Committee that the Institute of Political Science, contrary to other Institutes within the Faculty, has adopted an egalitarian approach: *every* member of the research staff receives the base percentage of 27.5%, while those who have been successful in bringing in external funding can supplement their research time. Staff members added to this that their teaching load of 4-5 courses per year is kept manageable by the recent ‘rationalisation’ of the teaching Programmes, the Institute’s rather flexible organisational system and the introduction of the teaching-free period in which they can devote themselves entirely to research. Nevertheless, staff members admit that pressures are high and rising. The Committee was impressed to hear the efforts being made to maintain an active research culture in the face of these pressures. It encourages the Institute to maintain its egalitarian approach.

The staffing policy of the Institute is to replace departing staff at an equivalent level of seniority wherever possible and to appoint innovative and dynamic early career researchers. New members of staff must be able to contribute to the established research areas of comparative politics, international relations, political theory and Dutch politics, or to open up significant new areas of research that enhance their present research portfolio, such as political psychology and communication. New junior staff, a majority of whom were recruited from abroad, are appointed on a five-year ‘tenure track’ position, which is converted into a permanent contract upon meeting the Institute’s requirement in research, teaching and administration. Progress is discussed during the annual performance appraisal with the Institute’s academic director. Publishing in high-end outlets is seen as positively influencing the career prospects of staff members, including granting of tenured contracts and/or promotion to a higher academic rank. Underperformers are either filtered out before they reach tenure or, when they already have tenure, are submitted to a coaching Programme before – as a last resort – their research time is reduced. Based on the information about the quality of the research staff, both junior and senior, the Committee judges that a successful research staff recruitment and retention policy is in place, evidenced in part by the quality of the publications of the junior staff.

The Committee also notes that a gender imbalance is apparent. In 2013, at the associate professor rank men outnumbered women by 4:1, while at the rank of full professor this was 4:2 (although the ratio had been better in 2009: 2:3 at the professorial rank). As always, the Institute should be mindful of these imbalances and make an effort to understand why these ratios are currently out of balance and work towards rectifying them where possible.

4. Productivity

As was already mentioned above, the self-evaluation report states that the Institute of Political Science prioritises quality over quantity in its research outputs. To resist the potentially ‘perverse incentives’ that may emerge from an increasingly output-oriented academic practice, it has devised an internal protocol that sets a series of standards against which individual research output can be assessed. Generally speaking, the Institute therefore encourages single-authored work. Over the review period, a little over half (54.2%) of all indexed publications consisted of single-authored work, a third (33.9%) were publications with one co-author, while publications with two or more co-authors made up only a small portion of the total

publications (9.3% and 2.6% respectively).

The Committee learned that these principles also apply to the work of PhD candidates. Dissertations are typically research monographs rather than collections of published articles and supervisors never act as co-authors of dissertation chapters. The practical implications of this decision – slower/lower completion rates, less publications (in top journals) by the time of graduation and, the possibility of diminished funding opportunities and career perspectives for PhDs – were discussed at length during the site visit, both with the Institute management and with the PhD candidates themselves. Although both groups clearly acknowledge the possible disadvantages of this strategy, they also trust that the Leiden system is more beneficial in the long run. PhD candidates seem to draw a strong sense of pride from authoring a monograph by themselves. In spite of the apparent down sides, the Committee supports the Institute's publication strategy. As mentioned above, it would encourage the Institute to review its strategy in due course with a view to assessing whether there are undesirable side-effects of its policy.

The Committee has established that the preference for single-authored work has not harmed Leiden's productivity. With an annual average of 13.6 publications per research FTE (PhD candidates disregarded) over the period 2007-2012 (of which 3.4 were refereed articles, 0.4 monographs and 3.8 publications for the general public and professional audiences), its Programme performs very well when compared to the other Institutes under review. Generally speaking, there has clearly been a greater focus upon the publication of articles in leading journals (and some evidence that higher ranked journals are being successfully targeted more often) a parallel decline in the number of monographs (0 in 2012), and a small fall in the number of publications that communicate research to non-specialist audiences.

Productivity in terms of PhD completions (1.1 PhD per tenured FTE per year) seems better than elsewhere, mainly because of a significant number of externally funded PhD candidates. Completion times, however, are long. Between 2003 and 2008, there was an influx of eleven internal PhD candidates. After four years, only 27% of them had finished, after five years this was 63%. After seven years, 18% was still working on their research, while a further 18% had dropped out. Additionally, there was an influx of ten external PhD candidates, whose completion rates were somewhat lower than those of internal PhD candidates: after four years, 30% of them had finished their projects, after five years this was 50%. After seven years, 40% was still working on their research, while a further 10% had dropped out.

5. Societal relevance

The self-evaluation report lists several convincing indicators of the societal relevance of the research of Leiden's political scientists. Staff regularly publish articles in Dutch and foreign newspapers, opinion weeklies and semi-academic journals, they appear on national and international Radio & TV, they have closely collaborated with the Dutch media on opinion poll research, they have produced a number of policy relevant outputs (though perhaps less than before) and they have been involved in external consultancies for, or in collaboration with, local and national governments as well as national and international governmental and non-governmental organisations and think tanks. Furthermore, several members of staff have received awards and nominations for awards for academic research which bridges the gap between scientific research and wider society, including the Laurens Pieter van de Spiegelprijs, awarded by the Dutch Association for Public Administration.

Although there is clear evidence that staff members have been involved in societally relevant projects and have communicated their research findings to broader audiences, the self-

assessment does not indicate the kinds of support or emphasis placed on this aspect of the Programme. During the site visit, the management confirmed that, up to now, the Institute has not felt the need to develop a strategic approach for outreach or ‘valorisation’. The Committee noted the different kinds of societal impact which research at Leiden achieves, and concluded that the Programme’s efforts in this area might be more strategically planned and better co-ordinated. It noted too that more consideration might be given to the possibility of leveraging the relationships, which individual researchers have developed (in the context of third stream funding).

6. Strategy for the future

To underline the Institute’s and Programme’s viability, the self-evaluation points first and foremost to its active and ambitious staff. Additionally, the report stresses the Institute’s embedding in national and international networks, its flexible research infrastructure and productive research culture. The creation of a new undergraduate Programme (International Relations and Organizations) has greatly increased student numbers and therefore consolidated the inflow of direct funding from the University, while at the same time the Institute has increased its success in the acquisition of research grants.

There are, however, several potential threats that the unit is seeking to address, notably: managing its growing financial reliance upon external funding; resolving the general lack of administrative support for research activities and, therefore, the increasingly taxing administrative burden on individual researchers; managing the teaching of increasing numbers of students in a time of declining resources, and modernising the out-dated IT environment. The Committee further notes a relatively low number of PhD candidates, which the self-assessment report identified as an important challenge for the Programme. Also, the continued emphasis on the dissertation as a single book-length study rather than a collection of research articles (which is a possibility in other Institutes being assessed) might place PhD candidates or recently graduated doctoral degree holders from Leiden at a disadvantage on the job market; again, a point recognised in the self-assessment report. Although there still is a lot to be said for favouring the dissertation as a single book-length study, the Committee encourages the Institute to review its policy on a yearly (and case-by-case) basis, with a view to ensuring that its strategy continues to meet its goals.

The Committee was informed that the main aspect of the strategy for the future will be to continue the recruitment policy of appointing motivated and talented researchers and to provide them with opportunities for career advancement and promotion. The Institute is convinced that its innovative capacity derives in large part from the engagement of academic staff with contemporary issues and debates. In that context, its recruitment strategy constitutes a pivotal element in the continued efforts to rejuvenate and innovate. The second aspect of the strategy for the future is to maintain funding, as the viability of the research Programme largely depends on the capacity to continue to secure financial resources. This entails both keeping up student numbers in order to secure first stream funding and further promoting and strengthening the acquisition of external research grants.

The Committee concludes that there has been a concerted attempt to address weaknesses highlighted in the previous assessment process. A considered, strategic approach has been developed in relation to research in this period, based primarily on increasing staff numbers, promoting publication in highly ranked journals, and growing the number of PhD candidates. Commendable steps are being taken to address the question of how to integrate internal and external PhD candidates. The Committee was impressed by the strategic and forward-

thinking approach taken by the Programme's senior staff to a range of different threats and opportunities.

7. PhD-training and supervision

The Institute of Political Science hosts internal and external PhD candidates; the latter tend to receive a monthly stipend from an international higher education foundation rather than a salary and are not employed by the university itself. The research master's Programme serves as a recruitment base for internal candidates, who hold either 3 or 4-year contracts at the Institute. The self-evaluation report mentions that recently there has been a decline in PhD positions financed out of Institute funds. Currently, there is just one first stream PhD position per year and competition is, understandably, considerable. Additional internal positions are paid out of second stream funding (NWO, EU, FP7). The internal PhD candidates with whom the Committee spoke during the site visit stated that a larger PhD community would be beneficial. At the same time, however, they insisted that they feel well-integrated within the research staff. They participate in lunch- and research seminars, the teaching Programme and run a PhD club where work in progress is discussed.

Traditionally, external candidates are not entitled to the same benefits as internal PhDs. According to the self-evaluation report this dichotomy has become increasingly untenable in recent years. The management informed the Committee that the Institute of Political Science plans to take steps to reform the admission, recruitment and supervision Programme for external PhD candidates so as to reduce further the gap within the PhD candidate community, to improve academic supervision, to enhance the academic quality and relevance of external PhD dissertations and to improve their structural integration within the Institute. The external PhD candidates with whom the Committee spoke during the site visit subscribed to the necessity of these steps. They confirmed that they feel somewhat isolated and would welcome the opportunity to enrol in the training Programme and also have the opportunity to contribute to the teaching of undergraduate students. The Committee concludes that, although progress is being made to integrate external PhD candidates into the regular PhD Programme, a further streamlining of the inclusion of these external PhD candidates is necessary, so that they could participate as fully as possible (for instance in the Promoclub and the like). In a similar vein, some external PhD candidates are doing their dissertation work in part-time. The Committee would encourage occasionally scheduling the seminars, in which PhD candidates present their work to one another, in timeslots conducive to these part-timers.

The self-evaluation report does not go into detail about the supervision of PhD candidates. During the site visit it became apparent that procedures have not been fully formalised, apart from the use of a 'promotion and supervision plan'. PhD candidates have different experiences when it comes to their supervision. As of yet, the training Programme is only intended for internal candidates. Their needs for methodological training are assessed on an individual basis, agreed with the supervisors and laid down in the promotion and supervision plan. Until 2012, the Netherlands Institute of Government (NIG), a national research school, provided their training. Since leaving the NIG, the PhD Programme has become embedded within the newly established Graduate School, which offers several interdisciplinary courses to all PhD candidates at the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences. In addition, many PhD candidates take courses in methodological Programmes elsewhere, such as the summer and winter schools in methods and techniques organised by the European Consortium of Political Research (ECPR). The Committee encourages the Institute to review, in a few years, the decision to leave the national research school and examine whether the Leiden Graduate School is equally well-equipped to offer courses and exchange with other PhD candidates as

it would be if it were still part of the NIG. If not, management should consider returning to the national research school or find ways to offer education, training, and engagement with other PhD candidates.

8. Conclusion

The Institute of Political Science at Leiden University is a world-renowned, internationally recognised Programme. Its strengths are many and include a strong publication record as well as the high reputation of its research staff. It has done well in an environment of diminishing internal funds by, for instance, securing more external funds and appointing the 'best and the brightest' junior research staff. In terms of the challenges, the Committee encourages the Institute to review its strategy of having one overarching theme for the entire Institute. The Committee realises that the Institute has been given a variety of recommendations during the past two external reviews, but in an increasingly competitive environment for external funds, a reassessment may be appropriate.

In terms of encouraging publications, the Committee commends the Institute's policy of offering incentives to target quality over quantity. Yet in due course the Institute may want to review its egalitarian policy with a view to ensuring that the Institute as a whole obtains the best level of research (both funding and publications).

The Committee also encourages the Institute to examine whether a more formal strategy can be devised to ensure better societal engagement and to encourage a particular quality and quantity of societal relevance with a view to reflecting on what types of engagement the Institute might find most attractive and strategic.

The strategy for the future indicates the concerns held among research staff about resources. The Committee agrees that the Institute and Programme management need to review regularly whether the strategies still are adequate in light of ongoing limitations in resourcing. Maintaining one or more directly funded PhD positions should be continued.

4. Research review University of Amsterdam

Programme: Transnational Governance, Political Economy and Democracy
Programme leaders: Prof. Brian Burgoon, Prof. Wouter van der Brug, Prof. John Grin
Research staff 2012: 17.5 FTE tenured, 39.7 total FTE

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

1A. The Institute

At the University of Amsterdam (UvA) Political Science research is conducted within the institutional infrastructure of the Amsterdam Institute for Social Science Research (AISSR), which was founded at the beginning of 2010 and is the largest social sciences research Institute in the Netherlands. The AISSR is one of four research Institutes within the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences (FMG) and spans three Departments (Human Geography, Planning & International Development; Political Science; Sociology & Anthropology) and four disciplines.

The AISSR hosts a total of twelve bottom-up research clusters or ‘Programme groups’, which are the primary units in which academic staff carry out their research and teaching. Three of these groups conduct Political Science research and together constitute the research Programme ‘Transnational Governance, Political Economy and Democracy’. Additionally, the Institute encompasses five Multidisciplinary Centres (i.e. Urban Studies, Global Health, Inequality Studies, Migration & Ethnic Studies, Gender & Sexuality), which foster activities across Programme boundaries and are organised around university-wide Research Priority Areas and Faculty research focus points.

