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Preface

This report presents the findings of the evaluation of the research quality of the Institute for Management Research (IMR) of Radboud University over the past six years (2013 – 2019). The evaluation was carried out by a Committee consisting of five professors from leading universities with expertise spanning the range of subfields and activities undertaken in IMR. I am indebted to Prof. Blotevogel, Prof. em. Davis, Prof. Janssens and Prof. Pierre for their hard work and cooperative spirit throughout the evaluation process. Also special thanks to the Secretary of the review, Jetje De Groof. Dr. De Groof provided tenacious and exemplary support to the Assessment Committee and in particular to its Chair, as well as maintaining an excellent time-management and set of minutes, which were invaluable in the preparation of this report.

The Committee's work was greatly aided by the excellent set of materials that were provided to us by IMR in advance of the review visit. During the visit itself, we benefited from excellent presentations and honest discussions with the directors, staff, PhD candidates, and researchers. Together, these provided the Committee with the documentation and information needed for its work, and enabled it to optimize use of the relatively limited contact time available. We would like to extend a special thanks to the institute staff who accommodated us by making us feel at home during the three days at the Elinor Ostrom Building.

The goal of this assessment was to offer an objective external evaluation of the quality of research of IMR. As will become apparent, our assessment of activities in all of the Departments and other areas of the Institute is very positive.

We congratulate the Institute with the progress it is making. Thanks to the clear engagement of the staff and the management of the Institute, important steps have been taken since the previous assessment in 2013. Notwithstanding this overall enthusiastic assessment, the Assessment Committee also presents critical findings and recommendations which we hope to prove helpful to IMR to develop strategic plans for the coming years.

February 2020
Prof. Patrick Kenis
1. Introduction

1.1 The Netherlands System of Quality Assessment of Research
An external committee of peers evaluated the research quality of the Institute for Management Research (IMR) of Radboud University during a site visit in November 2019 and reports its findings in this document.

This quality assessment (peer review) is part of the assessment system for all publicly funded Dutch research organizations, as organized by the Association of Universities in the Netherlands (VSNU), the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW) and the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO).

The aims of this assessment system are: (1) improvement of research quality, and (2) accountability to the board of the research organization, and towards funding agencies, government and society at large. The assessment takes place at the level of research institutes and research programmes within the institutes. The site visit to each institute by an external committee, once every six years, is an essential part of the assessment system. A committee of peers is appointed and asked to review the research. Important elements of the site visit are the interviews the evaluation committee conducts with the management, the institute's director and the heads of the departments, as well as with PhD candidates, postdoctoral researchers and junior staff members.

1.2 The Members of the Evaluation Committee
The Evaluation Committee consisted of:

Prof. Patrick Kenis (Tilburg University, The Netherlands),
Chair Prof. Hans Blotevogel (University of Vienna, Austria)
Prof. em. John B. Davis (Marquette University, US & University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands)
Prof. Maddy Janssens (KU Leuven, Belgium)
Prof. Jon Pierre (University of Gothenburg, Sweden)

Dr. Jetje De Groof (Eduflow, Antwerp, Belgium) was appointed as secretary to the Committee. A short bio of each of the members is included in Appendix 1.

All members of the Committee signed a statement of independence to ensure that they would judge without bias, personal preference or personal interest, and that their judgment is made without undue influence from persons or parties committed to the institute or programmes under review, or from other stakeholders.

1.3 Scope of the Assessment
The Executive Board of Radboud University commissioned the assessment of the Institute for Management Research (IMR). IMR is the research institute of the Nijmegen School of Management (NSM). NSM is built around seven disci-
plines, organized in four Departments: Business Administration (BA); Economics and Business Economics (EB); Geography, Planning and Environmental Studies (GPE); and Public Administration and Political Science (PA/PS). A description of the Institute can be found in section 1.2 of this report.

The Executive Board of Radboud University provided Terms of Reference (TOR) for the Committee. The assessment takes place at two levels of the research organization, i.e. the level of the Institute and the level of the Departments.

At the level of the Institute the main assessment questions regard the overall quality of research, societal relevance and viability. The Committee is asked to formulate a judgement on the Institute as a whole in qualitative terms, addressing the management and research policy activities in relation to the mission, strategy, research programming and resources of the institute.

