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Introduction

1.1 The Netherlands System of Quality Assessment of Research

This quality assessment of research is part of the assessment system for all public Dutch university research, as organised by the universities in the Netherlands.

The aims of the assessment system are:

- Improvement of research quality based on an external peer review, including scientific and societal relevance of research, research policy and research management.
- Accountability to the board of the research organisation, and towards funding agencies, government and society at large.

The assessment takes place at the level of research institutes and research programmes. The research institutes submit a description of the results that have been achieved in all contributing research programmes during the previous six years (including quantitative data about staff input, PhD’s, publications, financial resources), a short outline of the mission of the institute, the objective of each individual programme, and developments anticipated in the context of the research profile of the faculty or institute. Important elements of the assessments are the interviews, which the Evaluation Committee conducts with the management and the programme directors, and the visit to the facilities.

This evaluation of the Institute for Management Research was commissioned by the Executive Board of the Radboud University.

1.2 The Evaluation Committee

The Evaluation Committee was appointed in May 2013 and consisted of:

- Professor Pieter Hooimeijer (Chair), Professor of Human Geography and Demography, Utrecht University, The Netherlands.
- Professor David Lowery, Professor of Political Science, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, USA.
- Professor Carla Millar, Professor International Marketing and Management, University of Twente, Enschede, The Netherlands and Fellow Ashridge Business School, UK.
- Professor Dora Scholarios, Professor of Work Psychology, University of Strathclyde Business School, Glasgow, UK.
- Professor Jan-Egbert Sturm, Professor of Applied Macroeconomics, ETH Zürich, Switzerland.
Jetje De Groof (PhD), freelance, was appointed secretary to the Evaluation Committee.

A short curriculum vitae of each of the members is included in Appendix 1.

**Independence**

All members of the committee signed a statement of independence to attest that:

- they would judge without bias, personal preference or personal interest, and
- their judgment would be made without undue influence from the institute, the programme or other stakeholders.

### 1.3 Scope of the Assessment

This assessment covers the research of the Institute for Management Research (IMR). The period of assessment is 2007-2012, and recent developments have been taken into account as much as possible.

The committee was asked to operate according to the *Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015 for Public Research Universities (SEP)*. According to the SEP for Universities in the Netherlands (SEP), research is evaluated using four criteria: (i) quality, (ii) productivity, (iii) societal relevance, and (iv) vitality and feasibility.

During the period covered by the review, the structure and organisation of IMR research have changed substantially. In 2007, there were four more or less disciplinary research programmes, each corresponding to one of the four disciplinary departments of the Nijmegen School of Management (NSM): (i) Business Administration, (ii) Economics and Business Economics, (iii) Geography, Planning & Environment, and (iv) Public Administration & Political Science. In recent years, however, the IMR has changed its organisation with the aim of strengthening the multidisciplinary character of the institute. In 2010-2011 the four disciplinary programmes of the IMR were replaced by three multidisciplinary research platforms, each one corresponding to macro-level research debates within the IMR. Moreover, a bundling of research capacity and projects was established through a limited number of research clusters (‘hotspots’), each focusing on a major societal issue (see section 2.2. of this report).

To allow an adequate review of the IMR in the light of these recent changes, the committee was asked (1) to evaluate and grade the four disciplinary departments on the criteria ‘quality’ and ‘productivity’ from the perspective of the dominant culture within each of the four disciplines, and (2) to evaluate and grade the institute as a whole on the criteria ‘societal relevance’ and ‘viability and feasibility’. This working method allowed for continuity in the sense that the evaluation under (1) enabled a comparison with the previous research.
evaluation. However, for the future oriented criteria mentioned under (2), breaking the evaluation down into the four departments would be unproductive, since all departments are currently involved in or contribute to the multidisciplinary profile of IMR.

In addition the committee was asked to briefly express its opinion on the IMR as a whole regarding research management, education of next generation researchers, and facilities.

The evaluation committee received a detailed self-evaluation report provided by the IMR. For each programme, three to five key publications were specified in the report and copies of three of these publications were provided to the committee. The documentation included all the information required by the Protocol.

1.4 Procedures followed by the Committee

The assessments are based on the documentation provided by the IMR, the key publications of each programme, the interviews and the tour of the facilities. The interviews took place during the site visit on 24 and 25 October 2013. Time was allowed for visits to the experimental and instrumental set-ups and discussions with the Secretary General of the Executive Board of the University, the Dean and the Executive Board of the Nijmegen School of Management, the Institute for Management Research executive board, senior researchers, PhD students, and postdocs. The programme of the site visit is included in Appendix 2.

The committee members all read the Self Evaluation Report. The key publications of each programme were read by the first and the second reviewers of each programme. The committee members independently gave a preliminary assessment, using the form provided in the Protocol. These preliminary assessments were compiled and given to the members on 23 October 2013, preceding the site visit.

At the Welcome meeting in Nijmegen, the committee had the opportunity to meet with the Secretary General of the Executive Board of the Radboud University and representatives of the Faculty Board and the Institute for Management Research.

During the internal committee meeting on the evening of 23 October 2013, preceding the site visit, a number of issues and questions were defined both for the institute and for each department. The committee also agreed upon procedural matters and aspects of the assessment.
The interviews with the Management Team and Programme Leaders took place during the site visit on 24 and 25 October 2013. All interviews and discussions were conducted with the plenary committee. A tour of the facilities was conducted on the first day of the visit.

On the second day of the site visit, after the interview with the Management Team, the committee discussed the results for each programme as well as for the institute as a whole to prepare this report. Afterwards the main findings of the committee were reported.

A draft version of this report was sent to the Institute for Management Research and the Dean of the Nijmegen School of Management in December 2013, for factual corrections and comments. Early 2014 the comments were discussed with the committee chairman. This led to minor corrections and clarifications. The report was subsequently submitted to the Executive Board of the Radboud University.

1.5 Aspects and Assessment Scale

The Protocol requires the evaluation committee to assess the research using the four main criteria of the Standard Evaluation Protocol:

- Quality (the level of the research conducted)
- Productivity (relationship between input and output)
- Societal relevance (social, economic and cultural relevance of the research)
- Vitality and feasibility (flexibility, management and leadership)

The ratings used are: Excellent (5); Very good (4); Good (3); Satisfactory (2); Unsatisfactory (1). This five-point scale used in the assessment is described in the Standard Evaluation Protocol as follows:

Excellent (5) Research is world leading. Researchers are working at the forefront of their field internationally and their research had an important and substantial impact in the field.

Very Good (4) Research is internationally competitive and makes a significant contribution to the field. Research is considered nationally leading.

Good (3) Work is competitive at the national level and will probably make a valuable contribution in the international field. Research is considered internationally visible.
Satisfactory (2) Work adds to our understanding and is solid, but not exciting. Research is nationally visible.

Unsatisfactory (1) Work that is neither solid nor exciting, flawed in the scientific and or technical approach, repetitions of other work, etc.
2 Assessment of the Institute for Management Research

Director of the institute:  Professor Van Riel (as of 2011)
Professor Van der Heijden (2008-2010)
Professor Vosselman (2006-2007)

Academic staff in 2012:  96.3

Assessment of the institute
Societal Relevance : 4
Vitality and feasibility : 3-4

2.1 Mission, goals and research activities

The Institute of Management Research (IMR) is the research institute of the Nijmegen School of Management (NSM). The IMR, so the committee read in the self-evaluation, aims to achieve excellence in its constituent disciplines, i.e. business administration; economics and business economics; human geography, spatial planning, environmental studies; and political science and public administration. In addition, the IMR explicitly aspires to conduct high quality multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary research.