The mission of AISSR is ‘to create an academic environment that enables researchers to conduct cutting-edge and socially relevant research’. According to the self-evaluation report, the Institute is committed to ‘theoretically informed empirical research, broad thematic coverage, and multi-method research approaches’.

The Institute has a decentralised structure. AISSR provides the overarching institutional framework, but the directors of the Programme groups are responsible for human resources and research management.

1B. The Programme

The Research Programme Transnational Governance, Political Economy and Democracy is a broad and comprehensive Programme that investigates how ongoing social, economic and political transformations affect governance arrangements at the local, national, European and global levels and houses scholars working across the range of sub-fields in Politics and International Relations.

Its key objectives are to foster and maintain:

- A broad Programme, drawing on and contributing to all sub-fields within Political Science, as well as other relevant disciplines;

- Methodological and epistemological pluralism, leading to cross-fertilisation between theoretical and methodological traditions within and beyond Political Science;
- A broad, high quality and visible publication profile, aimed at highly ranked general and specialised international journals, academic books, edited volumes, and book chapters, as well as publications in Dutch;
- A healthy balance between core funding, research grants and contract research.

The Research Programme is, as said, sub-divided into three Programme groups that cut across traditional sub-disciplines, but together cover the discipline as a whole. These are: (1) Challenges to Democratic Representation, (2) Political Economy and Transnational Governance, (3) Transnational Configurations, Conflict and Governance.

The self-evaluation report stresses the continuous intellectual exchange and cooperation amongst the three Programme groups, which are each led by two senior staff members, but also between the Programme groups and other AISSR departments, and with the VU University Amsterdam. Staff members of the Programme participate (and take leading positions) in several university-wide Research Priority Areas (RPAs) including Communications, Institutions and Inequality, and Urban Studies, and in the new Amsterdam Centre for Contemporary European Studies (ACCESS EUROPE). In the SWOT-analysis, the interdisciplinary profile is described as a strength. Indeed, the Committee noticed that the AISSR has managed to achieve a considerable degree of pluralism by integrating the various disciplines as well as subfields. The Committee noted that there seemed to be a genuine collegial atmosphere and found evidence of interdisciplinary cooperation.

2. Quality and academic reputation

The research Programme Transnational Governance, Political Economy and Democracy is doing well when it comes to the quality of the output and the academic reputation of its scholars. This is clearly a very strong and internationally competitive Programme with some excellent and active faculty members who produce work of high distinction. Within the international Political Science community the Programme enjoys a considerable reputation and some of its staff are regarded as leaders in their sub-fields. The sample publications are uniformly of a very high standard, with several representing major contributions to their fields.

According to the self-evaluation report, the AISSR is the lead partner in several international research consortia. It is the third institution in Europe in terms of the number of ERC grants awarded. Although the Committee was impressed by the calibre and reputation of the Political Science research staff of the AISSR, it noted the relative lack of mid-career scholars who can take up a larger role for grant management and supervising PhD candidates. In recent years many new scholars have been recruited, but the category of mid career scholars seems less well-represented. The ‘unbalanced staff composition’ is also noted in the SWOT analysis as a weakness.

During the visit, a fairly clear idea of the distinctive position of the Programme was set out and areas of particular strength in scholarly terms were apparent. The Programme, for instance, manifestly benefits from the interdisciplinary ethos of the AISSR. A good number of scholars in the Programme are involved in international and national scholarly networks and their standing is recognised through editorships, Committee memberships and awards. Over the six-year review period, there has been a gradual rise in the amount of external research funding that has been won (discussed below). Several staff members have received large, prestigious research grants, have led and participated in major EU projects within the

Sixth Framework Programme (FP6) and Seventh Framework Programme (FP7), and there has also been a spread of medium-sized and smaller awards. During the site visit there was a constant reference to Horizon 2020 (the next generation EU framework grant programming) to which scholars will be applying. It was not clear to the Committee, however, after having read the self-evaluation report and after the site visit, what strategy is being used at either the Institute or the Programme level to ensure success in Horizon 2020 applications.

The self-evaluation report did not contain a formalised publication strategy. During the site visit, staff members mentioned that their Programme is committed to a pluralistic publication strategy, in which the subject of the research and the nature of the written work determine where material is best published. The self-evaluation mentions that the work is generally well-cited, and there has been an increase in the number of publications, with a particular strong upward trend in the number of ISI-ranked journal articles. The relevant table in the self-assessment report indicates a big jump in the research output in terms of the refereed articles published in 2012. Furthermore, the h-indexes of the most highly cited scholars are impressive and are clear indications of the high reputations of some of the Programme's research. Upon completing the interviews and assessing the materials made available to the committee before and during the site visit, the Committee remained unclear about the formal publication strategy.

Notwithstanding these signs of strength, the Programme also faces significant challenges which were touched upon in the self-evaluation report and explored further during the site visit. In particular, staff members expressed concerns about the physical quality of the new research environment, which might undermine morale and jeopardise the hiring staff of international quality. Although a number of impressive international linkages have been developed in recent years these have yet to give rise to significant volumes of external funding – as such, these linkages might be seen as less developed compared to other international institutes of this calibre. The Committee found that although there were many initiatives throughout the large and varied Programme, a strategic understanding of the threats, opportunities and challenges facing this Programme is less apparent than elsewhere. Thus, the Committee encourages the Programme to make more explicit its plans to offset the risks associated with a growing dependence upon competitive funding sources and a fall in direct funding. These issues are discussed further in paragraph 6 ('Strategy for the future').

3. Resources

Over the review period, around half of the total income of the AISSR was derived from external sources; the other half came from the university itself. Annually, the Institute received €12.2 million in core funding from the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, based on past performance (number of completed PhDs and diplomas awarded). As the financial structure of AISSR is decentralised, this first stream funding is allocated to the twelve Programme groups following the same logic. Thus, groups with higher productivity are financially rewarded. This particular set-up seems sensible to the Committee; the Programme groups are in control of a devolved budget and set their own strategic direction. The continuing concern is the apparent overall reduction in research time for research staff.

At the Programme level, the ratio of internal to external funding has gradually shifted over the review period. In 2007, 54% of the research FTE was funded by first stream money and 46% from external sources. In 2012 this ratio was almost the reverse: 52% of the research FTEs was paid for by external funding sources and 48% by core funding from the university. The increase in research grant funding and contract research – and in absolute terms the growth of the total annual research budget – has allowed the growth of FTE in all categories

(tenured/non-tenured/PhD candidates): starting at 29.7 FTE in 2007, it reached a peak of 45.4 FTE in 2011 and then fell back to 39.7 FTE in 2012. These numbers make the Programme the largest one of the four under review. The Faculty's decision to stop directly funded PhD positions has led to a drop in PhD FTEs (from 21.6 to 18.8 FTE) as of 2012. As was mentioned above, the Committee has concerns about the viability of PhD funding going forward. In the self-assessment report the Institute indicates that it shares this concern, in particular the lack of sufficient matching funds when PhD positions are being applied for within research funding applications. The Committee recommends that the Institute revisit its matching fund strategy with a view to ensuring that the applicants remain sufficiently competitive when applying whilst ensuring funding for PhD candidates.

Notably, contract research accounts for a substantial portion of the research budget (21% in 2012). Political Science research at the UvA has received funds from less traditional sources such as HIVOS, Dutch ministries and extra-EU bodies (e.g. the US Department of Defence). All in all, the Programme has brought in almost €17 million in external funding (grants and contract research combined) over the review period. This is an impressive amount of funding for a Political Science Institute over a six-year period and the Institute can be commended for this achievement.

The self-evaluation report points out that finding the funding for academic research has become a growing concern in the Netherlands: structural public support is waning while the competition for research grants is becoming more and more severe. As is evidenced by the above-mentioned figures, the Programme has done quite well so far. According to the self-evaluation report this is mainly because of its involvement in several university-wide RPAs (which secures additional first stream funding), its steady student numbers, and its good track record in bringing in external money. Without external funds the available research time for research staff has been brought down to 27%. Yet, given the success in attracting outside funds, the percentage of staff members' appointment that can be devoted to research could still be kept at 40%. As part of its strategy to increase the earning capacity of individual researchers, the AISSR has invested in developing an infrastructure to assist researchers in their grant applications, which consists of workshops, internal peer review and administrative support. The Committee is concerned that research staff may not have sufficient uninterrupted time to devote to research. Furthermore the recent change to 8-8-4 teaching may or may not facilitate using research time effectively. The Committee encourages the Institute to find ways to ensure that uninterrupted research time can be protected for research staff.

A key element of the personnel strategy described in the self-evaluation report is to invest in 'fostering the academic growth and development of [...] junior colleagues by ensuring reasonable teaching loads, substantial research support, and modest administrative burdens'. During the site visit the Institute management explained that staffing has changed radically over the review period. Out of the current 46 staff members, only 14 were in post before 2007. New hires are mainly early career scholars. During the assessment period, a number of externally funded Chairs have been established. Staff turnover was mentioned as one of the big challenges that the Institute currently faces.

To the Committee, the personnel policy seems fairly clear, with an emphasis on hiring younger scholars, appointing early career researchers and bringing in the occasional senior figure with an established international reputation. The Committee recommends that when new positions open up, the Institute consider hiring a few mid-career scholars from amongst its own junior faculty or from outside to avoid an increasingly lopsided composition of the

team, which can occur if too many of the new hires are predominantly junior. The Committee also notes that the full professor rank is still male dominated (3:1, and all white) and the gender ratio at the lower ranks (where there is 20 female research staff out of a total of 54). The Institute should be mindful of these facts and make an effort to understand why these ratios are out of balance and rectify them when new positions open up.

4. Productivity

In absolute numbers, the output of the Programme Transnational Governance, Political Economy and Democracy is substantial and rising. While in 2007 there was a total of 180.5 publications, in 2012 the total had grown to 280.5 publications. However, when looking at publication averages, and considering the large research staff, the output is somewhat less impressive. In the period 2007-2012, there has been an annual average of 10.8 publications per research FTE excluding PhD candidates (of which 2.5 refereed articles, 0.4 monographs and 4.6 publications for the general public and professional audiences).

Productivity in terms of PhDs per tenured faculty is small (0.4 PhD dissertations per tenured FTE per year). Between 2003 and 2008 there was an influx of 25 internal PhD candidates, an average of four per year. Recently, this number has dropped further: in 2012, only 1 new internal PhD candidate was appointed as a result of financial measures at the Faculty level. Completion rates are high (none of the students have dropped out), but completion times could improve. After four years, only 20% of the students had finished, after five years this was 36%, after six years 68% and after seven years 88% had completed their dissertation. Three students (12%) have not yet finished their research. External scholarship PhD candidates are a minority at the Political Science Department at the UvA. Only five of them entered the PhD Programme between 2003 and 2008. Three of them (60%) had graduated after five years; the other two have not yet completed their research. In recent years (2009-2012) no external scholarship PhD candidates have been admitted.

As part of the productivity strategy, the output of individual researchers was discussed during the annual appraisal interview. During the site visit, it was mentioned that in the case of underperformers the management's first priority is to get these staff members back on track. As a last resort tenure can be denied or research time can be cut.

Overall, the Committee assesses productivity as very good and considers that some parts of the research programme are excellent by international standards. Furthermore, the growth in the number of articles placed in leading international journals has been significant, from 37 in 2007 to 90 in 2012. The number of book chapters similarly went up from 35 to 55. Whether this is the result of a deliberate strategic decisions was not clear. The shift might well be a reflection of the rejuvenation of the research staff. The Committee further concludes that research performance and productivity are unevenly distributed. In terms of productivity policy the self-evaluation document did not reflect the practices at the Institute level to encourage publications across the board, beyond the mechanism of annual meetings with staff. The Committee understands that there are a series of formal and informal practices that should lead to strong publication output. The Committee recommends that this publication strategy that is sensitive to the wide range of suitable publication outlets of the various subfields, be reviewed at the Programme level so that it further encourages research staff to publish at a quality and quantity appropriate for their research.

5. Societal relevance

The self-evaluation report states that the research of the AISSR regularly generates new policy initiatives and public debate on topical issues such as health care, urbanisation, migration,

citizenship, inequality, environmental sustainability and transnational governance. Political Science research at the UvA, meanwhile, is described as intrinsically relevant because of its focus on major problems in contemporary political life. This is said to influence positively funding possibilities, e.g. within the EU's Horizon 2020 agenda. The report furthermore states that research results are disseminated widely. Staff members interact with public officials and societal stakeholders by way of their membership of Committees/advisory councils/NGOs, write commissioned reports (on issues like extremism, political trust, social cohesion, smart borders and privacy protection) and make regular appearances in the (inter)national media.

During the site visit the Committee did not get the impression that there is a particular formalised strategy in place to promote societal relevance, although there is some pressure on staff members to disseminate their findings. Outreach is thought to come more naturally to some scholars than to others.

The Committee acknowledges that there has been a steady output of professional publications and publications for the general public (an average of 2.4 publications per research FTE for the two categories combined – which is higher than elsewhere). The research Programme is involved in some contract research (although acquiring contract research is described as difficult because of high overheads charged by the UvA) and, indeed, emphasis is placed on the need to disseminate findings to key stakeholders, and non-specialist audiences. The policy on other forms of societal relevance was less clear to the Committee. While the Programme has cultivated a fairly extensive set of contacts with societal stakeholders, this kind of outreach appears to be the result of serendipity rather than strategy, and it was unclear what kind of support is available for these activities and what emphasis is placed upon them at the level of individual staff research performance.