At the level of the four Departments, the Committee is asked to provide an assessment regarding the overall quality of research, societal relevance and viability. The Committee formulates its judgement on the departments in qualitative and quantitative terms. The latter is done by assigning each of the Departments to a particular category (1, 2, 3 or 4), in accordance with the SEP guidelines.

The Committee is also requested to provide a qualitative judgement on the Hot Spots, the structures that the IMR has in place to encourage multidisciplinary research. Furthermore, the Committee is asked to assess four other aspects at the institute level: (1) PhD supervision and education, (2) policy regarding academic integrity, (3) policy regarding diversity of personnel, and (4) research facilities.

The Committee is required to operate according to the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP) for public scientific research in the Netherlands 2015-2021, which was drawn up by the KNAW, VSNU and NWO. The protocol specifies the information that must be provided to the Committee and the criteria for the research assessment.

1.4 Data provided to the Committee
Six weeks before the site visit, the Committee members received a self-evaluation report, containing the mission, vision, and ambition of the Institute and its Departments, as well as their academic results and societal impact in the period 2013-2018. Additional information was accessible on a secluded website. The Committee also received the Terms of Reference for the assessment.

During the site visit (for the programme, see Appendix 2), the Committee members were welcomed by the Rector Magnificus of Radboud University. They interviewed the director of the Institute and key representatives of the Departments and Hot Spots. They talked to IMR Research Services and representatives of the Scientific Advisory Committee and the Ethics Assessment Committee. They met with societal stakeholders of the Institute. They interviewed the Faculty Board, had a meeting with the head of the Doctoral School, and met key representatives of the IMR PhD Council and PhD candidates. Also, they received a tour of the IMR labs. Between the interviews, time was available to the Committee to discuss the various findings. At the end of the visit, the Chair verbally presented the main preliminary conclusions to the staff of IMR and the Faculty Board; the Rector Magnificus of Radboud University also attended this meeting.

After the site visit, the evaluation report was written, based on a specific template provided by Radboud University. When all Committee members had included their additions and comments, a final version was drawn up and sent to IMR for a check on factual errors. Finally, the report was delivered to the Executive Board of Radboud University.

1.5 Criteria and Assessment Scale
The Protocol requires the Evaluation Committee to assess the research on three main criteria of the Standard Evaluation Protocol:

- Research Quality (the level of the research conducted)
- Societal relevance (social, economic and cultural relevance of the research)
- Viability (strategy, governance and leadership)

The qualitative assessments are supplemented by assigning discrete categories (1-4): Excellent (1); Very good (2); Good (3); Unsatisfactory (4). The meaning of the categories in this four-point scale used in the assessment is described in the Standard Evaluation Protocol (see Appendix 4).
2. Assessment of the Institute for Management Research

Director of the Institute: Prof. dr. S. Van Thiel
Total research staff in 2018: 116.5 FTE

2.1 Mission, strategy, targets and research activities

Through the preparatory documents and the discussions during the site visit, the Committee obtained a clear view of the mission, strategy and research activities of the Institute for Management Research (IMR). A summary is given below.

IMR's mission is to study how governments, businesses, and other organizations can and do choose responsible ways to govern or manage complex problems in order to find future-proof societal solutions. IMR's mission is expressed in its research programme's title: 'Responsible Governance for Sustainable Societies'. The Institute's motto 'co-creating knowledge for society' accounts for the fact that organizations typically operate in particular contexts and cooperate with a range of stakeholders. IMR research derives its distinctive character from its focus on the combination of societal goals that concern the viability of societies specified via legitimized long-term goals of social-economic well-being ('sustainable societies') and societally acceptable ways of achieving these ('responsible governance'). Within this focus, topics under study at IMR are varied. In its self-evaluation report IMR points at the fact that its multidisciplinarity and its diversity of methodological and theoretical approaches makes IMR ideally suited for research into today's complex societal challenges. The diversity reflects a deliberate choice as IMR firmly believes that this will lead to the most interesting and productive combinations of researchers and research approaches, and hence to academic excellence and societal relevance.