The ambition of the IMR, so the committee learnt during the site visit, is to become an internationally renowned, prolific, and highly relevant research institute, with a mission to conduct top-level research on the governance of complex systems, which is reflected in its motto ‘Creating knowledge for Society’. The IMR aims to contribute to the international academic discourses on complex systems, to prepare generations of PhD candidates for academic and societal careers, to feed top-level academic and post-academic education, to participate in applied research and to take a leading role in debates.

The strategy it has deployed in order to reach this ambition is: (1) to capitalise on its multidisciplinary research base through the creation of an IMR Academy (platforms) (see 2.2.); (2) to invest in and further develop talent by supporting the career of current staff and hiring new staff with excellent research potential (see 2.3.); (3) to structure and defragment research efforts by building a hotspot infrastructure (see 2.2.); (4) to professionalise its research organisation and support by creating a research support department and a doctoral school (see 2.3. and 2.5.), and (5) to open up to the world and co-create knowledge with partners by focusing on societal challenges and collaborating with the best (see 2.3.).
Assessment/remarks
The committee appreciates the fact that, following the last research evaluation, the IMR has developed an ambitious strategy and has not been timid in addressing its problems. The committee however has some remarks. First, the committee is of the opinion that the theoretical and methodological underpinnings of the analyses of complex systems have not been internalised as yet by the majority of the research staff and the ambition might be overstated. Secondly, the committee finds that the motto ‘Creating Knowledge for Society’ is far too general to accurately describe the niche within which the IMR wants to present itself. Instead, the emphasis could be on the (co-)creation of knowledge for better governance. This should be conveyed more accurately in the institute’s motto (see 2.8.). Thirdly, the hybrid ambition of the institution to achieve multidisciplinary as well as disciplinary excellence may not serve the IMR’s goals in the long run (see 2.7.).

2.2 Organisation and leadership
The IMR has changed the organisation of its research, taking into account the worries expressed in the research evaluation of the institute in 2008. The main aim has been the strengthening of the multidisciplinary character of the institute. The two primary instruments the IMR has been using to facilitate its reorganisation are platforms and hotspots. In 2010-2011, the four disciplinary programmes of the IMR were replaced by three multidisciplinary research platforms, each one corresponding to macro-level research debates within the IMR: Responsible Organization (ResOrg), Distributional Conflicts in a Globalizing World (DisCon), and The Shaping and Changing of Places and Spaces (SCAPES). Together, the platforms constitute the ‘IMR academy’, a forum facilitating encounters and academic debate among researchers.

In 2013, hotspots for research were created, with the aim of pooling research projects that focus on a select number of highly relevant societal challenges. In order to qualify as a hotspot, researchers with related projects need to achieve critical mass in terms of research capacity, clear research goals for the short and medium term, clear research issues related to society, well-defined projects and deliverables, and a clear picture of financial needs and proposed funding. Thus far, two hotspots have been formally recognised by the Faculty Board: ‘Europeanization of Policy and Law’ and ‘Gender and Power in Politics and Management’. The IMR is working on establishing additional hotspots in the first half of 2014. Figure 1 depicts the current organisation of the IMR:
During the site visit, the committee discussed at length the added value of the platforms and the hotspots. The self-evaluation report and appendices left many questions regarding the new organisational matrix unanswered, particularly with regard to the locus of responsibility and accountability, the personnel policy and the budget flows in the IMR/NSM. The committee learnt that budget and personnel authority/responsibility remains with the heads of departments and the chairs. No such formal authority resides with the platform or hotspot managers, whose task is primarily to stimulate, facilitate and mobilise.

Another issue the committee was concerned about, was whether this new multidisciplinary organisational structure serves the interest of all disciplines of the IMR to an equal degree. It was learnt that the platforms are meant as a breeding ground, but that currently, IMR researchers are not forced to take part in platforms if they have no desire to do so.

All participating researchers the committee talked to were very enthusiastic about the synergies and thinking outside the box enabled by the platforms and the hotspots, and the collaboration and integration following from it. The platforms are regarded as a useful meeting ground and the hotspots as a unique opportunity for bottom-up initiatives that build networks within and in particular beyond the borders of the IMR.

**Assessment/remarks**

The committee values the leadership at the institute level. Following the research evaluation of 2008, the Faculty Board has taken difficult strategic and operational decisions, including the restructuring of the research activity. This has led to an open research organisation that stimulates researchers to be entrepreneurial, as was evident from the site visit.
The committee believes that the main value added of the IMR is its multidisciplinary constitution. The IMR appears well placed to develop its research effort around these three broad areas (DisCon, ResOrg, SCAPES). The committee was impressed with the energy and professionalism it encountered when interviewing the leaders of platforms and hotspots.

The committee finds the platforms an adequate change tool to move towards multidisciplinary research. However, the low-key organisational strength of the platforms seems adequate for a temporary change tool, but not for a permanent organisational structure. The committee wishes to express its concern that no plans have been made for a permanent structure for IMR, including adequate budgetary and personnel responsibilities, to replace the platform structure.

The committee took note of the fact that, at the moment of the site visit, active participation in the platforms was not yet evenly distributed over the four departments. The committee is of the opinion that the multidisciplinary strategy works especially well with disciplines that are multidisciplinary by nature and for which an almost one-to-one relationship seems to exist with the platforms. For the more monodisciplinary-oriented groups (like Economics, Business Economics, and Political Science), their place in the new multidisciplinary structure is less evident. Only individual members of these groups are contributing in the new structure. This left the committee with the question whether pockets of researchers will be ‘allowed’ to be active on a mono-disciplinary basis in the future. This question is especially relevant for groups with subcritical mass, like the Economists, who are, due to their size, unable to compete with others in the disciplinary field (see 2.7. and 3.2.). It will be helpful to monitor the participation and check the balance of disciplinary inputs to the platforms and vice versa.

The hotspots serve a different purpose. Centred on a small team of academic leaders that recruit others to their networks, these hotspots are prolific and contribute to the research reputation externally. So far, two hotspots have been consolidated, but several are under construction. The viability of the strategy will depend on the strength of these bottom-up initiatives.

The committee also thinks that a larger part of the budget and personnel authority should reside with the IMR rather than with the departments as this will give more leverage to implement the IMR-strategy in future years (see also 2.3. and 2.7.).
2.3 Resources and resource policy

2.3.1. Financial Resources

The IMR provided the following information on the sources of financial funding of the IMR:

Table 1 shows that the total research budget of the IMR decreased significantly in the first half of the evaluation period. After that, there was an increase, corresponding with the increase in the number of staff. The percentage of FTE’s based on direct funding decreased to 56% in 2012, while externally funded FTE’s increased from 25% in 2007 to 44% of total research capacity in 2012. The strongest and consistent increase was in contract research. The numbers of FTE’s on research grants show less consistent growth, and are small relative to the numbers on direct funding.