6. Strategy for the future

Although aware of the difficulties of the current funding climate, the report is optimistic about the Programme's viability. It considers the existing funding strategy and earning capacity, the recruitment strategy and personnel policy, and the research infrastructure as suited to facing the challenges of the future. The Committee noted that the Chair in Political Theory was vacant for some period but has now been filled.

Although the Committee feels that the overall vision of the Institute is fairly clearly set out, as is the underlying ethos upon which it rests, it was less assured of the reticent strategic approach to the Programme's viability. A key concern is that it is not altogether clear how the Programme's vision will withstand the pressures generated by growing international competition and the imperative to secure a larger portion of external research and contract funding to support a very large number of staff. It seems that some Programme groups might be in a better position to attract external funds than others. And in this respect, the self-evaluation report is somewhat vague.

And yet several factors suggest that the Programme already faces considerable challenges. The SWOT-analysis, for instance, mentions a series of institutional problems and issues (such as an increasing teaching load; the managerial culture and structures of the university) that are identified as possible causes of staff turnover. During the site visit, staff members mentioned such issues as the physical quality of the new research environment, where all permanent staff, including full professors, will have to share offices. Though the environment itself will be of a high quality, it is anticipated that the move to two-person shared offices will make it

more difficult to continue to recruit faculty of international quality. The documentation does not seem to indicate that having the office space reduced was a planned vision.

Also, it is notable that the rise in externally secured funding achieved in 2011 has not been matched in 2012. This suggests that acquiring enough external funding to keep up staff levels might be problematic in the future. Although the Programme is participating in international networks, this participation has yet to be cashed out in terms of research funding streams. The prospect of Horizon 2020 bids through the new ACCESS EUROPE with the VU was raised during the site visit, but perhaps too much emphasis was placed upon this particular funding source. Lastly, the Committee finds it regrettable that, although fluctuating during the period, that the number of PhD positions has dropped towards the end of the review period. The Committee wonders whether the recent decline could be a result of abandoning directly funded PhD research.

The Committee acknowledges that these issues are being reflected upon by senior figures within the Programme, but a more focused strategic understanding and clearer plans in relation to new threats and pressures would be welcome.

7. PhD-training and supervision

The AISSR currently hosts a total of 142 PhD candidates, who are embedded both in the Programme groups in which they conduct their research and in the Institute itself. Amongst them are internal, salaried candidates funded from second and third stream money (and some from earlier contracts with first stream funds) and external PhDs who work on a scholarship or are employed elsewhere. About half of the PhD candidates are non-Dutch. PhD candidates usually have a three or four-year appointment in which their primary task is to work on their doctoral thesis (80%). The PhD candidates with whom the Committee spoke applauded the vibrant, inspiring, interdisciplinary PhD community which they are part of at the AISSR.

PhD candidates at the AISSR have the option to complete a PhD thesis on the basis of a minimum of four research articles (at least one of which has to be single-authored), but can also opt to write a monograph. During the site visit, it was mentioned that PhD candidates are stimulated to write their thesis in the form of articles in order to be competitive on the labour market.

Apart from conducting research, PhD candidates are also expected to participate in a training Programme. The PhD candidates of the Political Science Department do not participate in the training programme offered by the national research school NIG because the AISSR and the Graduate School of Social Sciences (GSSS) jointly offer an alternative training programme. Procedures regarding supervision and training at AISSR are formalised in the AISSR PhD guide, which is well developed and offers useful information to the PhD candidates. During the site visit, PhD candidates appeared quite pleased with this Programme, which consists of (at least) a theory course, methods courses, customised courses and transferable skills courses. In consultation with their supervisor PhD candidates design a training plan, which is part of the PhD Trajectory Plan. This Trajectory Plan acts as a mutual agreement between the PhD candidate, his/her supervision team, the AISSR management and the GSSS, and is signed by all parties involved. Besides agreements on the training Programme to be followed by the candidate, the Trajectory Plan also contains arrangements concerning the composition of the supervision team, a definition of the research problem, a completion schedule, a publication plan and a plan for conference attendance. The plan is discussed/updated annually.

The PhD supervisor and daily supervisor are the PhD candidates' primary coaches. Additionally, other members of the supervision team and the AISSR itself play a role in the monitoring of PhDs. In the 9th month of their appointment the supervision team issues a formal go/no go decision, which it bases on the 8-month paper handed in by the candidate. In the case of a no go-decision the contract of the PhD candidate in question is terminated. After successfully passing this first evaluation, PhD candidates are evaluated annually.

Internal PhD candidates are also expected to teach undergraduate social sciences courses; for Political Science PhD candidates this usually amounts to roughly 10% of their appointment. The organisation of teaching duties is discussed with the supervisor and recorded in the PhD Trajectory Plan. Students who teach courses are offered a three-day didactic course.

PhD representatives advise AISSR and GSSS management on PhD-related issues. Each of the twelve Programme groups within AISSR selects one PhD representative. Furthermore, the AISSR hosts several PhD clubs, which offer the participating PhDs an environment in which to give and receive feedback on research, ideas and papers from a peer group rather than the supervision team.

The career perspectives of PhD candidates are not discussed in the self-evaluation report. During the site visit, the PhD candidates mentioned that labour market preparation is not included in the training Programme. Implementing some sort of bridging period after the end of the PhD contract would, they indicated, be very helpful and welcome. The Committee encourages the Institute to examine ways to provide PhD candidates with more professional development opportunities for when they are almost ready to graduate and to facilitate mediating the transition from graduating to graduate (and thus seeking employment).

8. Conclusion

The AISSR, and in particular the division of Political Science of the AISSR at the University of Amsterdam, has an excellent international reputation. Its strengths are many and include strong individual performers (for instance as demonstrated by very high h-values (20 or more) of individual professors). It has been successful in acquiring external funds in an environment where base funding is falling. The recently hired junior scholars have been successful hires in the sense that they are all active researchers. In terms of the key challenges it faces the Committee encourages the Institute to review its generalist approach. It is commendable that the AISSR seeks to be a broad based Institute, but it would be worth re-assessing this strategy in light of the imperative to win research funding. Finally, as mentioned above, in terms of hiring, the Institute should contemplate the composition of its research team when making decisions about hiring so that it has a greater spread of staff in terms of rank, gender and ethnicity.

In terms of publication strategy at the Institute or Programme level, the Committee advises to consider ways to encourage publications, as the Committee was unsure whether the current formal and informal policy is the most effective. Compared to the best performing Programmes and Institutes reviewed here, AISSR's publication per FTE ratio seems slightly lower.

The Committee also encourages the Institute to examine whether a more formal or explicit strategy can be devised to ensure societal engagement and to stimulate a particular quality and quantity of societal relevance with a view to reflecting on what types of engagement the AISSR might find most attractive and strategic.

The SWOT analysis indicates that there are serious concerns among research staff about resources. One major point of concern is the move to a new building that does not have enough space for current faculty. The Committee agrees that this is a point of major concern and could lead to recruitment and retention issues.

The strategy for obtaining external funding that was developed in the recent past has paid off. The Committee notes that, should there at some point be a lull in funding, the management might want to have a more transparent and explicitly stated expression of its publication strategy. As for PhD candidates, the lack of direct funding is a point of concern. The Committee would want to encourage the Faculty level to consider providing internal direct funds to a minimum of one PhD candidate per year. As far as external funding is concerned, although the concerns of the research staff are understandable, the Committee would suggest that there be some kind of matching funding to ensure that the PhD system can remain intact, whilst keeping applications competitive in international competitions. It is a concern that PhD candidate numbers have fluctuated over the period. It is hoped that a steady state can be found in the near future and that there not be a decline in the number of PhD candidates.

5. Research review University of Twente

Programme: Innovation of Governance
Programme leaders: Prof. Kees Aarts and Prof. Bas Denters
Research staff 2012: 5.6 FTE tenured, 15.9 total FTE

Assessments: Quality: 4
 Productivity: 4
 Relevance: 5
 Viability: 3.5

1A. The Institute

The Institute for Innovation and Governance Studies (IGS) was established in 2002. Out of the four ‘priority research Institutes’ of the University of Twente, it is the only one predominantly focused on social and behavioural sciences. IGS is a collaboration of fourteen departments from three Schools (Management and Governance, Behavioural Sciences, and Engineering Technology). Its 400 researchers undertake multidisciplinary research in the field of governance and management of technological and social innovation. Issues of coordination, steering and the operation of (networks of) institutions in both public and private sectors are addressed from a multi-level, multi-actor systems perspective. According to the self-evaluation report, IGS aims to combine scientific excellence with relevance to its stakeholders in the public and private sector. Within the IGS, technical, social and behavioural sciences work jointly on resolving the grand societal challenges facing European societies.

IGS is headed by a Scientific Director. Like the other priority research Institutes, it does not employ research staff itself but rather redistributes, in cooperation with the Deans of the Schools, direct research funding over the affiliated Programmes. For this purpose, the Institutes have formulated ‘strategic research orientations’ that aim at combining focus, quality and mass. The self-evaluation report states that the IGS research Programmes and strategies are discussed within its Programme Council and Institute Council, with the Board of the university, and with Board, Deans and the other Scientific Directors of Institutes jointly.

1B. The Programme

The Innovation of Governance Programme was established in 2001 as one of the research Programmes of IGS. Although staffed by researchers from various departmental backgrounds, this review only considers those staff members who are affiliated with the Department of Public Administration, more specifically with the Chairs of Political Science, Institutional Public Administration, Sociology of Public Governance, and Law of the EU and other International Organisations. Their work focuses on changes in the relationships between citizens and their government and thereby addresses two main questions:

1. How do the institutional structure and the decision-making processes in systems of public governance affect innovations of governance?
2. What is the effect of such innovations on the extent to which systems of public governance meet standards of legitimacy on the one hand and effectiveness and efficiency on the other, and how can we explain such effects?

The Programme uses a multilevel approach, which entails that it answers its main research questions at different levels of political decision-making: at the national level, but also at the

subnational tiers (municipalities and regional governments) and at the supranational level of the EU. Researchers focus on (a) the interactions between governments, (semi-)public agencies and individuals and (b) relations between different tiers of government.

The objectives of the Innovation of Governance Programme are threefold. First, it aims at describing, explaining and evaluating the shift from traditional to new forms of government in modern societies. Second, the Programme intends to apply this knowledge in practice-oriented activities, notably valorisation and knowledge dissemination, thereby contributing to the innovative capacity of public sector organisations and to the legitimacy and effectiveness of democratic governance. Third, the Programme strives to provide a stimulating environment in which to train the next generation of governance researchers.

During the site visit, the Committee spoke with Institute and Programme representatives about the specific conditions that exist within an environment that is as multidisciplinary as the IGS. The dominant presence of the technical disciplines at IGS and UT itself was described as ‘difficult’, mainly because of the fact that the comparatively generous funding climate of the technical sciences is taken as the norm, even though the Political Science research staff find it much harder to secure funding for their research and there is not the same amount of base funding made available to Political Science. At the same time, however, the integration of social science and technical departments is also seen as ‘unique’ and therefore as an opportunity. Staff members praised UT as an ‘entrepreneurial university’ and also pointed out the Programme’s strong reputation in quantitative methods and applied research as reasons to come to Twente.

2. Quality and academic reputation

In the opinion of the Committee, the University of Twente’s ‘Innovation of Governance’ Programme has successfully maintained an overall high quality of research over the last six years. It holds a strong, nationally and internationally visible and recognised position in its traditional core fields (electoral politics, political representation, political attitudes and political participation, public administration, and local government). In these domains, the Programme’s research can be ranked among the leading research groups in Europe. The group is involved in, and is often a leader of, several regional, national and international Programmes of cross-sectional and longitudinal comparative research. National and regional examples are the KISS Institute, the Data Infrastructure for the Social Science (DISS), and the SHARE-MESS project. Internationally the projects include the Connex project, the Local Councillors in Europe, the HILL project, the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems, and the European Social Survey.

The international standing of the Programme is mirrored in the academic reputation of its leading figures and in several indicators of high scientific performance. Some of the staff involved in the Programme are highly visible in national and international research and well integrated into the respective communities. This is indicated by the h-indices of the leading representatives of the Programme (h-indices of about 15) and by the positions held by staff members in some of the organisations of the national and international scientific community (particularly in editorial boards of highly visible academic journals). Members of the staff have also published in top tier journals in their fields and with prestigious publishers.

The Committee finds that, from a Political Science perspective, the Programme covers highly relevant research topics, as it focuses on various aspects of the interaction of citizens and political elite/political institutions at the European, national and subnational tiers of government. Particular emphasis is given to the changing structures of governance, with

particular attention paid to: (1) the transition from hierarchical to horizontally (network) structured modes of governing, (2) governing social and technological innovations and (3) the impact these changes have on the legitimacy, effectiveness and efficiency of the political system. From a firmly established position in academia, the Institute, as well as the Programme, have successfully managed to broaden their research profile by recruiting staff complementing the existing fields of expertise (e.g. in local government and regional governance).

The Programme is ambitious in its theoretical as well as its methodological profile. Core elements of the research profile can be characterised as multi-disciplinary, problem-oriented and comparative. The use of 'rigorous' quantitative and qualitative methods of empirical research serves as a common frame for researchers representing a variety of academic disciplines. Thus, the creation of a 'Datalab', intended to promote standards of excellence in data collection, analysis and storage/archiving, was an important step in strengthening the capacity for empirical research. Perhaps one downside is that the thematic focus seems more like a patchwork rather than engaging consistently with 'innovative governance'. It appears to be not very theoretically developed; staff members could possibly engage more with the literature in this field and thereby find a unifying theme amongst themselves. When the Committee prompted the interview partners on this matter, they agreed that they are using the thematic more as an umbrella term than as a means of unifying. The Committee feels that some more effort could be put into ensuring a commonality of focus for the group. By making a more conceptual contribution to the literature on 'Innovation of Governance' the lead scholars will also most likely increase their standing in the field.