Every IMR researcher belongs to one of its four Departments (see 1.3). During the site visit the Committee learned that each of the Departments formulated a research programme that is aligned with IMR's mission. For BA this is 'Responsible Organization'; EB focuses on 'Governance of Economic Behaviour'; GPE's chosen focus is 'Spatial Governance for Sustainable Development'; and PA/PS' focal point is 'Institutional Change and Legitimacy'. In addition, IMR has installed 'Hot Spots', multidisciplinary networks with temporary funding by IMR. Some IMR researchers are involved in the activities of one or more Hotspots while others are not. Currently, there are six Hot Spots: Europeanisation of Policy and Law (EUROPAL), Governance and Innovations in Social Services (GAINS), Gender and Power in Politics and Management (GENDER), Global–Local Divides and Connections (GLOCAL), Integrated Decision-Making (ID), and Innovation and Entrepreneurship in Business Ecosystems (INNOVATION).
During the review period (2013-2018) IMR has focused on five strategic targets. The first was to expand the multidisciplinary structure of IMR. Consequently, four new hotspots were created, and IMR reports that its researchers have increasingly engaged in interfaculty initiatives and collaborative projects and publications. In addition, new publication guidelines were developed and implemented, matching IMR’s multidisciplinary focus (see 2.2.1.1). The second target was to increase IMR’s research capacity through increasing the number and success rate of research grant applications (see 2.2.1.3). A third goal was improving second- and third-stream earnings. The fourth target has been to increase the number and success rate of IMR’s PhD candidates (see 2.3). And finally, the fifth target was to improve the visibility of relevance, impact and infrastructure (see 2.2.2).

2.2 Assessment of the Institute

In this section, the Committee evaluates the performance of IMR as a whole on the three criteria of research quality, relevance to society and viability. In addition, the Committee gives its evaluation of PhD supervision and education, research integrity, diversity, and research facilities as stipulated in the Terms of Reference (see 1.3.). For each of the sections, the report first provides an overview of the Committee’s observations on the basis of the preparatory documents and the site visit. Next, the Committee gives its assessment for each of the topics, based on the observations made. An overview of the Committee’s recommendations is given in section 3 of this report.

2.2.1 Research Quality

2.2.1.1 Output and academic reputation

The Committee learned from the self-evaluation report and during the site visit that the IMR introduced new guidelines for academic publications in 2015. The guidelines are considered a means to encourage IMR researchers to further improve their research quality, and to assist Chair Holders, Heads of Departments and the Faculty Board in research time allocation and research decisions. The guidelines are based on two principles. The first is ‘quality over quantity’, meaning that researchers are stimulated to publish in leading journals and with top publishers, rather than produce large numbers of publications. The second principle is multidisciplinarity, which implies that no limits are imposed on the disciplines in which researchers publish. Journal articles are awarded points based on the Article Influence percentile (AIP) score. AIP has advantages compared to the Impact Factor (IF) in assessing the quality of multidisciplinary research. IF cannot be used to compare journals from different fields or multidisciplinary journals because the IF differs significantly across research fields. Book publications get points based on the quality of the academic publisher. The IMR guideline for qualification of academic publications clearly specify Qualification rules for Academic Book publications.

The Committee learned that the new guidelines are used as the basis for calculating the publication score of each individual researcher. The guidelines stipulate that a researcher has to achieve a specified minimum score based on their research time, using the five best publications in the past five years, of which at least two must be journal articles. The starting level for the normative standard was attuned to the performance level of IMR at the time of implementation. As the aim was to gradually increase the quality of output, the normative standard increased gradually during the review period (expected API score of 1.50 in 2016; 1.75 in 2018; 2.0 in 2020), and will continue to do so in the future. Continued failure to meet the norm in principle leads to a reduction of research time, which, to date, has happened to a handful of cases (see also 2.2.1.3).

During the site visit the Committee observed that the guidelines are widely accepted by IMR scholars. Representatives from the Departments explained that they represent feasible goals that help researchers reflect on the kind of outlets they want to publish in. They stimulate portfolio building and allow scholars to go beyond the classical monodisciplinary journals. The Committee explored whether the implementation of these minimal, feasible norms has not led to a negative competitive culture. It found on the one hand that the Departments use the leeway that is offered by the publication guidelines to apply stricter criteria. An example is the Department of EB, where scholars are actively encouraged to perform at a higher level than what is strictly required, as IMR’s output norms are easier to achieve for economists due to the publication culture in that discipline.