It struck the committee that the dependence of the IMR on the first money stream is large. Considering a tenured staff of almost 50 FTE’s, 13 FTE’s (2012) on research grants seems rather minimal. A target of 2 to 1 within a period of 4 years should be feasible, and would bring the percentage of direct funding under 50%. During the site visit, the committee learnt that the IMR aims to further increase the proportion of external funding, and more specifically of research grants. Different strategies have been put in place to reach this goal. A system of grant matching for externally funded PhD positions has been introduced. Also, the Scientific Advisory Board now does a pre-selection of applications for research grants. Next to that, the IMR academy offers training for researchers in obtaining external funding.

2.3.2. Human Resources

The IMR provided the following information on staff levels:
Table 2 shows a decrease of research staff in the period 2007-2010 due to the reorganisation of the Department of Business Administration (see 3.1.) and the reduction of new PhD projects based on direct funding. However, since 2010, research capacity has increased again, both in terms of the number of PhD candidates and tenured and non-tenured staff. The origins of this increase, so the committee read, include the matching of externally acquired PhD grants and the allocation of 18 new multidisciplinary PhD positions across the IMR in 2011 and 2012, amongst other elements.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenured staff</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-tenured staff</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD candidates</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total research staff</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>96.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support staff</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total staff</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>94.40</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>101.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The committee learnt that the IMR has created a budget for two-year appointments in order to be able to invite external professors to visit the IMR. In the evaluation period, seven external professors and 16 guest researchers were hosted by the IMR.

The IMR wants to reward people who are performing at a high level, thus stimulating the research environment. The committee heard from the IMR researchers that they experience the IMR career policy to be transparent. The research capacity of staff members is set at 40% of their formal appointment. Temporary increases in research time are possible up to a level of 70%. Conversely, staff members not meeting the criteria with respect to research performance can temporarily see a reduction in their research time. Also, a tenure track for assistant professors was introduced recently in order to be more selective and guarantee the quality of future staff.

The committee is of the opinion that, compared to the departments, the IMR seems to have limited leverage in assuring that its strategy is backed by the faculty's personnel policy (see also 2.2.). It learnt that teaching rather than research needs drive the hiring of new personnel, which means that the dean, departments and ultimately the chairs are responsible. The same holds true for academic staff monitoring and evaluation. However, the committee also heard that research capabilities and fit with the new research organisation are increasingly taken
into account when new staff members are engaged. On being asked, representatives from the platforms confirmed that although they have no financial leverage in this respect, their advice is taken into account in practice. The hotspots are granted budget autonomy in hiring PhDs and post-doc researchers. Further development of hotspots would entail a larger share of research funding at IMR level.

2.3.3. Research Facilities

Next to the usual research facilities such as access to electronic journals and physical collections and an individual budget for each researcher to attend international conferences, the IMR accommodates two research laboratories, the Visa Skills Lab and the Decision Lab, both of which the committee visited during the site visit. The committee learnt about the recent investments made in these labs and received a demonstration of the research the labs are used for.

The IMR also hosts and participates in the construction of a number of large databases.

In recent years, the IMR has invested in a faculty-wide department charged with improving research support and communication. On being asked, the IMR researchers voiced their appreciation for the proactive communication of this support team on future research calls, possibly enabling competition to be pre-empted.

Assessment/remarks

During the site visit, it became clear to the committee that the IMR does not currently experience financial resources as a bottleneck, partly due to the financial aid received from the university. Still, the IMR continues to rely heavily on the first money stream. Regarding attracting external funding, the IMR has improved its position, but needs to understand that it is operating in a changing world. Its relative position therefore remains unchanged and some of the issues that have been raised in the past have not been solved. The share of research grants remains – at least relative to contract research – low. The committee is of the opinion that the causal chain claimed from the new multidisciplinary strategy has yet to become visible in the earning capacity of the IMR. The committee accepts that this may have to do with the time-lag effects as many initiatives were very recent.

From the perspective of the human resources policy and the allocation of financial means, it is clear to the committee that the real power in the IMR still resides with the departments and chairs. The committee gathered that this does not pose problems at the moment as agendas still coincide. However, the committee does not consider this to be a solid option for the future and is of the opinion that the research organisation should be made stronger in this respect.
Such changes may coincide with a reorganisation of the platform structure and platform managers’ responsibilities.

The committee appreciates the allocation of 18 new multidisciplinary PhD positions, with the aim of both strengthening the research potential of the IMR and boosting the multidisciplinary character of the institute. The committee also lauds the initiative of the IMR to extend research support for its researchers. However, it was also noted that the quality of the website, crucial to the visibility of IMR, its research and its researchers, could be substantially improved.

The committee values the IMR’s creation of visiting faculty programmes, but advises stimulating a research period abroad for younger researchers, which will be useful as international experience is increasingly becoming an evaluation criterion in allocating grants.

With regard to the research facilities, the current infrastructure offers potential for experiments on complex decision making and based on game theory, but does not seem to be used to the full extent so far.

2.4 Publication strategy

In the period preceding the mid-term review in 2010, IMR wide criteria for classifying and evaluating publications were developed. Peer-reviewed journals are classified as either A-, B- or C-journals, with A-journals being international academic top-tier journals (ISI-rate >1 and/or belonging to the top 25% of the journals in a particular discipline), B-journals being international academic journals (with an ISI rating <1) and C-journals being international academic journals without an ISI rating or national academic journals. Using this categorisation, the IMR has drawn up a list of journals, which it uses to register and monitor its research output. This list as well as the underlying criteria are reviewed, maintained and assessed on a regular basis by the Scientific Advisory Committee.

The committee noted that the publication output of the IMR is on the rise, with the proportion of A-classified articles steadily growing. During the site visit, the criteria for the A-category were discussed at length, as the committee felt that this category should be geared more restrictively towards top-tier publications. The committee learnt during the site visit that the IMR is indeed ready to take the classification system to the next level, with a further differentiation in the A-level category between top- and lower-tier journals.

The IMR management explained that the transition to an A-journal publication culture is a drastic one in an institute that used to be more teaching-oriented, with many staff lacking an academic publication record. It was learnt that through the new sense of community, through
the platforms and hotspots, IMR researchers have been submitting more papers in recent years. The platforms and hotspots, so the committee learnt during the site visit, are catalysts for the publication strategy. Meetings are organised on how to get published in top journals and have made IMR researchers more focused on and aware of the importance of quality output. Moreover, a discussion is ongoing about what are the best journals and initiatives are being taken to direct research output to the best journals. The IMR is confident that the results of this evolution will be evident soon.

On being asked, different groups of interviewees mentioned that at the moment the IMR does not have a multidisciplinary target list for publications. The hotspots have however been asked to develop a publication strategy for their multidisciplinary research.

**Assessment/remarks**

The committee appreciates that on many criteria the productivity of the IMR has been on the rise since the last review. As is evident from the self-evaluation report the IMR has shifted away from publication in books, chapters and C-journals, and has moved up to publication of papers in B- and A-journals. The committee lauds the efforts of the IMR in trying to catch up and move into a different league.

None the less, the committee also thinks that the IMR publication strategy is not good enough. In an environment that is very competitive and moving forward very rapidly, the IMR urgently has to take its strategy to the next level. The committee finds that the current classification of journals does not create real incentives for international quality oriented publishing. Further encouragement, and even incentives, to publish in the top-ranked journals (i.e. the upper e.g. 5% instead of the upper 25%) appear needed.