3. Resources

Over the review period, the ratio of direct funding to research grants and contract research has fluctuated somewhat. A general trend is that the percentage of direct or first stream funding has gone down (in 2007 85% of staff was paid from direct university funding; in 2012 this was 58%), while the share of external funding, most notably third stream funds obtained from external organisations, such as industry, governmental ministries, the European Commission and charity organisations has increased, especially over the second half of the review period (2010-2012). The self-evaluation report mentions that the total turnover of external funding during the evaluation period (including projects that started before 2007) amounts to 7.3 million euro. The total sum of funding acquired during the evaluation period (2007-12) amounts to 5.1 million euro. This is a considerable amount, especially given the relatively small size of the Institute. The Committee commends the Institute for having been able to capitalise on its unique position as a Political Science department in a Technical University by engaging in these kinds of funded research activities with societal relevance.

Although the share of direct university funding has gone down over the last decade at present the Twente Programme still heavily depends on first stream funds, which are based mainly on the number of diplomas awarded. According to the self-evaluation report, it is likely that teaching-related sources of income will decrease further in the near future. The recent discontinuation of the two-year research master's Programme, which was jointly offered by the Innovation of Governance Programme and the Programme in Educational Technology, is potentially worrying. The decrease of direct funds as a result of the low inflow of students means that the Programme will become more and more reliant on external funds. According to the self-evaluation report, the Programme is well positioned to increase its external revenues in the future. The Programme is multidisciplinary and has considerable experience in international collaborations and a prominent position in (inter)national networks. Furthermore, it has invested in maintaining good relations with external partners. This should

increase its chances of success in bringing in competitive funding. The Committee concludes that external funds mobilised by staff are relatively high and have increased over the years in review. Yet, the Committee notes the fall in direct University funding and fears that there may be years in which research staff is less successful in attracting external funds, or might wish to do research that is less likely to obtain external funding. It is hoped that the University will have enough foresight to provide the Twente Political Science research staff with sufficient funding to continue its research mission.

Total staff numbers have been more or less stable over the review period. Tenured research capacity was about 5.5 FTE on average, while non-tenured research capacity (new assistant professors and postdoctoral researchers) first rose to 4.1 FTE in 2009, and thereafter declined to 2.1 FTE in 2012, since some non-tenured staff members received tenure while others left the University of Twente. The number of research FTE of PhD candidates was relatively low throughout the evaluation period, but slightly increased in more recent years (5.9 FTE in 2007, 8.3 FTE in 2012). For a vibrant PhD Programme, maintaining a certain size is advisable. Thus this upward trend since 2007 is a positive development for the PhD candidates' experience in the Programme.

When describing its recruitment policy, the Institute mentions that it has over the years managed to maintain a balance between the broad aims of the Programme and the selectivity needed to make this work with a research group of limited size. The Committee welcomes the strategy to recruit new staff that complements the Programme's core competencies (e.g. in local government and regional governance).

The composition of the staff has changed quite a bit during the period under review. Several staff members left the University of Twente (because of retirement or because they accepted a position elsewhere), while several others joined the group. The composition of the research group is said to be international. Vacancies are advertised internationally, and the lingua franca during meetings, seminars and lunches is English. The international composition of the unit is commendable (including a variety of international PhD candidates). Although the group is quite international, the Committee did note that a gender imbalance still perseveres (which is perhaps more typical at a technical university, but nevertheless should be given attention): the Full Professor rank is still male dominated (4:1), as is the rank of Associate Professor (which is held by two male staff members). The picture at the rank of Assistant Professor is however more balanced: of the seven people at this rank four are women; three are men. So although the overall gender imbalance is still present in the higher ranks, the Assistant Professors are balanced out. The Committee wanted to point out that having only two Associate Professors is an unfortunate situation, as those appointed at this middle rank typically perform an important role in grant writing and supervision. The Institute should be mindful of these imbalances and make an effort to understand why these ratios are out of balance and rectify them where possible when new positions open up.

As was mentioned above, IGS does not employ research staff itself. In the School of Management and Governance, the Dean, the Scientific Director of IGS and the Department Chairs allocate the research, teaching and management time for each individual staff member in the department on an annual basis. This allocation is said to reflect largely the existing pattern of activities of staff members. Each Chair and department is expected to acquire external funding for their research activities; staff members with more than the minimum research time (which is 0.2 FTE) are thus expected to find external funding for their research. The average research time per FTE tenured staff was 0.34; for non-tenured staff 0.39; and for PhD candidates 0.67. During the site visit the Committee learnt that the allocation of research

time seems to be a mix of individual allocation by the Programme manager. It is based on seniority and whether staff in question has acquired research funding. Juniors are permitted to teach courses that can benefit their research. In the opinion of the Committee, research time could be allocated in a way that is more transparent. Clearly an ideal system permits everyone sufficient time to conduct research but also facilitates high performers to have more time for research whereas low performers might be given additional teaching duties or/and administrative responsibilities.

After speaking to the staff of the Programme, the Committee concludes that a recently introduced, university-wide teaching model is imposing a high workload on staff members who need to balance the time they invest in learning a new approach to teaching with the requirements of high quality research. Due to the small size of the staff, this can prove difficult. As demonstrated during the interviews, Programme leaders and staff have taken up most of these challenges. Measures to cope with them are currently being developed, including ensuring that each staff member has one quartile free of teaching. In the international context it is indeed important that each staff member has a 'teaching free' block; this is especially important given that the Netherlands does not have the tradition of a sabbatical (or study) leave. A small sized unit, like this one, is particularly sensitive to structural changes of this type. The committee encourages the University to offer support so that the Institute can maintain a high level of productivity in basic and applied research.

4. Productivity

The output of the Programme Innovation of Governance shows continuity over the review period, especially when refereed articles are considered. In the period 2007-2012, there has been an annual average of 8.7 publications per research FTE (of which 3.3 refereed articles, 0.3 monographs and 0.8 publications for the general public and professional audiences). Compared to other Institutes reviewed, Twente does not perform quite as well in the numerical sense; but the quality of the publications that were listed are strong and emphasis has been placed on the publication of articles.

Productivity in terms of PhD defences is relatively low. Between 2003 and 2008, there was an influx of nine internal PhD candidates, an average of 1.5 per year, although in some years (2006-2007) there was no enrolment at all. After four years, only 22% of the students had finished, after five years this was 56%, and after six years 78% had completed their dissertation. The remaining 22% had discontinued their projects. The completion times of the five external candidates, mostly scholarship students from abroad, who entered the Programme between 2003 and 2008, were a lot shorter. Two of the external PhD candidates (40%) had graduated after four years and after five years they had all finished their dissertations. In order to boost completion rates amongst internal PhD candidates, Programme representatives suggested the idea of introducing an incentive scheme to finish on time, such as a financial compensation for the printing costs of the manuscript. Or there might be some kind of completion grant, in case lack of funding is an impediment to completion.

The Programme turned out a yearly average of 0.3 dissertations per tenured FTE, which is lower than elsewhere. According to the Programme this is caused by the fact that the University of Twente no longer provides direct funding for PhD candidates, whereas acquiring external funding has become increasingly difficult. To remedy this situation, the department has introduced a new revolving fund in which it deposits the government premium (currently 93.000 euros) for every finished PhD. It is not clear exactly how these funds are distributed other than to say that future internal positions will be paid for by this

fund. The Programme also aims to increase the attractiveness and the quality of PhD trajectories for external PhDs – by which it mainly means those academically trained professionals who aspire to do PhD research at a later stage of their professional career. The Programme will try to attract this category of PhD candidates by developing a training Programme geared to their needs. The Programme also expects to benefit from the move of the NIG to Twente. The Committee is supportive of using as much of the government premium as possible for future PhD positions. This seems a good way to offset the fact that there is no longer university funding for PhD candidates.

The productivity strategy of the Programme is to stimulate publications that do justice to the type of data that researchers of the Department collect. This means, for example, the encouragement of the production of edited volumes, which are seen as a good vehicle for presenting the extensive sets of observational data that are gathered within the Programme. In 2011, staff members published a peak number of 10 edited volumes. Typically those who publish edited volumes will also ensure the main message of the research will be disseminated in the form of one or more refereed articles; given the number of refereed articles at the Innovative Governance Programme, it seems that this may well be happening.

5. Societal relevance

The Innovation of Governance Programme clearly values engaged scholarship. Providing a research-based contribution to the prevention, alleviation or solution of urgent social problems and communicating research results to professionals and the general public is a prominent part of the Programme's mission. In the institutional context the Programme is assisted by a communication advisor, who assists with public relations and the communication of research findings to external audiences.

According to the Committee, the high societal relevance of the Programme manifests itself in the research topics, in the high share of commissioned research (for example by the Netherlands Institute for City Innovation Studies, NICIS) and in the dense and encompassing networks between researchers and various fields of political and administrative practice. A large part of the Programme staff's research serves as a potential base of improving the interchange between citizens and governments and of empowering citizens to become active in political life. This is one of the main reasons why a relatively high proportion of all publications consists of professional papers written in the Dutch language. Additionally, several workshops and seminars were held in the period under review in order to maintain a close exchange with practitioners. Staff members have made important contributions to the development of regional and national platforms to be used for productive interactions with stakeholders and activities for the general public (KISS, Academic Workshop Youth Twente, and National Democratic Audit). They hold an impressive number of positions in advisory councils at various levels of government and in the public sector, and have been prominent in the mass media as commentators. For three consecutive years, one of the Programme leaders was second in the competition of most visible staff member of the School of Management and Governance in the media (2010-12).

6. Strategy for the future

While considering the viability of the Programme, the Committee has identified a number of challenges and threats, some of which are also mentioned in the SWOT-analysis in the self-evaluation report. The most notable constraints are the small number of staff from Political Science who are strongly involved in the Programme, the strains resulting from the distinct research environment of a technical university and the challenges of a multi-disciplinary approach, the extremely complex organisational structure of the Programme (particularly

regarding the partial disjunction of resources and responsibilities), the decline of research time and direct funding, and the inability to recruit a sufficient number of highly qualified PhD candidates. These factors impact strongly on the vitality and feasibility of the Programme.

The Committee concludes that both the Programme management and the staff in general have made considerable efforts to cope with these problems. In this respect, the self-evaluation points at the promising new hires and at the multidisciplinary and societally relevant thematic focus, which is thought to put the Programme at an advantage in the increasing competition for external funds. However, the Committee finds that a clear and encompassing strategy for the future development of the Programme is not yet as visible as would be desirable. That applies particularly to the recruitment of PhD candidates.

Furthermore, the Committee formed the view that the concept of governance as well as that of innovation may be clearly developed by some but not shared by all the participating members of staff. Therefore, governance and innovation rather seem catch-all terms under which a number of more or less autonomous research activities can be subsumed, rather than unifying concepts guiding common research. Actually, the patterns of cooperation between Social Science and Technical Disciplines within the Programme seem to be additive rather than integrated, that is they seem to be working along-side one another rather than more fully integrated. Although the contours of an inter- or multi-disciplinary, problem oriented approach are visible in several domains of research (Safety and Security, Health, political participation and 'new media'), this is not yet a well-elaborated, consistent characteristic of the Programme as a whole.

7. PhD-training and supervision

Since the discontinuation of the two-year research master's programme in 2010-2011, the Innovation of Governance Programme no longer serves as a training-ground for future PhD candidates. According to the self-evaluation report, the Programme currently considers participating in the existing two-year master's Programme Research in Public Administration and Organisational Science, which is based in Utrecht. In the meantime, the TGS Programme offers an extra-curricular research honours Programme to excellent UT master's students who have demonstrated research affinity. Requirements for PhD candidates entering the Programme are not discussed in the self-evaluation report.

PhD candidates of the Innovation of Governance Programme receive most of their training at the KNAW accredited Dutch-Flemish graduate school for Political Science and Public Administration: the Netherlands Institute of Government (NIG). Currently, the Twente Department of Public Administration hosts the directorate of this rotating Institute, which was co-founded by the University of Twente in 1993. As of 2012, the training of the PhD candidates has become the formal responsibility of the Twente Graduate School (TGS), which offers skills courses. PhD candidates also continue to participate in the educational Programme of the NIG, whose curriculum consists of a combination of courses and tutorials. The courses provide the common core of the curriculum and are offered in the form of four seminars and two weeks with short courses on skills. Tutorials are tailor-made modules that PhD candidates take with senior NIG staff or other qualified researchers. The goal of the NIG curriculum is to train PhD candidates to become researchers with a broad knowledge of the various research traditions in Public Administration and Political Science. This relates both to the development and use of theories as well as the ability to conduct empirical research. In addition, the curriculum contains an applied component with a focus on various skills, such as problem definition, research methods and strategies to get one's work published. Participation in these training schools is an excellent way for PhD candidates to be

trained. During the Committee's site visits and interviews with the PhD candidates, it became apparent that they were receiving adequate training and were overall satisfied with their received educational programme.