On the other hand, the Committee noted that the overall quality of output has clearly improved. Table 3 in Appendix 3 shows that in the review period, the total number of journal articles as share of the total number of publications has risen from 57% to 67%. Tables 4 and 5 in Appendix 3 reveals that the average AIP score of journal articles has gone up from 0.57 to 0.64, and the percentage of publications in top tier journals has increased from 52% in 2013 to 71% in 2018 in the first and second quartile. In 2018 almost 20% of journal articles were in the top 10 percentile, whereas this just over 10% in 2013. The self-evaluation report points at the fact that most researchers meet the minimum API norm set by IMR (ranging from 69% of Assistant Professors to 83% of Full Professors).
The Committee also looked into other indicators of research quality. It learned that 93 PhD theses were defended in the review period, averaging 15.5 PhD defences per year, or 2.0 defences per fte scientific staff member over the review period. Regarding the acquisition of grants, Table 2 in Appendix 3 shows that in 2018 66.2% of funding originated from the first fund stream, 13.7% from the second, and 20.1% from the third. The relative distribution between the fund streams has remained more or less the same in the review period, although the percentage of first stream funding has gone up slightly compared to 2013, whereas the percentage of the third stream has dropped slightly. IMR reports that there has been an increase in the number of individual and collaborative applications, but that success rates vary per programme and funding agency, and international competition has increased strongly.

Overall, IMR researchers have been most active and successful when applying for international funding schemes, particularly in the case of collaborative grants (see also 2.2.1.3).

Other demonstrable marks of recognition of IMR scholars during the review period that are highlighted in the self-evaluation report are membership of the Young Academy of the Royal Dutch Academy of Science; the Radboud Science Award for scientific breakthroughs; three visiting scholars funded by the Radboud Excellence Initiative; International accreditation for NSM by AACSB in 2018; and chief editorships in leading journals such as *Organization; Journal of Borderland Studies; Voluntas; ECPR Political Data Yearbook;* and *International Journal of Public Sector Management.*

The Committee learned from the preparatory documents that IMR has developed indicators to demonstrate the results of its multidisciplinary research. Three important groups of indicators are considered. The first group are publications, where IMR takes into consideration (1) co-authored publications by researchers from multiple disciplines; (2) the number or percentage of publications of its researchers in journals in other disciplines; and (3) publications of research findings in multidisciplinary journals. The second category are multidisciplinary projects. These can be either (1) projects that make use of theories and methods from other disciplines than the one to which the researchers belong; (2) projects undertaken by researchers from different disciplines; or (3) multi-disciplinary PhD projects, with teams of supervisors from different disciplines. For the third category, IMR looks at (1) the participation of IMR researchers in activities of the IMR in which exchange between the disciplines takes place and/or (2) the participation in the Hot Spots. The Committee concludes on the basis of the information received prior to and during the site visit that the IMR progresses towards more multidisciplinarity on each one of these indicators.

During the site visit, the Committee explored the effectivity of the Hot Spots as an instrument to drive interdisciplinary research and their effect on the quality of research at IMR. The scholars the Committee talked to were unanimous in recognizing the added value of the Hot Spots. They mentioned the learning opportunities and new idea generation when topics are discussed from different backgrounds. They explained that the Hot Spots allow them to strengthen their internal networks and give access to external networks that would otherwise be hard to connect to. These benefits allow participants of Hot Spots to have a head start when applying for large funding schemes, where new ideas that cut across disciplines and a wide array of partners are required. Scholars mentioned that the Hot Spots also lead to joint publications.

2.2.1.2 Governance structure and organisation

Figure 1 (see below) gives an overview of the organizational structure and governance of IMR. IMR is the research institute of the Nijmegen School of Management (NSM). It encompasses researchers from the seven disciplines present within NSM and has implemented a matrix structure to facilitate multidisciplinary research, with vertical lines (the Departments), and temporary, horizontal networks (the Hot Spots). During the review period, a third, middle structure, the Platforms, was abolished, following the 2013 evaluation Committee’s advice to IMR to make its structure less complex. By combining vertical Departments and horizontal Hot Spots the IMR aims to facilitate exchange of expertise and research findings, in line with its multidisciplinary ambitions.
The Committee learned from the preparatory documents that the Hot Spots are an instrument to facilitate multidisciplinary collaboration, focusing on topics that are at the forefront of research at the IMR. They group researchers from different disciplines with a shared research interest, led by high potential or top researchers with a proven record. Typically, Hot Spots consist of 20-25 researchers. They are created through a process in which bottom-up elements are combined with the Institute’s interests: initiatives can be taken by individual researchers, but need to meet a number of requirements, such as the presence of critical mass and the ability to generate external funding. Once approved, Hot Spots receive a subsidy for a period of six years, including the costs of a coordinator (0.2 FTE), €10k per year for activities, and funding for one PhD candidate at the start. Currently, about 54% of IMR researchers are registered members of one or more Hot Spots. The Committee learned during the site visit that participation in the Hot Spots is not required, but that Heads of Departments and Chair Holders are expected to stimulate scholars to explore participating in the Hot Spots. It is moreover important to note that there is also room for multidisciplinary collaboration outside of the Hot Spots.