Furthermore, it is the opinion of the committee that the IMR has not yet resolved the balance between the disciplinary and multidisciplinary perspective when it comes to its publication strategy. In the eyes of the committee, the IMR has thus far failed to translate its multidisciplinary strategy into an appropriate publication strategy and criteria for publication. This includes lobbying outside, to enable multidisciplinary research to become more widely accepted in the more mono-disciplinarily oriented top journals.

### 2.5 PhD Training

The committee learnt during the site visit that PhD training and supervision is one of the focal points of the IMR strategy. In order to improve the performance of the PhD programme, reduce the average duration of the PhD and improve completion rates in the period under consideration for this assessment several steps have been taken.
Every new PhD student has to discuss a ‘training and guidance’ plan within six weeks after starting the programme. Next, the Scientific Advisory Committee takes a formal role in assessing the progress of all PhD projects after the first nine months, after which a decision is made on continuation. This rule will be extended to all external PhD students, ensuring that they will be evaluated after the first 18 months of their trajectory. During the site visit the committee learnt that the publication strategy of PhD students is part of this initial assessment. PhD students have to indicate whether their PhD will take the form of a monograph or several articles in peer-reviewed journals. Moreover, they have to defend their choices of journals in which to publish.

Since 2010, in many cases, internal PhD candidates are supervised by at least two supervisors, from different disciplines. They formally assess progress on an annual basis. A PhD network has been initiated by the PhD students themselves and since 2011 IMR PhD days are organised twice a year.

In 2010 the IMR launched a basic, one-year training programme for external PhD students, which thus far has been limited to PhD students with research topics related to the thematic platform of ResOrg. In 2012, the IMR Doctoral School was launched, which organises courses in methodology and academic writing, the PhD research days, introduction days and exit interviews.

The SER has provided the committee with data on the success rate of its internal PhD candidates. Discontinuation of PhD projects mostly happens in the first year and is lower than the national average, which is at about 25%. Still, the proportion of PhD candidates completing their project within five or six years is small, although increasing compared to the period 2001-2006.

During the site visit, the PhD students told the committee they are very happy with the support and environment offered to them and conveyed a lot of positive energy. They expressed that they were in charge of their own project, with supervisors in an appropriate advisory role, important in becoming an independent researcher. They moreover seemed comfortable in the multidisciplinary organisation and knew who to turn to with their questions. They were appreciative of the flexibility offered to them and were happy with their teaching load.

Assessment/remarks
The committee approves of the way PhD students are introduced, trained, supervised and allowed their own organisation. The committee found ample proof of the fact that the students are benefitting from the open, multidisciplinary research environment the IMR is currently
offering them. IMR PhD students showed exceptional levels of enthusiasm. The committee thinks the openness of the supervision will eventually pay off to the IMR research community.

Still, this open system also carries a possible trade-off when it comes to timely completion of the PhD. Although during the evaluation period there has been an improvement when it comes to completion rates, there is a clear need for further enhancement, as is the case for the Netherlands as a whole. The committee believes that the whole process could be more effective, and could be better managed as PhD students are still losing time, especially at the beginning of their project.

**2.6 Societal relevance**

In the self-assessment report, the IMR reports on its societal relevance using the three categories suggested by VSNU: people, collaboration, and output.

With regard to people, the IMR states it contributes in a variety of ways to the societal agenda. IMR researchers are all involved to some degree in teaching and often have students involved in their research. The training of PhD candidates also is an important aspect of this. Moreover, several IMR researchers hold important advisory functions outside academia, an involvement the IMR actively stimulates.

With respect to collaboration, IMR researchers collaborate frequently with stakeholders from industry and institutions in addressing societal issues. The proportion of project-based collaboration in IMR funding increased over the evaluation period. Also, the hotspots conduct research with societal impact and in interaction with societal partners. The appointment of a series of endowed professors whose main work lies outside the IMR also demonstrates the link between research and society at the IMR.

In terms of media exposure and professional publications (‘output’) the committee took note of the fact that there is a large media presence and input in societal debates. Also, regular publishing in professional journals remains a goal, next to academic publications.

**Assessment/remarks**

It is the opinion of the committee that the IMR is especially well positioned in terms of societal relevance, with staff publishing in professional journals, involved in various academies (both academic and professional), and organising conferences involving a range of stakeholders. The IMR moreover has a large share of contract research in the total funding and multidisciplinary research on societal challenges both nationally and internationally. Attracting the attention of stakeholders through the hotspots will contribute even further to IMR’s societal
relevance. The impression is one of a vital, lively research culture, which engages in many ways with various stakeholders through varied and stimulating activities.

2.7 Vitality and feasibility

The committee learnt that in the future, the IMR aims to continue in the direction set out above (2.1. to 2.6.), moving its strategy further in some respects.

The IMR wants to further enhance its multidisciplinary profile by strengthening the hotspots and platforms. During the site visit, the committee learnt that whereas the IMR platforms are seen as change tools (see 2.2.), the hotspots are regarded as the research programmes of the future. The committee learnt that the Faculty Board will take these research foci into account when hiring new researchers or when evaluating PhD proposals.

The IMR wants to further facilitate individual researchers developing proposals for research grants. The IMR aims to submit more, and potentially more successful, grant proposals by professionalising grant-writing skills, better organisation of internal peer review, and systematic learning from (un)successful submissions.

Improving the international reputation of the IMR is seen as another focal point for the future. Involvement of IMR researchers in committees that set the research agenda of large funding schemes (NWO, Horizon 2020) is high on the agenda. Academic and societal relevance of the IMR are to be more structurally improved by strengthening national networks and increasing substantial institutional cooperation with international research partners. The Executive Board of the University has moreover invited the IMR to come up with proposals to attract top researchers with the support of the University.

The IMR continues to believe that being a renowned multidisciplinary research institute requires disciplinary excellence. The IMR wants to invest more structurally in postdoc positions to further attract and keep talented researchers and to strengthen its international network.

With regard to the IMR strategy the committee was ultimately left with the question of what is the end goal of the IMR. During the discussions the committee learnt that the idea is to consolidate towards a multidisciplinary institute of management research rather than using the multidisciplinary approach to leverage the IMR back into disciplinary prominence.
Assessment/remarks
The site visit made clear to the committee that from a research management point of view, the creation of an open structure has been very effective in revitalising the research community and bringing researchers together. The sequence of opening up, creating tools for collaboration and then stimulating the IMR strongholds seems to have been a very good strategy in terms of feasibility and was, according to the committee, a reasonable response to the issues facing the IMR. Also, the committee found the IMR to be robust in the sense that it is well funded, has qualified staff, and an overall image that looks promising.

The committee appreciates that many initiatives have been set in motion in recent years, some of which have not yet had the expected result, due to a time-lag effect. Therefore, it is difficult to see now whether the strategy has had a measurable impact. According to the committee the most immediate tangible effect of the strategy is in the quality of the PhD students (see 2.5.) and the perceived vitality of the research community.