The design principle of the Innovation of Governance PhD Programme is described as the 'master-apprenticeship idea'. Thesis supervision is conducted in supervisory teams, comprising at a minimum the main supervisor (a Full Professor) and a second supervisor (usually an Associate or Assistant Professor). The supervision team meets with the student at least on a monthly basis, but the student is supposed to have more frequent contacts with the second supervisor, who also plays a role in coaching the student concerning his/her long-term career perspective. During the site visit, it was stated that IGS has an active policy of involving both internal and external PhD candidates in its activities. The PhD candidates that the Committee spoke to mentioned that there is ample opportunity to present and discuss their research with fellow PhD candidates, even though the PhD community is small. PhD candidates are also given the opportunity to teach. Teaching duties constitute a maximum of 10% of their appointment. Again, PhD candidates benefit greatly from teaching opportunities. It is commendable that the Institute makes every effort for PhD candidates to be involved in undergraduate teaching (provided it indeed does not exceed their maximum – measured over the duration of their Programme).

At the beginning of a PhD trajectory a training and supervision plan (TSP) is drafted, which contains the training and supervision rights and duties of both the PhD candidate and his/her supervisors. This TSP is submitted to the NIG, and NIG approval is required for a PhD candidate's admission. The Netherlands Institute of Government also actively stimulates best practices in PhD supervision. Its PhD Council annually confers the NIG Best PhD Supervisor Award. During the period under review (2009) one of Twente's Programme leaders was honoured with this award.

Dissertations can consist of a collection of articles, but candidates are also allowed to produce a monograph. As has been seen from other Programmes, choosing either option has various pros and cons. It is important that current day PhD students have some choice in the matter.

8. Conclusion

The Committee feels that specific conditions and constraints must be considered when evaluating the Twente Programme; Political Science at the UT forms just a small part of the much broader School of Management and Governance, which does not cover all core subfields of Political Science. For example, normative political theory, peace and conflict studies, and political communication are beyond the direct scope of the Programme. The research Programme is a multi- or even pluri-disciplinary endeavour, integrating the theories and substantial interests of Political Science, Administrative Science, Sociology, Economics, Law and some Technical Sciences in a way that not only brings different disciplines together to tackle the issue of innovation from various perspectives, it also leaves room for particular disciplinary research questions. Such a pluri-disciplinary approach (where no discipline is dominating others or research is carried out beyond the traditions of established academic disciplines) is unusual. The Committee also notes that Political Scientists at Twente University tend to be well integrated in national and international scientific communities. This holds the promise of finding niches for inter- or pluri-disciplinary research at the intersection of Political Science and other disciplines that cannot be filled similarly well by 'standard' Political Science Programmes.

However, this focus also has some downsides. First of all, the Committee formed the impression that integrating the various perspectives was not easy and could be time-consuming. Staff is working in the environment of a Technical University with a particular research culture that has an impact, among others, on the practices of affiliated PhD candidates; for example some PhD candidates' research fits well into a larger project and can be seen as quite 'applied'. Furthermore, in order to be appropriately integrated in the Political Science Community, there is a need to engage with core Political Science topics. Focusing too much on research in niches or on applied research creates the danger of becoming marginalised in the Political Science community. A further constraint is that, after the retirement of one of its leading senior scholars, the Programme is obviously in transition. New leadership structures were established in the period under scrutiny here and new colleagues, some of them representing disciplines hitherto not integrated in the Programme, were recruited. A new teaching model recently introduced at Twente University is imposing a high workload on staff. It is not just the reduction of research time, but also the challenges induced by a new, time-consuming style of teaching that need to be balanced with the requirements of high-quality research. This is particularly difficult due to the small size of the staff. As demonstrated during the interviews, Programme leaders and staff have taken up most of these challenges and measures to cope with them are currently being worked out. Even so, the Committee wishes to stress that support from the University at large is crucial for their efforts to succeed. Finally, when examining the publications over the six year window, it appears that the Institute has done well in terms of articles in refereed journals but less so in terms of publications overall. The Institute should seek ways to keep that number of publications in refereed articles high and to ensure that the publications have impact so that the h-indices of staff members will continue to rise.

6. Research review VU University Amsterdam

Programme:	Multi-layered Governance in Europe and Beyond		
Programme leader:	Prof. Kees van Kersbergen (up to 2010), Henk Overbeek (as of 2010)		
Research staff 2012:	3.9 FTE tenured, 13.2 total FTE		
Assessments:	Quality:	4.5	
	Productivity:	4.5	
	Relevance:	4.5	
	Viability:	4.5	

1A. The Institute

The Faculty of Social Sciences (FSS) of VU University Amsterdam accommodates six disciplines (Communication Science, Organisation Sciences, Philanthropic Studies, Political Science and Public Administration, Social and Cultural Anthropology, Sociology), which are organised in six different departments, each with its own research Programme. The Political Science research Programme is entitled Multi-Layered Governance in Europe and Beyond (MLG).

The departmental merger of Political Science and Public Administration is a recent development (2013); during the review period separate departments still existed. While the departmental merger was designed to stimulate further research collaboration, for substantial and practical reasons the separate Political Science and Public Administration research Programmes still run alongside each other. The Committee is unable to offer a full assessment about how Political Science may fare in the new merged department. In the current assessment the Committee looks to the past (2007-2012) and where applicable examines the prospect for quality assurance for Political Science only.

FSS researchers participate in six Inter-Faculty Research Institutes created by VU University to increase the value, impact, and originality of research. Staff of the research Programme on Multi-Layered Governance are also involved in (1) the Amsterdam Global Change Institute (AGCI) and (2) the Talma Institute for the Study of Work, Care and Welfare. The FSS is also the VU lead Faculty in the joint VU-UvA Amsterdam Centre for Contemporary European Studies (ACCESS EUROPE) that has started in 2013, with the MLG-research Programme as the FSS Programme that is most intensely involved. The Department of Political Science and Public Administration furthermore maintains relationships with two VU departments outside of the FSS (i.e. Department of Environmental Policy Analysis, Department of Transnational Legal Studies).

1B. The Programme

The research Programme Multi-Layered Governance in Europe and Beyond deploys the concept of multi-layered governance to capture the crucial interconnections between domestic and global political dynamics. The primary objective of the Programme is to conduct high quality research on how contemporary politics operates across different levels and arenas of governance.

The three overarching research questions in existence during the review period focused on how the 'New Europe's' emerging system of multi-layered governance operates in terms of its (1) origins, (2) conceptualisation and (3) effects. In the run-up to the 2014 research review

there has been a change of focus. In order to reflect the shifting research interests of the Programme staff, the overarching questions have been redefined in terms of scope, institutions and agency. The new research questions also relate to a number of cross-cutting topics like European integration, political parties, elite networks, and environmental, welfare and security politics.

The Programme's staff is organised around two core chairs – Political Science and International Relations – with the strategic research chair in Multilevel Governance serving as a bridge. This basic structure has remained intact after the merger of the Political Science Department with the Department of Public Administration.

2. Quality and academic reputation

The Committee considers Multi-Layered Governance in Europe and Beyond a very strong, clearly internationally-oriented Programme that has great attractivity. The research itself is very solid, the best of it is clearly and consistently of an internationally excellent quality, as is evidenced by the sample publications, and the overall reputation of departmental members documented in the self-evaluation report. Moreover, an impressive proportion of faculty and Programme members publish in leading English language journals and with top university and other presses, and they acquire very high levels of citations for their work (and have done so over an extended period of time) as is witnessed by the high values of h-indices for scholars in the department. There is an impressive evenness of research performance across the Programme in that research faculty all appear to be active. Most of them are more active than one would typically expect.

During the review period, several staff members have acquired research grants, including a prestigious European Research Council (ERC) Advanced Grant (2009). Individually, they have all been involved in international research networks and professional organisations such as the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR). The indicators of academic esteem mentioned in the self-evaluation report also include prizes and awards, memberships of academic bodies, invited guest lectures and keynote speeches, and editorial positions.

The above is all the more impressive when considering that there recently has been some staff turnover, as well as some high profile retirements. A new generation of Programme contributors has risen to the top or are in the process of taking up the reins of the Programme and it is most encouraging to see continuity in the research strategy of the Programme and a series of new initiatives and developments. The Research Programme is tightly structured and well-led and yet individual research profiles are also strong and distinctive – and the Programme itself is suitably diverse and varied to encourage this without diluting its core focus (for which it is very well known).

Notwithstanding this excellent transition from the very senior to more recently appointed senior scholars for the management of the Programme, the SWOT analysis does point to an ongoing weakness (which the Committee also notes), namely that the excellent senior researchers are predominantly male and that more junior ones still need to acquire more experience. The team of staff is unbalanced in terms of rank, age, gender and also ethnicity. Of the fourteen tenured staff members (as per 1 October 2013) there were three women listed, and one of them only has a 0.25 FTE position. During the site visit the Committee was briefed on the strategies adopted to address the gender imbalance (most of the recent hires have been female) and there are some resources made available specifically to stimulate female talent (for instance if a female PhD candidate wishes to apply for a postdoc she may have her teaching assignment reduced to free up some time).

Whilst the committee saw evidence of a commendable range and number of international partnerships, it noted that, at present, these have yet fully to mature into sources of external research funding, although the participation in two ERC framework programmes (RECON and Neujobs) is a promising sign of things still to come. In this context the Committee also very much welcomed the prospect of Horizon 2020 bids associated with the new ACCESS EUROPE programme with UvA. As such there is a clear strategy to rectify an apparent weakness. The development of a research Programme collaboration with the University of Amsterdam in European Politics is a clear strength in this regard and a development to be encouraged. There are incentive structures in place to encourage research staff to apply for external grants (for example reduction in teaching hours to apply for a grant). These are suitable strategies to encourage grant writing. Another strategy is to ensure there is enough accounting support for those applying for external research funds. It is not clear to the Committee if that support is adequate or not.

Further issues that may affect research quality in the future are the ending of the research master's Programme and the pressure on staff member's research time. These issues will be discussed below.

3. Resources

Over the review period, the ratio of direct funding to research grants and contract research has shifted. The percentage of direct or first stream funding has declined (in 2007, 80% of Programme staff was paid by direct university funding, in 2012 this was just 41%), while the share of external funding has increased, especially in recent years. The percentage of staff funded by research grants has gone up from 20% in 2007 to 40% in 2012, while the percentage funded by contract research similarly increased from 0% in 2007 to 18% in 2012. Overall, the level of funding increased by 24% in the years 2007-2012. This, according to the self-evaluation report, reflects the outcome of two contradictory trends: a reduction by 36% in regular research funding by the university and a sharp increase (of 271%) in research grants and contract research. In 2012, the share of external funding in MLG's budget was larger than within the overall Faculty budget (56% direct funding, 23% research grants, 21% contract research). Although it appears that the Programme has responded very well to the challenges posed by the reduction in direct funding, the Committee worries about the viability of the research mission if this downward trend continues into the next 6-year period. There may well be ebbs and flows in the success to achieve external funding; thus there should be more security (indeed funding) from the central level to the Programmes to support the research mission.

As part of the Programme's strategy to increase its earning capacity, attracting public research grants (NWO, EU) is given the first priority. However, further exploring contract research (and most notably projects commissioned by private and semi-public foundations) is also seen as a promising line to pursue. During the site visit the Committee learnt about new initiatives to engage with companies and organisations that are in the immediate vicinity of the VU University Amsterdam. The Committee felt that this could be a good way to embark on new initiatives for partnerships and funding.

The FSS Board allocates budgets for teaching and research to departments by means of an allocation model based on past performance in teaching (course credits given out in the previous year) and research (research output; completed PhD projects; funding acquired). As of 2010, the standard research time allotted to academic staff was reduced from 40% to 30%. In the near future, there might be a further reduction to 25%. The Faculty also abolished the Faculty Fellowship scheme in which staff could compete for extra research time. To

compensate, the new Department has set up a research stimulation scheme that supports special research initiatives by way of student assistance and editing and by allowing two staff members yearly to be bought out of their teaching obligations for 0.15 FTE. This scheme is primarily funded through taxing externally funded research. It is seen as instrumental towards further increasing the Programme's earning capacity. During the site visits the Committee was informed that the Institute and the Programme levels are keen to try to ensure that all research staff have equal access to research time. The Committee welcomed this attempt to ensure that any reduction in research time is equally shared and to provide a reward for success in securing external grants and contract research. This may well offset a self-identified weakness in the SWOT analysis that points to a limited track record with contract research and private partners.

Total staff numbers have grown over the review period, from 10.6 FTE in 2007 to 13.2 FTE in 2012. This was mostly due to an increase of the non-tenured staff (from 0.5 FTE in 2007 to 1.7 FTE in 2012) and of PhD candidates (from 6.1 FTE in 2007 to 7.6 FTE in 2012). Tenured research capacity went down somewhat, especially in 2011-2012. The self-evaluation report points out that the growth in total staff numbers was realised in spite of the reduction of research time allotted to academic staff. The Committee thinks it is important that the Political Science contingency of the new unit remains strong and shows vibrant numbers. There is a benefit to being a certain size. Thus, it welcomes the expansion of Political Science experienced over the past six years but notes the importance of maintaining a good balance – and developing fruitful research synergies – between Political Science and Public Administration in the newly merged Department.

4. Productivity

The self-evaluation report mentions that over the last decade FSS's research productivity has risen steeply as a result of two policies. First, a minimum standard of (on average) one peer reviewed English language publication per year was set for all staff members. This requirement is directly translated to departmental funding. Second, high-level senior staff have been attracted through temporary ('strategic') appointments. In the review period, these policies have become more targeted on seeking and rewarding talent by setting ambitious criteria for professorship appointments, tenure tracks and (temporary) promotions. Staff members are expected to publish steadily, frequently in high impact outlets, be well-cited, acquire grants, and supervise PhD candidates. As part of its productivity policy, the Faculty reportedly provides coaching schemes for personal grant applications and devotes specific attention to talented female scholars. Research productivity and performance are returning subjects in the annual appraisal of staff members. This strategy seems a solid one that should enable the various research staff to perform well. There also seems to be sufficient support for grant writing and incentives for research staff to prepare grants. In the SWOT analysis the concern is expressed that a current threat is that there is increasing inequality in available research time and that this may lead to divisions among staff. The strategies chosen seem adequate in the short run to offset this threat but would be worth revisiting yearly to ensure that this concern is being addressed.