Other important bodies in the IMR structure are the IMR Academy, the IMR Research Services, and the Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC). The IMR Academy was established in 2016 to provide a platform for dialogue and exchange for all IMR researchers. IMR Research Services is a support unit that, among other tasks, is responsible for grant-advice (see 2.2.1.3), maintaining contacts with societal partners, research and administrative data management, and executing Doctoral School policy (see 2.3). The SAC consists of representatives from all four Departments, and has two official tasks. First, it is IMR’s official advisory body, providing advice on a wide range of research policy matters. Second, it is in charge of the first-year evaluations of PhD candidates (see 2.3). The SAC consists of representatives of the four Departments.

During the site visit, the Committee explored with different groups of interviewees how research activities are coordinated across the many different units and levels of the structure described above. The first question regarded the relationship between the Institute level and that of the Departments and the Chairs. The Committee learned that researchers are not employed by the Institute, but by the Faculty, that assigns them to a particular Chair Group in a Department. The Head of Department (HoD) takes decisions regarding personnel and finances, together with the Chair Holders who are primarily responsible for teaching and research. Moreover, the HoDs are, together with the Chair Holders, responsible for the research programme of their Department. This implies that IMR shares its responsibility for the development of the research strategy at the Institute level with the Heads of Department. In contrast to what the Committee initially expected, it observed during the discussions that IMR researchers and other collaborators in general do not experience navigating this structure as problematic. While IMR researchers were candid about the fact that tensions sometimes do arise, they also convincingly argued that line management and the division of responsibilities is clear to all involved. The Committee learned that IMR has the right scale to provide support services the Departments are too small to provide. The model where IMR sets standards that Departments and Chairs are allowed to implement at differing speeds, thus recognizing the differences between the disciplinary
Departments, seems to be working well. The researchers the Committee spoke to agreed that the governance model does involve a lot of consultation. The Faculty Board and HoDs meet once a month to discuss teaching, research and personnel affairs. Also, the IMR director and the HoDs meet regularly to discuss relevant research developments. In general, the Committee clearly observed the presence of a culture of collaborative governance. Both Institute management and researchers expressed their appreciation of the non-hierarchical, friendly, and open atmosphere at the Institute.

The Committee also explored the relationship between Departments and Hot Spots. The Committee learned researchers’ core affiliation is with the Departments, and that the Hot Spots are a secondary affiliation. Contrary to what the term ‘matrix structure’ implies, the coordinators of the Hot Spots do not assume a managing role; rather, they have a facilitating function. Also, the Hot Spots are non-permanent structures. When a Hot Spot attracts money, it flows to the Departments involved, and formally it is the Department that employs new staff. Hot Spot coordinators explained that good working relations are a requirement to make this work but it can be also a potential area of tension. Thus it is important that Heads of Departments and Chair Holders meet regularly with Hot Spot coordinators to discuss ongoing activities, both formally and informally. The 2018 Memorandum on the Governance Structure of the IMR describes that when new staff is recruited, Hot Spot members are to be involved in the recruitment. Also, Departments and Hot Spots are to decide together how funds that have been acquired by the Hot Spots are spent. The Committee learned that there is room for improvement in implementing these guidelines and fine-tuning the relationship between Departments and Hot Spots. The representatives of the SAC explained during the site visit that it has advised to deploy a more balanced system of accountability between Departments and Hot Spots, and to involve the Hot Spots in hiring procedures for vacancies that pertain to a topic that is relevant to the Hot Spot. The Institute management recognized that not all Departments at this point involve the Hot Spots in the decision process, and that this is a point of improvement in the period to come.