However, the IMR is moving forward in a very competitive environment and in order to maintain or improve its position, the IMR has to look forward and be critical about the next phase. In order to avoid a hybrid strategy and profile that does not lead to the desired increased output in terms of quality and quantity the committee recommends that the transition process is now brought to its conclusion. The committee approves of the direction chosen by the IMR to go further towards achieving multidisciplinary excellence, as this is the locus of the IMR’s critical mass rather than in its constituent disciplines, where the capacity is rather limited. Hence, the way back to monodisciplinarity prominence is far from easy. Making this choice involves, of course, an important trade-off. The more strongly the IMR develops its multidisciplinary profile, and the more its resource policy is geared towards reaching this goal, the more difficult it will become to flourish in individual disciplines.

The IMR must ensure that the strategy does in fact lead to measurable effects, like high-level publications. Therefore, the IMR will have to be more explicit on how the chosen strategy is going to be implemented, controlled and measured. This implies making adequate choices on the locus of responsibility and accountability (see also 2.2. and 2.3.) and developing a multidisciplinary publication strategy (see also 2.4.).

2.8 Recommendations for the Institute
Following its evaluation of the IMR, the committee recommends that the institute
1. makes a clear choice for multidisciplinarity and tries to achieve excellence in this respect;
2. develops a publication strategy that embraces this multidisciplinarity, aiming to (a) excel in multidisciplinary journals and (b) at the same time publish in top tier generic journals open to multidisciplinary research;

3. rethinks its motto ‘creating knowledge for society’ as this does not convey the IMR’s particular identity. ‘Co-creating knowledge for better governance’ would be more accurate according to the committee;

4. continues its strategy of fostering an open research community by providing opportunities for researchers to have creative meetings. Although the platforms have been instrumental in creating the current open culture of the IMR, the committee recommends that IMR considers new tools and strategies to guide the institute through its next phase of transition;

5. improves its earning capacity in general and its ability to attract research grants in particular by implementing an internal review of proposals institute-wide, based on the good practices in the hotspots;

6. continues the matching of externally acquired funding for PhD grants as this is a good incentive to apply for external funding;

7. strengthens its international networks to serve two main goals: co-operation for international research programmes and career development of staff;

8. further invests in a visiting faculty programme;

9. improves its website dramatically in order to increase its visibility.
3 Assessments per theme

The committee carried out an assessment at the level of the departments, as defined by the IMR (see 1.3.).

Comments that are applicable to all departments have been made in Chapter 2 (Assessment of the Institute) and are not repeated below.
3.1 Department of Business Administration

Speaker: Professor Van Kranenburg (since 2011)
         Professor Vennix (until 2011)

Academic staff in [Year]: 30.2 fte
Assessment: Quality : 4
              Productivity : 4

Objectives and research activities

Researchers in the Business Administration department address the need to transform business organisations towards ‘the creation of value in multiple dimensions’, i.e., towards a focus that is broader than the creation of financial or economic value alone. They make a fundamental contribution to theories about decision-making, organisational change, multiple value creation, stakeholder relationships, innovation and diversity management. The department is very active in the development and application of participatory research methods.

The department of Business Administration went through a fundamental reorganisation in 2008-2011 as its three separate research programmes were merged into one. New chairs were appointed in Marketing, Strategic Human Resource Management, and Organizational Design and Development. The other chairs in the department are in Research Methods, Corporate Strategy, and Innovation Management.

The committee is pleased to see the strong strategic commitment to enhancing research quality and leadership in the Department of Business Administration, as is evidenced by the department’s appointment of a number of full professors and endowed professors during the evaluation period. The research capacity has declined slightly from 31.5 FTEs in 2007 to 30.2 FTEs in 2012. Although the non-tenured staff decreased from 4.7 FTEs in 2007 to 1.9 FTEs in 2012, due to the reorganisation, the department was able to keep its research capacity relatively stable by investing in tenured staff. The number of internal PhD candidates remained stable at an average of 8.6 FTEs. This commitment will, according to the committee, also reflect well on the doctoral programme and success rates in the long run.

The department seems to be gradually improving its performance with regard to earning capacity. Contract research rose from 446.000 euro in 2007 to 692.000 euro in 2012. Whereas the department had no money coming in from research grants in 2007, this has risen to 122.000 euro in 2012. Nevertheless, the committee noted that research grants still only account for 5% of the total funding of the department.
Quality
The key publications that were read by the committee members reflect excellent quality in terms of proportion of publications in A-ranked journals and the content of the individual papers themselves. Most papers reflect strong conceptual contributions and empirical work, many with sophisticated research design. The committee found some of the articles to be of quality that is world-leading in terms of originality, significance and rigour, other of quality that is internationally excellent in terms of originality, significance and rigour but which falls short of the highest standards of excellence.

The department performs well on research esteem as is evidenced by the list of awards in the SER and the listed keynote and invited seminar contributions of various members of staff. Staff also hold associate editorships in well regarded international journals and are members of the editorial boards of some top ranked international journals. Many staff are members of professional associations or academies and are active in organising conferences. Noteworthy is also that staff of this department are directly involved in some of IMR’s most active research platforms (ResOrg) and at least one of the awarded research hotspots (’Gender and Power in Politics and Management’).

Productivity
During the evaluation period the research output of the department has increased with the academic productivity rate (academic publications/fte) increasing from 3.2 (2007) to 4.5 (2012). This is primarily explained by an increase in the number of journal articles in refereed journals, as of 2010. The number of PhD theses is 5 to 6 per annum.

Conclusions and recommendations for the programme
The committee applauds the progress the department of Business Administration has made since its major reorganisation in 2008-2011. The department has been adequately restructured which has led to considerable progress both in terms of quantity and quality of its output. The department has also aligned its activities to the policy of the IMR. Nevertheless, the department is still catching up with the competition, especially with regard to attracting research grants and increasing the share of publication output in the top tier journals.

---

1 The committee has set three international peer reviewed journal articles per FTE tenured research staff per year as the minimum requirement to award a four for productivity. In evaluating against this quantitative benchmark, the committee has also taken into account the quality of the journals the articles appeared in. Other products – chapters and professional publications -help in compensating if below that line. With regard to PhD defenses, a four is granted if a department is at least close to one PhD defense per one full time chair. This benchmark applies to all departments.
### 3.2 Department of Economics and Business Economics

**Speaker:** Prof. Weitzel (since 2012)  
Prof. Sent (until 2012)

**Academic staff in 2012:** 11.5 fte

**Assessment:**
- Quality: 3
- Productivity: 3

---

**Objectives and research activities**

Research in the Department of Economics and Business Economics covers a broad range of topics in economics and accounting. In general, the department has a strong behavioural focus as is apparent in its research on the historical roots of behavioural economics, on behavioural decision making in individual investment decisions and in financial markets, behavioural aspects of accounting, and cultural explanations of macro-economic phenomena such as the European sovereign debt crisis. Much of the research in the department makes use of experiments, in some cases in collaboration with the University's Donders Institute for Brain, Cognition and Behaviour.


**Quality**

The Department of Economics and Business Economics is the smallest of the four departments of the IMR. The research capacity of tenured staff has decreased in the period under consideration from 8.5 FTEs in 2007 to 7.4 FTEs in 2012 due to a high level of vacancies and the difficulty to attract staff of high quality for these vacancies. Non-tenured staff fluctuated between 0 and 0.8 FTEs. The number of internal PhD candidates first decreased from 5.2 (2007) to 1.7 FTEs (2010) and has since 2010 increased again to a level of 4.1 FTEs in 2012.