The output of the MLG Programme shows continuity over the review period. All Programme members publish well above the faculty's publication minimum norm of one international refereed publication per year. In the period 2007-2012, there has been a respectable annual average of 14.8 publications per research FTE excluding PhD candidates (of which 4.8 are refereed articles, 0.3 monographs and 3.9 publications for the general public and professional audiences). In terms of output, 2007 and 2012 were particularly good years, especially for

refereed articles, edited volumes and book chapters. Of the four Programmes reviewed here the MLG Programme had the highest number of refereed article per research FTE.

Productivity in terms of PhD defences is as small as in most of the other Programmes (0.4 PhD dissertations per tenured FTE per year), although this seems mostly due to the fact that external candidates were (almost) absent during the review period. The number and performance of internal candidates, by contrast, is quite good. Between 2003 and 2008, there was an influx of thirteen internal PhD candidates. After four years, only 23% of these candidates had finished, but after five years this had risen to 61%, and after six years 92% had completed their dissertation. The remaining 8% had dropped out. There was no influx of external scholarship candidates between 2003 and 2008.

The Committee concludes that, in terms of simple metrics, the productivity of this Programme is amongst the strongest of those in the review even if not all research staff contribute evenly towards this overall productivity. When considered in terms of quality, the positive assessment of the productivity remains. The levels of citation are extremely strong and, more impressively still, there is clear evidence of excellent publications in international peer-review journals and in monographs with leading university presses from tenured and non-tenured faculty alike, and, indeed, from PhD candidates (whose publications are particularly highly commended).

The Programme's strategy is not explicitly concerned with productivity per se, but with productivity of quality research outputs in leading international journals and with internationally leading presses. In these areas, the Committee feels, there are considerable strengths. Though the research team of the Programme is highly productive, there is no danger of quantity trumping the search for quality. PhD completion rates and publication records are both impressive. It is clear that the VU is producing very strong young scholars who are likely to be highly competitive in the international academic job market. The investment of staff resources, explicated in detail in the self-evaluation report, seems to pay off.

5. Societal relevance

The self-evaluation report does not describe a distinct societal relevance strategy, but it does mention that the FSS supports the application of scientific insights to develop products of direct societal use. Furthermore, the FSS has sponsored chairs (15 in 2012) from various types of societal organisations and acknowledges research with high scientific and societal relevance by presenting awards. FSS is said to have by far the most media exposure across VU University faculties. This achievement is remarkable due to the fact that the VU does not traditionally have the strongest connections to political parties or media.

To testify to the societal relevance of the research Programme, the self-evaluation report lists examples of policy involvement and media appearances of MLG-staff, and of practical devices developed for the general public. A prominent example of the latter is the *Kieskompas*, a voting advice application with high public visibility. Also, it was mentioned during the site visit that there is a recent practice of organising speed dating seminars with profit and non-profit organisations, by which the Programme also tries to prove its relevance to the city of Amsterdam and the immediate vicinity of the VU.

The Committee notes that tenured and non-tenured faculty alike are clearly passionate advocates of the societal relevance of their work who have disseminated their work in a range of contexts to the benefit of an impressive diversity of societal actors and publics. Even so,

more could perhaps be done. At present, knowledge utilisation would – at least from the self-evaluation report – appear to be rather narrowly focussed around TV and other media appearances, apparently initiated in most cases by the media outlet. The site visit, however, revealed a rather more sophisticated and diverse range of strategies for securing appropriate societal relevance. Indeed, the Committee was very impressed by the capacity of the research Programme (despite its theoretical nature) to engage stakeholders and to generate significant levels of societal impact.

Though this is by the Programme's own admission not its core strength, there is in fact an impressive record in recent years of diversifying the income streams of the Programme to generate significant volume of private and/or third sector funding. This is much to be commended.

6. Strategy for the future

The Committee notes that the self-evaluation report underlines the viability of the research Programme by pointing at its consistent publication output and the uptake of its work in academia. The financial base of the Programme is relatively secure because of its stable (BA) and slightly increasing (MSc) student numbers, and its strong record in securing external research grants. Strategic calculations and considerations of organisational effectiveness led to the 2013 merger of the Department of Political Science with that of Public Administration.

As part of its strategy for the future, the Programme plans: to further elaborate on the new overarching research questions around scope, institutions and agency; to specifically target national and EU grant schemes for follow-up grants; to explore possibilities to attract more self-financing PhDs; to pursue collaboration within ACCESS EUROPE; and to establish a VU Centre for Governance Studies, for which the Faculty has already provided a start-up grant. This Centre should function as a platform for strengthening existing collaborations, and also become the locus for offering tailor-made post-graduate executive training to specific audiences as a novel way to increase external income. This initiative makes sense to the Committee as such a strategy would enhance the opportunities for international collaborations and possibilities for research cooperation and winning research grants.

During the site visit, various individuals touched upon recent events whereby there had been difficulties with central administration, changes in policies and the challenges caused by reduction in research funding (see also the threats mentioned in the self-evaluation report). It was felt that the Institute had overcome these difficulties. There is an expectation that these matters with central administration will be resolved.

Amongst the weaknesses and threats to the Programme's viability, which were rather candidly discussed by Programme and Institute Management during the Committee's site visit, is the relatively recent demise of the faculty wide research master's Programme that was considered too broad in focus. The Committee agrees that this is a worrying development that may have an impact on the longer-term capacity of the PhD Programme to nurture home-grown research talent. During the site visit these concerns were almost entirely resolved. The Committee would wish to commend the Programme and department for the moves they have taken (through ACCESS EUROPE) to develop a (still prospective) research master's Programme with the UvA in European Studies. This is a most promising venture.

Another issue that was raised in the report (and rather refreshingly, in the Dutch context) is the concern about the still unbalanced composition of the research team in terms of rank, age and gender. The panel was most impressed by the considerable steps that are already in place

to address these issues. In 2010 a policy to stimulate female talent was implemented and most of the recent hires are women. Other Dutch Programmes could learn from this excellent practice. There was no specific mentioning of widening the spectrum of ethnic backgrounds of research staff, which could be something the Programme could be sensitive to in due course.

The Committee is impressed by the way in which the VU has handled the departure of leading figures and the retirement (or impending retirement) of others. The Committee noted that a new Head of Department will be appointed soon. It is fully confident that the new research leadership of the VU Programme will continue to attain, support and achieve research excellence and to innovate within the context of its developing research on multi-layered governance. It is exciting to see the evolution of the distinctive research on multi-layered governance that has always characterised this Programme as a new generation of VU scholars picks up the baton from those who have done so much to define the field of research over more than a decade in this area. The Programme would appear to be in good hands and has a clear and cogent strategy for its further development. It is both vital and sustainable.

7. PhD-training and supervision

During the review period, PhD candidates were mostly salaried internal candidates. In the near future, the research Programme hopes to attract more external candidates. At MLG these self-financing PhD candidates are said to work under the same conditions as standard PhD candidates, which means that they can make use of the same facilities and training opportunities. The PhD candidates that the Committee spoke to during the site visit indicated that they feel very much part of the Faculty and Department and are given the opportunity to participate in all kinds of Committees. The Committee asked them about their publications and was impressed by the steps already taken on the road to full completion of the PhD. The students seemed confident and happy with the Programme.

The primary responsibility for the professional development of the PhD candidates and the supervision of the PhD process lies with the promoter and daily supervisor. At the start of a new PhD project, the candidate and supervisor(s) agree upon a Training and Guidance Plan that includes elaborated work appointments (including teaching of undergraduate tutorials – not exceeding 5% of the total workload), a detailed work plan for the first year, a detailed training Programme of 30 ECTS, and the supervision structure. Students normally have one co-supervisor next to their own supervisor. Employed PhD candidates receive a 12-month contract; extension depends on a positive assessment of a detailed research proposal presented in the eight-month and a literature review or first paper. Each year, the progress of the projects is reported to the Academic Director through progress reports. This process seems an adequate way to supervise PhD candidates in a constructive and speedy fashion.

PhD candidates in the MLG Programme are registered at the Faculty's Graduate School in the Social Sciences (GSSS), where they follow a training Programme designed to familiarise them with the process of drafting research proposals and peer review, with conducting collaborative work, and presenting and communicating research within a community of experts. On top of the courses offered by the GSSS, most PhD candidates follow the more discipline-related PhD training Programme of the Netherlands Institute of Government, and/or attend international summer schools. This PhD training school seems very suitable for candidates in Political Science

Dissertations can either take the form of a monograph or a collection of articles, but the latter is more common. It was mentioned during the site visit that it is not common that supervisors are co-authoring articles with PhD candidates.

Career perspectives for graduates seem very good, as was confirmed by the PhD candidates during the site visit. An impressive nine out of a total of twelve PhD candidates who enrolled between 2003 and 2008 and graduated within the review period continued in academia, mostly on postdoctoral grants. Some have already attained the position of associate and even full professor.

8. Conclusion

The MLG Programme at VU University Amsterdam is at the international leading edge in research and offers a quality PhD Programme. Its research staff can count itself to be among the best in the Europe and the group as a whole is consistently able to produce good quality work. It has managed a difficult period of retirements and staff turnover, after which the next generation has started to get involved in Programme management. Strategies have been deployed to encourage female faculty to succeed.

In terms of encouraging publications, the Committee is pleased that the research staff at VU University has been able to ensure that they produce articles in leading journals. VU University Amsterdam Political Science seeks to ensure fairness among its members and seeks to find ways to share the burden of reduction in research time due to the decrease in direct funding for research. In years to come the Institute should review its egalitarian policy so as to ensure that the Institute as a whole obtains the best level of research (both funding and publications) in terms of absolute quality and quantity production and relatively speaking a fair distribution of workload given success and performance in research and publications.

The Committee also encourages the Institute to consider developing a more formal strategy to ensure societal engagement and to obtain a particular quality and quantity of societal relevance. Especially with the departure from the Institute of a staff member who has been very active in creating online voting tools, it may want to consider explicitly how it wants to maintain its standing and what it wants to be known for, rather than relying mostly on self-motivation of research staff.

Given that there are now more PhD candidates with external funding the Institute may want to consider if there is good balance in the way both internal and external PhD candidates are treated (given opportunities, for instance teaching opportunities) even if their funding source differs.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Curricula vitae of the Committee members

Amy Verdun (chair) is Jean Monnet Chair Ad Personam, Professor of Political Science in the Department at the University of Victoria (UVic) in Canada, of which she was the Chair (Head of Department) from January 2010-June 2013. She is author or editor of seventeen books, recent ones being *Mapping European Economic Integration* (Houndmills: Palgrave-Macmillan 2013), *Ruling Europe: The Politics of the Stability and Growth Pact* with Martin Heipertz (Cambridge University Press 2010) and *Innovative Governance in the European Union* co-edited with Ingeborg Tömmel (Lynne Rienner Publishing). With Donna Wood she co-edited a special issue of *Canadian Public Administration* (2013), on the theme 'Comparing Modes of Governance in Canada and the European Union: Social Policy in Multilevel Systems'. She is co-editor of the *Journal of Common Market Studies*, one of the leading international journals on European integration and editor of the book series *European Union Studies* of the University of Toronto Press. She was the recipient of the 2009 Craigarroch Silver Medal for Excellence in Research at the University of Victoria. She is currently the Convenor of the ECPR Standing Group on the European Union.

David Farrell holds the Chair of Politics at University College Dublin, where he was Head of School from 2010-2013. He is a Member of the Royal Irish Academy, President of the Political Studies Association of Ireland, and Speaker of the Council of the European Consortium for Political Research. He was the Research Director of the Irish Constitutional Convention (2011-14). Prior to his return to Dublin he held the Jean Monnet Chair in European Politics at the University of Manchester. Between 2006-09 he was Head of Social Sciences at Manchester. A specialist in the study of parties and elections, he is the author of a best-selling textbook on *Electoral Systems* (the second edition published by Palgrave Macmillan in 2011). His most recent book, *Political Parties and Democratic Linkage* (co-authored with Russell Dalton and Ian McAllister and published by Oxford University Press in 2011) won the prestigious GESIS Klingemann Prize for the Best CSES Scholarship in 2012. Professor Farrell is the joint editor of *Party Politics* (a Journal he co-founded in 1995). Between 2007-2013 he was joint editor of the Oxford University Press book series on Comparative Politics.

Oscar Gabriel was Professor of Political Sociology and Comparative Politics at the University of Stuttgart (1992-2012) and Visiting Professor at the University of Vienna (1998) and SciencePo Bordeaux (2004). Since December 2012, he is a member of the German Research Institute for Public Administration (Speyer). Prior to that he taught as a Professor for Political Science at the Universities of Bamberg and Mainz. He acted several times as Head of Department of Social Science, Dean, Vice Dean and Dean of Student Affairs of the Faculty of Economics and Social Science at the University and as Coordinator of the Joint Study and Research Programs Stuttgart-Bordeaux. In the 2000s, he was Head of the Scientific Advisory Board of ZUMA-GESIS (2002-2004) and Head of the Supervisory Board of GESIS (2004-2007). From 2002 to 2006 he was Editor in Chief of the German Political Quarterly (*Politische Vierteljahresschrift*). His main research areas are Comparative Studies of Political Attitudes and Behaviour. His recent publications include *Political Participation in France and Germany* (ed. with Silke Keil and Eric Kerrouche, ECPR Press 2012) and *Society and Democracy in Europe* (ed. with Silke Keil, Routledge 2013).