The Committee also discussed the lifespan of Hot Spots. It learned that after six years, a Hot Spot is evaluated to decide whether funding should be continued. The Committee gathered that the two oldest hotspots (GENDER and EUROPAL) have been evaluated in 2019. It was decided that they will be continued. During its interview with the coordinators of the Hot Spots it learned that the evaluations of the Hot Spots that have been existing for a longer time, such as EUROPAL and GENDER, revealed that the Hot Spots’ members highly value them, but would welcome clearer operational steering.

Scholars that have recently joined IMR explained that although many research environments claim to be multidisciplinary, IMR goes beyond what is happening elsewhere. Representatives of the Hot Spots mentioned that this is also evidenced by the fact that researchers from other universities are highly interested in the multidisciplinary strategies and structures IMR has developed.

### 2.2.1.3 Resources

#### Staff

Table 1 in Appendix 3 shows that 242 researchers were working at IMR in 2018 with a total research time of 116.5 FTE. The total volume of research staff grew from 105.1 FTE in 2013 to 133.9 FTE in 2017. This increase was mainly due to the growing number of international PhD candidates with a scholarship (IPS). In 2018, staff numbers decreased to 116.5 FTE, a decline that was most discernable in the category of PhD candidates. One of the reasons behind the drop in research staff were budget cuts that were imposed on the Faculty by the University Board, leading to a strong increase in work pressure, and less time for research. The Committee learned that the departments of BA and PS/PA were most affected by the budget cuts, and were either not able to hire external staff, or had to let temporary staff go, while student numbers went up. However, extra funding has been made available in 2019, which is why the Departments mentioned are in the process of hiring new staff. On the question whether the clearly multidisciplinary profile of IMR is attractive for top-researchers, representatives of the Departments now hiring new staff emphasized that scholars that aim at hardcore disciplinary research are not attracted to Nijmegen. Rather, the overwhelming response to the open vacancies proves that top researchers choose for IMR because of and not despite its multidisciplinary composition.

As NSM is organized as a predominantly decentralized faculty, development of personnel and allocation of time for various tasks of individual scientists are allocated to the Chair Holders, and coordinated by the HoD. Nevertheless, a few principles currently apply for the allocation of research time for all faculty members. The generic aim is to dedicate 40% of the employment of an academic staff member to scientific research. The personnel policy framework allows to temporarily increase research time, but permanent academic staff needs to remain involved in teaching for at least 20% of their employment. Currently, increasing research time is primarily decided upon in the case of scholars attracting external funding.
However, the Committee learned that IMR considers a further differentiation of research time, based on staff performance indicators, as one of its main strategic goals in years to come, which is why the Committee discussed this topic in depth with different groups of interviewees. It learned from the 2015 Memorandum on the allocation of research time that both structural underperformance and structural excellent performance should have consequences. Using the publication guidelines as a basis, the Memorandum puts forward a minimal requirement for research per year based on a nominal research time of 0.4 FTE (see 2.2.1 for more details). On the basis of the Memorandum, a Chair Holder or HoD can subsequently decide to reduce research time to 20% of employment, or to allocate extra research time of 0.1 FTE or 0.2 FTE. For this allocation, first flow budgets can be taken into account.

The Committee observed during the site visit that some Departments have already implemented the model described above, whereas others have not. The Department of EB, for example, uses the minimal requirements to differentiate the allocation of research time of its researchers. It has however decided to only differentiate in a downward manner, and not to allocate extra research time, so as to not create a two-tiered system within the Department.

Importantly, researchers whose research time has been limited are coached, in most cases leading to the recuperation of research time. Also, scholars receiving less research time are not necessarily given more teaching tasks, but may also be given more administrative duties. For the Department, it is important that different career perspectives are explored with the people involved. The Department was pleased to report that it receives the necessary space from NSM and IMR to explore alternative routes. Recently the Department of EB attracted staff at the assistant and associate professor level, mainly based on their societal impact.

The Committee learned that the Chairs are responsible for faculty development. In some Departments this responsibility is delegated to the Head of Department. The Committee appreciates that in some Departments senior staff assist junior staff to make deliberate choices regarding grants to apply for journals to aim for, allowing them to build a diverse grant and/or publication portfolio.