The department became more dependent on direct funding during the evaluation period, while the amount of actually allocated direct funding decreased slightly. The department was relatively successful in attracting research grants in the first part of the evaluation period, but since then the proportion of research grants decreased considerably from 28% (2007) to 2% (2012). Contract research funding remained stable at between 2% and 6%.

During the site visit, the committee learnt that the difficulties in attracting external funding can for a large part be attributed to the lack of manpower the department has been dealing with in
recent years. With the support of the IMR and the new people that have been attracted, the department hopes to improve its achievement on this level.

The key publications that were read by the committee members were mostly of an applied nature using either experiments or econometric methods to analyse a broad variety of economic and business-oriented questions. Several of the publications are in journals outside of the core of their respective discipline highlighting the move this department is making towards multidisciplinary research. This, however, comes at a price. Within their still relatively mono-disciplinary disciplines it is not easy to publish in what are considered to be the top-tier journals. Overall, the publications of this department are internationally visible and likely to contribute to specific research areas without, however, being at the forefront.

**Productivity**

The committee learnt that the research output of the Department of Economics and Business Economics remained stable during the evaluation period, despite the decline in research capacity.

The number of journal articles is, corrected for the small size of this department and relative to the other departments at IMR, good. The work is also cited and internationally recognised, albeit none of the researchers can be considered leaders in their respective fields when looking at different international publication and citation rankings.

The committee is of the opinion that the departments' peer groups focus more on top tier generic A-journals, whereas the department of Economics and Business Economics of the IMR concentrates more on publications in specialised academic journals, which are not considered top-tier.

**Conclusions and recommendations for the programme**

The committee finds the quality of the output and productivity levels of the department to be respectable, given its size. Still, the research of the department lacks visibility, partly due to the relative size of the department. Also, the current level of external funding (either via research grants or contract research) appears disappointing. All in all, the department of Economics and Business Economics lacks the critical size to be able to compete with regards to quantity and quality of output with their (international) peers within the discipline. Given the size of the department, the committee is of the opinion that the way back to disciplinary prominence is too far, especially considering the size of the competing departments.
The committee finds the department of Economics and Business Economics moreover to be constituted of several tight-knit, small groups that content-wise are quite distant from each other and may even be more related to themes in other departments and the IMR platforms. The committee thinks that the Economics and Business Economics research may have better opportunities in linking up with other departments in the platforms to reach the critical mass necessary for the production of more and better output. The committee is pleased to see that some of the researchers are already doing this, as is apparent from the active involvement of the departments’ chairs and researchers in the platforms and the planned hotspots. The committee thinks this is all the more important as there is a need for economists in a management institute and it is therefore crucial that the economists find a place in the new structure.
3.3 Department of Public Administration and Political Science

Speaker:  Prof. Wissenburg (since 2011)
          Prof. Lieshout (until 2011)

Academic staff in 2012: 24.8 fte
Assessment: Quality : 3-4
              Productivity: 3-4

Objectives and research activities

Researchers in the Department of Public Administration and Political Science study and develop theories about the impact of globalisation and state-market-civil society arrangements on social, economic and political conflicts. They focus on a range of societal systems, actors and their mutual interactions on and across transnational, national and local levels. The research in the department is committed to classical and fundamental research themes, but also addresses complex topical issues such as new forms of participation and welfare state reforms. As to methods, staff conduct comparative research, develop unique datasets and combine and confront theory driven, normative and empirical research of a quantitative and qualitative nature.

The Department of Public Administration and Political Science is built upon two chairs: the chair of Political Science and the chair of Public Administration, including (in 2012) in total seven professorships next to three endowed professors.

The committee found that the department is very heterogeneous in scope, ambition, publication culture and commitment to the multidisciplinary strategy of the IMR.

Quality

There has been a steady growth of research staff capacity, with tenured staff increasing from 7.4 FTEs in 2007 to 11.6 FTEs in 2012, while non-tenured staff increased from 0.9 FTEs in 2010 to 4.0 FTEs to 2012. The most rapid growth was in the number of PhD students, mainly due to the multidisciplinary PhD position awarded by the Faculty Board and obtaining of NWO- and FP7-grants. According to the committee, the award of multidisciplinary PhD positions, the NWO/FP7-research grants and the integration of the Centre for International Conflict Analysis and Management all reflect significant gains for the department in terms of prestige and influx of research capacity.

The committee is pleased to see that the earning capacity of the department is clearly improving, as is evident from the following data. During the evaluation period the number of
students in the department increased, which had a positive effect on direct funding. Still, the proportion of direct funding in the total funding has decreased from 65% in 2007 to 47% in 2012. The amount of resources coming in from research grants has been steadily rising from 229,000 euro in 2007 to 407,000 euro in 2012. Nevertheless the proportion of grants has remained more or less stable and is at 24% in 2012. Contract research stands for 29% of income in 2012 (11% in 2007) and has increased considerably from 103,000 euro to 488,000 euro.

The key publications that were read by the committee members contain some strong publications in top-ranked journals, and the papers show theoretical depth and empirical rigour. The committee found some of the articles to be of quality that is world-leading in terms of originality, significance and rigour, and other of quality that is internationally competitive in terms of originality, significance and rigour but which falls short of the highest standards of excellence.

In terms of research esteem, staff have received a number of awards from journals and associations, and are members of several editorial boards. The department appears strong in terms of societal relevance with a number of collaborations with non-academic partners, involvement in advisory boards, a large proportion of professional publications, and rising share of contract research income.

**Productivity**

In terms of productivity, the overall productivity ratio clearly indicates that there is an upward trend since 2008. The full list of publications provided in the SER shows significant quantity in both English and Dutch language publications. Still, the proportion of A-ranked journals overall is low (an average of 17% of all outputs). The committee also noted that the number of doctoral awards is lower than in other departments (an average of 1.7 between 2007-2012 compared to 4.5 in the Geography, Planning and Environment Department, which has a comparable size).

The committee did not find researchers of the department to sufficiently aim for the more generic top-ranked journals. It is the opinion of the committee that there should be more incentives to aim for the top journals, as the quality of individual papers is good. This issue was raised during the site visit and it was learnt that changing the publication culture is an ongoing challenge. The committee appreciates some of the initiatives being taken, like the financing of the editing of English articles to be submitted in top journals.
According to the committee, the need to change the publication culture applies to the whole department, but is most urgent for the International Relations researchers, whose output is primarily in chapters in edited books with limited international visibility and is very insular.

**Conclusions and recommendations for the programme**

The committee found the Department of Public Administration and Political Science to be very heterogeneous, on the one hand with regard to the quantity and quality of its output, and on the other hand concerning the alignment with the IMR strategy. According to the committee, three groups can be distinguished.

The researchers in Public Administration are publishing in high quality journals, have clear linkages with the other units of the IMR, and are committed to the multidisciplinary strategy of the IMR.

The researchers in Comparative/European Politics recognise that they have to improve the quality of their output by aiming more for top-ranked A-journals. They are however contributing to the new IMR structure in the hotspot on ‘Europeanization of Policy and Law’ and the DisCon-platform, and therefore the committee trusts that the upward movement regarding quality will have a good potential to be brought to the next level.