Colin Hay is Professor of Political Sciences at Sciences Po, Paris, France and an Affiliate Professor of Political Analysis at the University of Sheffield, UK where he co-founded the Sheffield Political Economy Research Institute. He is the author of a number of books including, most recently, *Civic Capitalism* (Polity, forthcoming, with Anthony Payne), *The*

Legacy of Thatcherism (Oxford University Press 2014, with Stephen Farrall), *The Failure of Anglo-Liberal Capitalism* (Palgrave 2013) and *The Political Economy of European Welfare Capitalism* (Palgrave 2012, with Daniel Wincott). He is lead editor of *New Political Economy* and founding co-editor of *Comparative European Politics* and *British Politics*.

Hubert Heinelt is Professor of Political Science in the Institute of Political Science at the technische Universität Darmstadt since 1997. He was the Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences and History from 2005 to 2009 and the Student Dean of this Faculty from 2008 to 2011. From 2005 to 2013 he was member of the evaluation board of the *Leibniz-Gemeinschaft* and since 2012 he is 'advisory professor' of the Tongji-University, Shanghai. Furthermore, he is member of the editorial advisory board of the journal *Policy & Politics*, of the scientific boards the French journal *Metropoles* and of the editorial boards of the journal *Urban Research & Practice*. He is author or editor of 42 books, recent ones being *Governing Modern Societies. Towards participatory governance* (Routledge : London/New York 2010), *Policies within the EU Multi-level System. Instruments and Strategies of European Governance* (Nomos: Baden-Baden 2011, edited together with Knodt), *Metropolitan Governance. Different Paths in Contrasting Contexts – Germany and Israel* (Frankfurt/New York: Campus Verlag 2011, with Eran Razin and Karsten Zimmermann) and *The Second Tier of Local Government in Europe. Provinces, counties, départements and Landkreise in comparison* (Routledge: London/New York 2011, with Xavier Bertrana).

Knud Erik Jørgensen is Professor of Political Science and International Relations (IR) in the Department of Political Science at Aarhus University. He is president of the European International Studies Association and Chair of the ECPR Standing Group on IR. He has been visiting professor at the European University Institute (EUI), VUB, Yasar universities, IBEL, the Canadian Institute of International Affairs and Chatham House. He is co-editor of Palgrave Studies in International Relations, *The European Union in International Affairs*, the *Journal of European Integration* and *Global Affairs* (which he co-founded). A specialist in foreign policy analysis, he is co-editor of the Sage Handbook of European Foreign Policy (Sage 2014), editor of *The European Union and International Organizations* (Routledge, 2009); co-editor with Mark Pollack and Ben Rosamond, *Handbook of European Union Politics* (Sage 2007); author of *International Relations Theory: A New Introduction* (Palgrave 2010); co-editor with Oriol Costa, *The Influence of International Institutions on the European Union: When Multilateralism hits Brussels* (Palgrave 2012); co-editor with Katie Laatikainen, *Handbook on the European Union and International Institutions: Performance, Policy, Power* (Routledge 2013).

Michael Kenny is Professor of Politics in the School of Politics and International Relations at Queen Mary University of London. He has previously held positions at the Queen's University, Belfast, and the University of Sheffield (where he was Head of Department). He has also held Visiting Fellowships at the College of William and Mary in the US, Wolfson College (Oxford University), the Centre for Research into the Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities (Cambridge University) and the Centre for Science and Policy (Cambridge University). He holds a Major Research Fellowship awarded by the Leverhulme Trust (2012-14), and previously held awards from the British Academy, the Nuffield Foundation and the Institute for Public Policy Research. He is a member of the Economic and Social Research Council's College of Assessors and is currently a member of the Leverhulme Trust Advisory Board. He serves on the editorial boards of *Political Quarterly*, *Contemporary Political Theory*, *Global Politics*, and *Open Political Science*, and is a Commissioning Editor of *Juncture*. His most recent book is *The Politics of English Nationhood* (Oxford University Press, 2014), and his most recent works include (With Patrick Diamond, eds), *Reassessing New Labour: Market, State and Society under Blair and Brown* (Blackwell, 2011); *The Politics of Identity: Liberal Political Theory and the Dilemmas of 'Difference'* (Polity Press, 2004); (With Matthew Festenstein, ed.).

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 institutes 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

April	28th	Site visit University of Amsterdam, Special Collections UvA, Regents room, Oude Turfmarkt	
8.30	12.30	Introduction / Preparatory committee meeting	
12.30	13.15	lunch at museum café	
13.15	14.00	preparation UvA	
14.00	15.00	Institute management UvA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prof. Wouter van de Brug (Chair Department Political Science) • Drs. José Komen (Managing Director AISSR) • Prof. Dr. Brian Burgoon (Academic Director AISSR)
15.00	16.00	Programme UvA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prof. Marlies Glasius (Programme Director Transnational Configurations, Conflict and Governance, TCCG) • Prof. John Grin (Programme Director Transnational Configurations, Conflict and Governance, TCCG) • Prof. Jonathan Zeitlin (Programme Director Political Economy and Transnational Governance, PETGOV) • Dr. Floris Vermeulen (Programme Director Challenges to Democratic Representation)
16.00	16.15	Break	
16.15	17.15	PhD students UvA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loes Aaldering (Challenges, 1st year) • Joep Schaper (PETGOV, 2nd year) • Jesse Hoffman (TCCG, 3rd year) • Marijn Hoijtink (TCCG, 3rd year) • Sarah Hardus (PETGOV, 4th year) • Marc van de Wardt (Challenges, PhD approved by committee. Defence on 23rd of April 2014)
17.15	18.00	committee meeting	
April	29th	Site visit VU University Amsterdam, Metropolitan building, Buitenveldertselaan 3-7, Room Z 009	
9.00	9.45	preparation VU	
9.45	10.45	Institute management VU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prof. Cees Elzinga (Vice Dean) • Prof. Leo Huberts (Faculty Board Member responsible for Research) • Prof. Henk Overbeek (Head of Department, Department of Political Science and Public Administration)
10.45	11.00	Break	
11.00	12.00	Programme VU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Ben Crum (Research Manager Political Science 2011-2013) • Prof. Henk Overbeek (Programme Leader Multi-Layered Governance in Europe and Beyond) • Dr. Philipp Pattberg (Deputy Head of Department, Department of Environmental Policy Analysis) • Prof. Barbara Vis (Research Manager PS & PA, 2014-2016)
12.00	13.00	Lunch	
13.00	14.00	PhD students VU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Naná de Graaff (defended her dissertation 18/10/2013) • Falk Ostermann (Final year) • Trineke Palm (2nd year) • Menno Soentken (3rd year) • Mariken van der Velden (1st year)
14.00	15.00	committee meeting	
April	30th	Site visit University of Twente, Campus UT, Ravelijn building, Office 2334 and 2336	
9.00	9.45	preparation UT	

9.45	10.45	Institute management UT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prof. Kees Aarts (Scientific Director IGS) • Prof. Ariana Need (Vice-Dean School of Management and Governance) • Sjoerd van Tongeren (Executive Director IGS)
10.45	11.00	Break	
11.00	12.00	Programme UT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prof. Bas Denters (Professor of Public Administration and Program Leader Innovation of Governance) • Prof. dr. René Torenvlied (Professor of Public Management and Director of Education) • Dr. Henk van der Kolk (Associate Professor of Political Science/Research Methods) • Dr. Giedo Jansen (Assistant Professor on tenure track) • Dr. Kostas Gemenis (Assistant Professor on tenure track) • Prof. Marcel Boogers (Professor of Regional Innovation, and Senior Consultant with BMC Consultancy)
12.00	13.00	Lunch	
13.00	14.00	PhD students UT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wouter Jans (4th year of 4-year contract) • Kira Killermann (2nd year of 3-year contract) • Sedef Turper (4th year of 4-year contract) • Joost van den Akker (2nd year, external PhD candidate) • Annemieke Konijnendijk (3rd year of 4-year contract) • Evisa Kica (4th year of 4-year contract)
14.00	15.00	committee meeting	
May	1st	Site Visit Leiden University, Pieter de La Court Building, first floor, A wing, Wassenaarseweg 52, Leiden	
9.00	9.45	preparation LEI	
9.45	10.45	Institute management LEI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prof. Hanna Swaab (Dean Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences) • Prof. Petr Kopecký (Head of the Institute) • Dr. Oda van Cranenburgh (Director of Studies) • Prof. Ingrid van Biezen (Research Director)
10.45	11.00	Break	
11.00	12.00	Programme LEI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prof. Rudy Andeweg (Professor in Empirical Political Science) • Prof. Ruud Koole (Professor in Political Science) • Dr. Marius de Geus (Lecturer in Political Science) • Dr. Francesco Ragazzi (Lecturer in International Relations) • Dr. Maria Spirova (Lecturer in Comparative Politics and International Relations) • Dr. Danie Stockmann (Lecturer in Comparative Politics and Political Psychology)
12.00	13.00	Lunch	
13.00	14.00	PhD students LEI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Femke Avtalyon-Bakker (1st year) • Tim Mickler (2nd year) • Xinrong Ma (3rd year) • Josje den Ridder (4th year) • Dr. Wouter Veenendaal (PhD defence April 2013) • Cynthia van Vonno (last year)
14.00	18.00	committee meeting	
18.00		end of site visit	

Appendix 4: Quantitative data

A Comparative table *output 2007-2012*

	FTE ¹ total	Total publications	Refereed articles	Book chapters	Books total ²	Mono- graphs	Professional publications ³	Dissertations
VU	34,95	516	168	156	38	12	136	12
UvA	119,9	1292,5	296	279	78	46	545,5	35
LEI	53,44	726	183	128	49	22	203	26
UT	52,84	457	174	172	39	17	40	11

B Comparative table *efficiency per research fte (excluding PhD candidates) 2007-2012*

	Total Publications <i>per research fte</i>	Refereed articles <i>per research fte</i>	Book chapters <i>per research fte</i>	Books total ² <i>per research fte</i>	Monographs <i>per research fte</i>	Professional publications ³ <i>per research fte</i>	Dissertations <i>per tenured fte⁴</i>
VU	14,76	4,81	4,46	1,09	0,34	3,89	0,43
UvA	10,78	2,47	2,33	0,65	0,38	4,55	0,37
LEI	13,59	3,42	2,40	0,92	0,41	3,80	1,13
UT	8,65	3,29	3,26	0,74	0,32	0,76	0,32

1. Comparisons based on research FTE could be misleading since research FTE is calculated and implemented differently across universities. Representatives of the UvA programme pointed out in their response to the draft report that the UvA administratively reports a higher research component of staff members' time than the other universities in this review. They argue that this impacts negatively on the calculations of UvA's productivity as the actual research time of faculty is another matter and cannot be reduced to such administrative accounting.
2. This category includes both edited volumes and monographs.
3. This category includes both professional publications and publications aimed at the general public.
4. For this indicator only tenured fte's have been taken into consideration.

Leiden University

Table A *Research time of Research staff at Institute of Political Science, 2007-2012*

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Tenured staff	4,04	3,49	3,40	3,50	4,05	4,46
Tenure-track staff	2,20	2,48	3,03	2,75	2,25	1,90
Non-tenured staff ²	0	0,20	2,50	6,20	3,13	3,86
PhD candidates ³	3,17	7,12	9,28	10,08	8,44	7,73
Total research time of Research staff	9,41	13,29	18,21	22,53	17,87	17,95

1. Includes research staff with a minimum of 0.2 fte appointment. For all research active staff, research time allocated equals 27.5% per 1 fte appointment.
2. Including post-docs; research time allocated to post-docs is 100%.
3. Excluding contract/external PhD-students; research time allocated to internal PhD candidates is 80%.

Table B *Funding of staff 2007-2012 (in fte)*

Funding	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Direct funding ¹	8,26	11,86	13,97	15,26	13,40	11,12
Research grants ²	2,75	4,56	4,56	7,05	6,97	10,73
Contract research ³	0,17			0,83		0,33
Total funding	11,18	16,42	18,53	23,14	20,37	22,18

1. Direct funding by the University (eerste geldstroom).
2. Funding obtained in competition for external scientific grants (NWO, KNAW, ERC etc. – tweede geldstroom).
3. Contracts for specific research projects obtained from external organizations (derde geldstroom).