The committee learnt from its discussions with the International Relations researchers that they have little recognition of the IMR’s new strategy and of the need to converge to this strategy. Also, speaking with members of other departments within IMR, the International Relations researchers - in contrast to members of the Public Administration and Comparative/European groups of the chair of Political Science - were not mentioned as either active or prospective partners in cooperative research activities.

The researchers in International Relations thus seem less open to cooperation with the emerging interdisciplinary strategy of the Institute. This will likely restrict this group’s contribution to the emerging research strategy of the institute. Moreover, the International Relations group is not especially visible internationally given a seemingly over-strong commitment to publishing chapters in edited books and niche-journals. This limits achieving real prominence as a stand-alone mono-disciplinary unit. In the committee’s view, the future of the international relations group is likely to find more success by more actively committing to the overall interdisciplinary focus of the Institute.
3.4 Department of Geography, Planning and Environment

Speaker: Prof. Leroy (since 2011)  
Prof. Van der Heijden (until 2011)

Academic staff in 2012: 29.8 fte
Assessment: Quality: 4  
Productivity: 4

Objectives and research activities

Researchers in the Geography, Planning and Environment department study processes of changing (social, economic and environmental) meanings of places for individuals, communities and states, and their consequences for territorial governance. Researchers in the department aim to improve the understanding of frictions between territorial governance structures on the one hand, and the seemingly autonomous social, economic and environmental processes in space on the other. In doing so, they focus on a variety of themes: transnationalism and borders, migration and development, regional governance, transport and spatial development, water management, environmental governance, and land policy and location development.

The department is built upon three chairs: the chair of Social and Political Sciences of the Environment, the chair of Human Geography and the chair of Urban and Regional Planning.

Quality

The tenured staff of the department stayed stable over the evaluation period (8.9 FTE in 2012). The non-tenured staff decreased significantly in the first half of the evaluation period, but has risen again to 5.2 FTE in 2012 due to the appointment of several new postdocs. The number of PhD candidates increased as a result of successful grant applications and the decision of the IMR to allocate new multidisciplinary PhD positions in 2011 and 2012. In 2012, the department counted 15.7 PhD students, making it the only department where the number of PhD candidates outnumbers the tenured research capacity in full-time equivalents.

The committee finds the department to be well organised and to stand out from the other departments of the IMR in their very successful efforts to acquiring research grant funding both nationally and internationally. The department is more able than the others to profit from current trends in the funding of more applied and multidisciplinary research. Fifty-four percent of its research funding comes from contract research (62% in 2007), 23% from research grants (still at 11% in 2007) and 24% comes from direct funding (stable over the evaluation period).
period). The committee finds the successful application for the FP7-programme particularly noteworthy.

The key publications read by the committee cover a wide range of areas and showed excellence in each of these. A common focus is the theoretical contribution to the literature on territorial governance through publications in high-ranking journals in the field. The researchers have a keen eye for (the application of) emerging concepts in the study of land-use, water- and transportation management, making their contributions original and significant to a worldwide audience of fellow academics. In this respect the research is nationally leading and highly competitive internationally.

Societal relevance is clear from a substantial number of professional publications, a large share of contract research in the total funding and the multidisciplinary research on societal challenges both nationally and internationally. The editorship of Regional Studies is a clear token of recognition by international peers.

**Productivity**

The committee took note of the fact that the publications of the department show a tendency to appear in the better ranking journals. The share of publications in A-journals of the department is at 40% in the period 2010-2012 (25% in 2007-2009), meaning that the share of publications in A-journals is the highest of all departments of the IMR. The productivity has not increased between these periods and should be considered average by both national and international standards for the disciplines.

The numbers of PhD defences has been fluctuating over the last few years (4.5 per annum on average during the evaluation period), but is in line with expectations considering the presence of four full-time chairs in the department. The higher influx of PhD students will contribute to a rise in productivity in the near future.

During the site visit, the committee learnt that the department however hopes to improve its productivity as a result of the new PhD students starting to publish and successfully defending their PhD. It is the policy of the department to target their publications towards the best journals, rather than to publish as much as possible.


Conclusions and recommendations for the programme

The committee appreciates that the department of Geography, Planning and Environment has been able to keep the quality and quantity of their research at the same level as the last evaluation. The department has a good, focused leadership, and has a solid sense of where it is heading. The committee found ample evidence of the stability of the programmes, the coherence of the department and its strength within the larger institute. The committee clearly found that the department has performed well with respect to the policy of the larger institution.

The committee saw that the department is still at the same relative position it was in 2007. In order to be able to keep up with the competition in future years, the committee recommends that the output of the department should be improved to the next level.
4. Response of the institute

IMR staff and management thank the review committee for a thorough and constructive assessment of the performance of the Institute. As the review committee acknowledged, many improvements have been realized due to changes in the Faculty’s research policy during the assessment period 2007-2012. Since the mid-term evaluation in 2009, we have chosen to develop the IMR into a top-level multidisciplinary research institute, focusing on complex societal challenges, and consequently to strengthen the focus on multidisciplinary collaboration across the borders of the various research groups in the institute as well as within the University. We are very pleased that the review committee fully supports our strategy in this respect. The scores for the institute have improved to a level close to an average of 4. It is clear to us that further improvements are required to continue adapting to the rapidly changing environment. We continued to implement new structures and research policy instruments since the assessment period, and aim to bring the organization to a next level of robustness by the midst of 2014. Suggestions made by the committee regarding improvements at the level of departments will be discussed separately with the departments and are translated into operational agreements.

Vitality of the Institute

The committee underlines that due to severe global competition each of the disciplinary research groups is too small to reach the world top. The committee also clearly stresses that raising the position of the IMR to a top-level research institute requires more mass and bundling of forces across the borders of different IMR research groups. We consider the creation of an attractive and lively research environment a crucial condition for sustainable top-level research. The review committee confirms this view, but noticed that the transition process had not yet finished by the end of 2012. Based on the developments in 2013 and 2014, we trust that the realization of improvements regarding collaboration, scientific debate, acquisition initiatives and quality of output are no incidents, but signs of a new and robust way of working. Nonetheless, we understand that the committee attached a score 3-4 for vitality, mainly because it takes time to demonstrate that the followed strategy is indeed effective. We strongly believe that the further integration of the institute, an increased identification of researchers with the institute, and strong multidisciplinary collaboration in our research organization are crucial for its vitality. Measures are or will be taken to strengthen various structural aspects:

1. Integration of the three research platform agenda’s into a coordinated approach for stimulating the academic climate within the IMR, including one IMR-wide agenda with academic events and seminars.
2. Before Summer 2014, we will further concentrate our research into five or six Multidisciplinary Research Programs (a.k.a. 'Hotspots'), two of which already have a formal status since 2013. These programs build upon past performance of IMR's research groups.

3. The organizational structure of the faculty, which embeds research and education, is stable, and widely accepted. As suggested by the committee, we will fine-tune budgetary and personnel responsibilities within our research structure, based on a critical review of changing needs.

4. Implementing agreements with each department as of mid-2014 aimed at increasing the commitment of departments to the IMR strategy (involvement in and leadership of Multidisciplinary Research Programs, alignment of publication strategy and acquisition initiatives - notably grants - and a reallocation of resources - notably research time - to IMR initiatives). A first agreement was made in April 2014 with the Economics department to strengthen the teaching and research capacity and the research focus of this department. Implementation has started in 2014.

Effectively and efficiently educating PhD candidates is an important task of the IMR. The IMR commits itself to the further professionalization of the IMR Doctoral School and its activities, and to developing it as a healthy integration mechanism in the Institute. We intend to further increase the number, quality and focus of PhD candidates, by:

a. Increasing support to members of staff on obtaining (NWO-EU) funding for PhD positions.

b. Increasing the quality and amount of support for PhD Supervisors.

c. Introducing career development initiatives.

d. Further integrating external PhD candidates into the IMR Doctoral School. To that end, a set of guidelines to guarantee the quality, involvement and training of these external PhDs has been formulated in early 2014.

e. Increasing the international experience of our PhD candidates.

f. Preparing for a multidisciplinary Research Master.

Societal Relevance

We are pleased that the committee assessed the societal relevance of our research as internationally competitive. The IMR's multidisciplinary approach, reflected in our Multidisciplinary Research Programs, is making our research more relevant for society. To further increase its impact we are committed to continue improving the interaction between society and our researchers by:

1. Introducing a series of workshops focusing on the interface between science and society.

2. Publishing in the most effective media for our stakeholders.
3. Further increasing involvement of societal actors in the design and acquisition of research projects.
4. Stimulating the co-creation of societal value by further increasing participation in societal debates and in advisory committees and boards.

Research Quality
The committee clearly confirms that the policy that has been implemented in the past years has created an open research atmosphere in the institute, with more opportunities for encounters across the research groups, with significantly increased dynamics regarding initiatives for acquisition and with a stronger feel for quality improvement. We take further measures to enhance the quality of our publications and implement a stronger, in particular grant-oriented, acquisition policy:
1. According to planning, the output classification system is critically reviewed in early 2014 and will be updated in 2014 with the aim to sharpen the IMR publication strategy.
2. The IMR will appoint an International Advisory Board to obtain regular feedback and suggestions for improvement.
3. Since the end of 2013, special support staff has been appointed with the aim to further initiate and support external funding proposals for talent development as well as the coordination and support of participation in international research consortia.

Visibility
The IMR is a unique multidisciplinary research institute, which creates unique and highly relevant knowledge. We are committed to increasing the international visibility of our researchers and research output. A number of measures are or will be taken:
1. Early 2014 a project has been initiated, in collaboration with external experts, to improve the structure and content of the faculty’s website. Implementation will start before summer 2014. Notably IMR’s researchers and the Multidisciplinary Research Programs will be better shown.
2. The aim is to further refine the IMR’s motto and the positioning of the institute as a whole.
3. Institutional cooperation with selected international peer institutes will be intensified.

Conclusion
The assessment report gives valuable support to our strategy and the realization of positive trends so far, while it also urges to realize further improvements. We are confident that these will be realized and evidenced in the mid-term evaluation (2013-2015).

Prof. Rob van der Heijden (Dean)
Prof. Allard van Riel (Vice-Dean / Director IMR)
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Dora Scholarios is Professor of Work Psychology at University of Strathclyde Business School in Glasgow, Scotland. She was Associate Dean for Postgraduate Research from 2010-2013 and is currently Deputy Head of Department for Human Resource Management. Her research activity spans several areas of work psychology and HRM/organisational behaviour, including recruitment, assessment and selection, skills and employability, HRM and wellbeing, and work-life boundaries. She is Associate Editor of Human Resource Management Journal and on the Editorial Boards of the Journal of Management Studies, Work, Employment and Society, and New Technology, Work and Employment. She has published widely in psychology and management journals as well as receiving research funding from international and national UK research bodies.

Prof.dr. Jan-Egbert Sturm

Jan-Egbert Sturm is Professor of Applied Macroeconomics as well as Director of the KOF Swiss Economic Institute at the ETH Zurich. He was researcher at the University of Groningen, The Netherlands, until 2001, and has held positions at the School of Business, Bond University, Gold Coast, Australia; at the University of Munich (LMU), Austria; the University of Konstanz, Germany; and the Thurgau Institute of Economics (TWI) in Kreuzlingen, Switzerland, 2003-2005. He has been Research Professor at the Ifo Institute since 2003. In 2005 he was appointed to the European Economic Advisory Group of the CESifo. At the beginning of 2007, he became President of the Centre for International Research on Economic Tendency Surveys (CIRET). Starting 2013 he is editor of the European Journal of Political Economy. Currently he is member of several advisory commissions in Switzerland.
## Appendix 2  Programme of the site visit

### 23 October 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>Kick-off meeting with chair and secretary of the committee, and Dr. C. Mollema, Policy Advisor Strategy and Development Radboud University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.45</td>
<td>Welcome to the committee by Prof. dr. ir. R.E.C.M. van der Heijden, Dean; Prof. dr. A.C.R. van Riel, Vice-dean of Research / Director of the IMR; and Dr. C. Mollema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>Preparation of the site visit (committee only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>Dinner (committee only)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 24 October 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08.30</td>
<td>Welcome and introduction Radboud University and IMR by J.J.A. van de Riet MSc, Secretary General of the Executive Board Radboud University; Prof. R. van der Heijden; Prof. Van Riel; Dr. Mollema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.00</td>
<td>Interview Prof. Leroy and Prof. Lagendijk, chairs Department Geography, Planning and Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.25</td>
<td>Interview Prof. Weitzel and Prof. Vosselman, chairs Economics and Business Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.50</td>
<td>Interview Prof. Van Kranenburg and Prof. Lauche, chairs Business Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>Interview Prof. Wissenburg and Prof. Van Thiel, chairs Political Science and Public Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>Break/writing (committee only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>Interview Prof. De Jong, platform manager DisCon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>Interview Prof. B. van der Heijden, platform manager ResOrg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>Interview Prof. Ernste, platform manager SCAPEs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.15</td>
<td>Writing/evaluation/reading (committee only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>Lunch and interview with PhD students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.15</td>
<td>Tour of Decision lab and Visa skills lab (Dr. Rouwette and Dr. Qiu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>Interview research support and quality management with Prof. Van Riel, R.F.M. Vermeulen MSc, Head of the department ICR: Internationalization, Communication &amp; Research Support; Prof. Brandsen, Chair Scientific Advisory Committee; Dr. Meijerink, Member Scientific Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>Interview with Prof. Benschop, coordinator hotspot 'Gender and Power in Politics and Management', and Prof. Leyenaar and Dr. Van den Brink, principal investigators of the hotspot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>Interview Faculty Board with Prof. R. van der Heijden, Prof. Van Riel and Dr. Van der Vleuten, vice-dean of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.15</td>
<td>Writing/evaluation (committee only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>Dinner (committee only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>25 October 2013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.00</td>
<td>Review of research evidence (committee only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.30</td>
<td>Interview Dr. Mastenbroek, coordinator hotspot EUROPAL, and Dr. Anderson and Dr. Liefferink, principal investigators of the hotspot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>Break/writing (committee only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>Interview Faculty Board with Prof. R. van der Heijden and Prof. Van Riel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>Break/evaluation/writing (committee only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.45</td>
<td>Lunch (committee only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>Brief presentation of preliminary conclusions for institute staff and Executive Board Radboud University representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>Drinks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>