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

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Total
Refereed Articles (academic)	21	32	22	39	31	38	183
Non-refereed Articles (academic)	9	6	25	22	13	10	85
Books: Monographs (academic)	6	7	5	2	2	0	22
Books: Edited Volumes	4	3	3	10	3	4	27
Book chapters (academic)	51	20	25	25	30	29	128
PhD-theses	3	2	8	6	2	5	26
Professional publications	7	6	7	10	6	1	37
Publications aimed at general public	31	32	20	33	23	27	166
Total publications	132	108	115	147	110	114	726

Table F *Standard PhD candidates¹*

Start year	Enrolment			Success rate								Total					
	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	#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2012	1	1	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	100	0	0
2011	2	2	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	-	--	--	--	3	75	1	25
2010	0	2	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	-	--	--	--	2	100	0	0
2009	1	2	3	1	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	33	2	67	--	--
2008	5	1	6	3	50	1	17	--	--	--	--	4	67	--	--	2	33
2007	0	2	2	0	0	1	50	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	50	0	0
2006	1	0	1	0	0	1	100	--	--	--	--	1	100	--	--	--	--
2005	1	1	2	0	0	1	50	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	50	0	0

1. PhD candidates with salaried appointment paid by the University.

Table G *Contract PhD candidates¹*

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		#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
2012	4	0	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	-	--	--	--	4	100	0	0
2011	1	1	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	-	--	--	--	2	100	0	0
2010	5	3	8	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	7	87	0	0
2009	3	4	7	1	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4	57	2	29
2008	3	1	4	1	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	3	75	0	0
2007	0	0	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	-	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2006	2	0	2	1	50	1	50	0	0	0	0	2	100	--	--	--	--
2005	2	1	3	1	33	1	33	0	0	0	0	2	67	--	--	1	33

1. *PhD candidates without salaried appointment paid by the University.*

University of Amsterdam

Table A *Research staff at programme level*

Composition of the research group: Political Science Total												
Research staff	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		2012	
	FTE	#										
Tenured staff	13,3	34	12,4	36	13,6	41	18,3	50	19,3	51	17,5	50
Non-tenured staff	3,8	7	4,9	10	3,8	12	5,1	15	4,6	10	3,3	9
PhD candidates	12,5	19	14,5	19	17,3	26	20,4	25	21,6	29	18,8	22
Total research staff	29,7	60	31,7	65	34,6	79	43,7	90	45,4	90	39,7	81

Table B *Overview of the various sources of financing of staff*

Funding and earning capacity: Political Science Total												
Funding	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		2012	
	FTE	%										
Direct funding	16,2	54%	13,9	44%	16,9	49%	21,2	49%	20,9	46%	18,9	48%
Research grants	6,6	22%	9,3	29%	7,8	22%	8,6	20%	14,2	31%	10,8	27%
Contract research	6,7	23%	7,8	25%	8,4	24%	10,9	25%	8,4	18%	8,5	21%
Other	0,2	1%	0,7	2%	1,6	5%	3,0	7%	2,0	4%	1,5	4%
Total FTE	29,7	100%	31,7	100%	34,6	100%	43,7	100%	45,4	100%	39,7	100%
Expenditures	€		€		€		€		€		€	
Personnel costs	€ 2.599.301		€ 2.742.220		€ 2.974.553		€ 3.877.257		€ 4.059.088		€ 3.616.377	

Table D *Main categories of research output at institutional and programme level*

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Refereed articles (academic)	37,5	35	36	48,5	49	90
Non-refereed articles (academic) ¹	10	9	12	9	9	10
Books: Monographs (academic)	5	7	10	11	7	6
Books: Edited volumes	6	4	6	4	8	4
Book chapters (academic)	35	32	53	59	45	55
PhD-theses	5,5	3	5,5	6,5	10	4,5
Professional publications ²	35,5	39	34	37	40	67
Publications for general public ³	46	48	37	57	61	44
Total publications	180,5	177	193,5	232	229	280,5

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').*

3. *Also known as 'populariserende artikelen'.*

Table F *Standard PhD candidates¹*

Enrolment			Success rate								Total				
Start year	Enrolment m/f		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	3	5	--	1	2	2	5	100	--	--				
2004	4	2	6	2	--	2	2	6	100	--	--				
2005	2	4	6	1	2	2	--	5	83,3	1	--				
2006	1	1	2	1	--	1	--	2	100	--	--				
2007	2	2	4	--	--	1	1	2	50	2	--				
2008	1	1	2	1	1	--	--	2	100	--	--				
Total	12	13	25	5	20%	4	16%	8	32%	5	20%	22	88	3	--

1. *PhD candidates with salaried appointment paid by the University.*

Table G *Contract PhD candidates*

Enrolment			Success rate								Total				
Start year	Enrolment m/f		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	0	1	1	--	1	--	--	1	100	--	--				
2005	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--				
2006	2	1	3	--	2	--	--	2	66,7	1	--				
2007	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--				
2008	1	0	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--				
Total	3	2	5	-	--	3	60%	--	--	--	--	3	60	2	--

University of Twente

Table A *Research capacity at programme level*

	2007	n	2008	n	2009	n	2010	n	2011	n	2012	n
Tenured staff ²	5.67	18	5.43	16	6.48	20	6.21	17	4.74	14	5.53	15
Non-tenured staff ³	2.64	9	3.38	9	4.13	9	3.48	9	3.06	7	2.09	5
PhD Students ⁴	5.92	10	4.39	6	4.68	9	5.23	8	7.7	10	8.3	11
Total research staff	14.23	37	13.2	31	15.29	38	14.92	34	15.5	31	15.92	31

1. *As per Dec 31st*

2. *Comparable with WOPI-categories HGL, UHD and UD (including category Bijzonder Hoogleraren)*

3. *Comparable with WOPI-category Researcher, including post-docs*

4. *Standard PhD (employed) and Contract PhD's (externally or internally funded but not employed)*

Table B *Funding of research capacity at programme level*

	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		2012	
Direct funding ²	12.07	85%	11.66	88%	13.15	86%	10.97	74%	9.94	64%	9.26	58%
Research Grants ³	1.36	10%	0.69	5%	1.23	8%	1.85	12%	2.86	18%	3.90	24%
Contract Research ⁴	0.80	6%	0.85	6%	0.91	6%	2.10	14%	2.70	17%	2.76	17%
Total research staff ⁵	14.23	100%	13.2	100%	15.29	100%	14.92	100%	15.5	100%	15.92	100%
Personnel costs	€ 855,807		€ 881,535		€1,168,756		€ 1,117,993		€ 1,006,363		€ 1,011,797	

1. *As per Dec 31st*

2. *Direct funding of staff by the university*

3. *Research grants obtained in national and international scientific competition (e.g. grants from NWO, KNAW and European Research Council)*

4. *Research contracts for specific research projects obtained from external organisations, such as industry, governmental ministries, European Commission and charity organisations*

5. *Funding of 'research time' in FTE of program members*

Table D *Main categories of research output at institutional and program level*

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Total
Refereed articles (academic)	27	32	26	38	22	29	174
Non-refereed articles (academic) ¹	4	3	1	2	5	6	21
Books: Monographs (academic)	3	2	5	4	1	2	17
Books: Edited volumes	2	3	3	1	10	3	22
Book chapters (academic)	33	30	32	16	42	19	172
PhD-theses	0	4	4	0	1	2	11
Professional publications ²	7	5	1	1	10	5	29
Publications for general public ³	5	0	3	0	1	2	11
Total publications	81	79	75	62	92	68	457

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)*

Table F *Standard PhD Candidates¹*

Starting year	Enrolment (M/F)			Graduated after (≤) 4 years	Graduated after (≤) 5 years	Graduated after (≤) 6 years	Graduated after (≤) 7 years	Total graduated	Not yet finished	Discontinued
	M	F	Total							
T-8 ² (2003)	1M	2F	3	0/0%	1/33 %	1/33 %	1/ 33 %	1/33 %	0/0 %	2/66 %
T-7 (2004)	0M	1F	1	1/100 %	1/100 %	1/100 %	1/100%	1/100%	0/0 %	0/0%
T-6 (2005)	2M	2F	4	1/25%	3/75%	4/100%	4/100%	4/100%	0/0%	0/0%
T-5 (2006)	0M	0F	0	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
T-4 (2007)	0M	0F	0	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
T-3 (2008)	1M	0F	1	0/0%	0/0%	1/100%	1/100%	1/100%	0/0%	0/0%
T-2 (2009) ²	1M	3F	4	0/0%	3/75%	3/75%	3/75%	3/75%	1/25%	0/0%
Overall	5M	7F	13	2/15% ⁰	7/62%	10/75%	9/77%	10/77%	1/8%	2/15%

1. *Standard PhD-candidate with employee status and conducting research with primary aim/obligation to graduate; (AiO, promovendus)*
2. *5 year period not completed, graduation rate may still rise.*

POLMT/MRE&V/LEGS (Standard PhD-candidates with employee status: AiO/Promovendus: startjaar in periode 2003-2013)

Table G *Contract PhD Candidates¹*

Starting 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
	male	female								
T-8 ²	0M	0F	0	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0 %	0/0%	0/0%
T-7	1M	0F	1	0/0%	1/100%	1/100%	1/100%	1/100%	0/0%	0/0%
T-6	0M	0F	0	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
T-5	1M	0F	1	1/100%	1/100%	1/100%	1/100%	1/100%	0/0%	0/0%
T-4	0M	1F	1	1/100%	1/100%	1/100%	1/100%	1/100%	0/0%	0/0%
T-3	2M	0F	2	0/0%	2/100%	2/100%	2/100%	2/100%	0/0%	0/0%
T-2	1M	0F	1	0/0%	1/100%	1/100%	1/100%	1/100%	0/0%	0/0%
Overall	5M	1F	6	2/33%	6/100%	6/100%	6/100%	6/100%	0/0%	0/0%

1. *Contract PhD-candidates without employee status, receiving external funding or university scholarship, conducting research under the authority of the institute with primary aim to graduate; (beurspromovendus)*
2. *5 year period not completed, graduation rate may still rise.*

VU University Amsterdam

Table A *Research staff at programme level*

MLG	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		2012	
	N	Research FTE										
Tenured staff ¹	16	4.04	17	5.47	19	5.66	20	5.35	16	3.76	17	3.86
Non-tenured staff ²	2	0.47	3	1.58	2	0.91	2	1.17	4	0.98	4	1.70
PhD-students ³	10	6.11	9	5.31	10	4.70	11	5.89	12	8.74	13	7.61
Total research staff	27	10.62	29	12.36	31	11.27	33	12.41	32	13.48	34	13.17

* Totals of N do not all add up, as some researchers held combined PhD/staff-contracts.

Since 2011, the VU-FSSS standard norm for research time of tenured staff has been set at 30%; in the preceding years it was 40%.

1. Comparable with WOPI-categories HGL, UHD en UD (including BHL and temporary UD).
2. Comparable with WOPI-category Onderzoeker, including post docs.
3. Standard PhD (employed) and Contract PhD's (externally or internally funded but not employed)

Table B *Funding of staff at programme level in fte (%)*

MLG	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Funding	fte (%)	fte (%)	fte (%)	fte (%)	fte (%)	fte (%)
Direct funding ¹	8.54 (80%)	9.78 (79%)	9.21 (82%)	9.07 (73%)	6.69 (50%)	5.45 (41%)
Research grants ²	2.08 (20%)	1.43 (12%)	0.8 (7%)	1.71 (14%)	4.41 (33%)	5.33 (40%)
Contract research ³	0	1.15 (9%)	1.23 (11%)	1.63 (13%)	2.38 (18%)	2.39 (18%)
Total Funding	10.62(100%)	12.36(100%)	11.24(100%)	12.41 (100%)	13.48(100%)	13.17(100%)
Expenditure	k€	k€	k€	k€	k€	k€
Personnel costs ⁴	659.3	800.2	794.7	857.6	810.3	835.3

1. Direct funding of staff by the university.
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 organizations, such as industry, governmental ministries, European Commission and charity organizations.
4. Costs for research fte's as presented above.

Table D *Main categories of research output at institutional and programme level*

MLG	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Total
Refereed articles (academic)	37	27	19	24	26	35	168
Non-refereed articles (academic)	2	1	0	1	2	3	9
Books: Monographs (academic)	2	2	0	3	2	3	12
Books: Edited volumes	8	4	4	2	1	7	26
Book chapters (academic)	24	22	23	31	18	38	156
PhD-theses	1	2	7	1	-	1	12
Professional publications	21	15	21	18	20	12	107
Publications for general public	1	1	2	2	9	14	29
Total	96	74	76	82	76	112	516

Table F *Standard PhD-Candidates¹*

Enrolment			Success rates				Total			
Starting year	m/f		Total (male + female)	Graduated after (≤) 4 years	Graduated after (≤) 5 years	Graduated after (≤) 6 years	Graduated after (≤) 7 years	Total graduated	Not yet finished	Discontinued
2003	-	2	2	1 (50%)	-	1 (50%)	-	2 (100%)	-	-
2004	4	3	7	1 (14%)	3 (43%)	2 (28%)	-	6 (86%)	-	1 (14%)
2005	1	-	1	-	1 (100%)	-	-	1 (100%)	-	-
2006	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2007	-	1	1	-	-	1 (100%)	-	1 (100%)	-	-
2008	2	-	2	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	-	-	2 (100%)	-	-
2009	1	2	3	-	-	-	-	-	3	-
2010	4	1	5	-	-	-	-	-	4 (80%)	1 (20%)
2011	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
2012	1	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	-
Total	13	11	24	3 (23%)	5 (38%)	4 (31%)	-	12 (50%)	10	2 (8%)

1. 'Standard PhD-candidates' are defined as having employee status and conducting research with the primary objective of graduating to graduate (AiO, promovendus).

Table G *Contract PhD-Candidates¹*

Enrolment			Success rates				Total			
Starting year	m/f		Total (male + female)	Graduated after (≤) 4 years	Graduated after (≤) 5 years	Graduated after (≤) 6 years	Graduated after (≤) 7 years	Total graduated	Not yet finished	Discontinued
2003 2009	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2010	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	-
2011	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2012	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	-
2013	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Total	2	3	5	-	-	-	-	-	5	-

1. Contract PhDs are defined as PhD candidates without employee status, formally admitted to a 3/4 year PhD trajectory with external funding. The candidate conducts research under the authority of the institute with a primary aim to graduate; (beurspromovendus).