The Committee learned that the Chair Holders/HoD have yearly appraisal meetings with the researchers. Also, there is a yearly meeting at the level of the faculty board, a so-called ‘vlootschouw’ (fleet view), where the development of all staff members and the needs for all the teams are looked at both individually and collectively. The Committee interpreted this as another token of IMR and NSM’s collectivist culture.

The Committee also explored the possibilities of tenure track at NSM. It learned that all new assistant professors enter in a tenure track. Requirements to advance in this tenure track seem to be well-known to all involved researchers. Regarding career tracks for people already working at NSM, some departments have systems that are very much like the tenure track system, while others do not. The Committee learned the Faculty is currently in the process of writing up a new personnel policy. One of the ambitions is to come to a more unified tenure and career track policy.

Funding
A detailed overview of IMR’s funding sources can be found in Table 2 in Appendix 3. A discussion of the distribution of IMR’s sources of income can be found above (section 2.2.1.1). Regarding expenditure, the budget for research in 2018 was a little over €10 million. The Committee learned from the self-evaluation report that about 90% of this was allocated to the Departments to pay for permanent staff research time and the appointment of temporary staff such as PhD candidates. The remaining 10% was spent by IMR on a variety of initiatives, such as co-funding PhD candidates, the Hot Spots’ funding, costs for visiting professors, replacement of researchers working on grant applications, and to reward researchers who have received excellent reviews of their grant applications but no subsidy.

One of the main targets for the past review period as well as for the review period to come has been/is increasing the success in (individual) grant applications in order to increase research funding. IMR management explained that there is currently clear variation between the Departments on how the stream funds are divided (e.g. 45.3% of GPE’s funding originates from the first stream, compared to 85% of BA’s). One of the strategies the Institute considers to address this issue is to apply an appropriate benchmark across the Departments.

The Committee and IMR representatives however also discussed that dependence on external money is not without risks, as the second and third money stream do not ensure a continuous flow of money. Being more dependent on the second and third money stream implies devising a strategy to moderate the fluctuations. The Committee observed that in the Department of GPE a strategy has been developed in the form of CentUR, where external research funding is pooled to ensure a steady income stream and keep a group of researchers on permanent externally funded positions (see also 4.4).
Another good practice is the development of a portfolio of external funding sources that is simultaneously pursued in the Department of EB (see also 4.3).

The Committee learned on the basis of the self-evaluation report and during the site visit that several measures have been taken to improve the success of (individual) grant applications (see also 2.2.1.1). One such measure is that IMR researchers can apply for a small sum of seed money that they can use to support grant applications. The Committee was pleased to hear that the scholars can use the money in a way that best suits their needs, e.g. to buy time or to buy assistance. The Committee also learned that IMR scholars who were excellently reviewed but at the last round failed to obtain a major grant are rewarded by the Institute in offering a grant for a PhD student. From its discussions with IMR Research Services, the Committee learned that IMR has invested in two grant advisors, one specialized in collaborative grants, the other in individual grants. The Committee was impressed with the wide array of advisory tasks offered, ranging from information on funding schemes, matching of calls to profiles of researchers, personal coaching and profile building towards future goals. Importantly, the IMR grant advisors collaborate with the research acquisition coordinators that have been appointed in every Department, to fine-tune their services to the needs of the researchers. In the near future, the IMR Research Services wants to also build capacity in post-award advice, as it has found that many researchers have questions on how to continue with stakeholders after a research project. The Committee also learned that IMR wants to systematize contacts with societal stakeholders as they are potential research project commissioners for research (see 2.2.2). The Committee observed that the new strategies seem to be bearing fruit, as 2019 has been a successful year in acquiring grants.

Assessment of ‘research quality’ by the Committee
The Committee concludes that IMR is well underway in realizing its ambition to become a distinctive research institute, not only regarding its mission, but also considering the strategy and policy measures it deploys to achieve this mission. The Committee applauds the choice for a multidisciplinary approach, as it resonates excellently with current societal challenges and expectations.

IMR is, by all metrics and information the Committee consulted, a healthy Institute. Its Departments and Hot Spots have contributed significantly to current debates in their chosen field of expertise, and the general quality of the output is high, with a large amount of the research published in leading journals. The quality of research has clearly increased over the review period. This is the case for all the Departments, albeit that the quality varies between and within Departments. The Hot Spots are a clear added value in the sense that they are seen as the ideal place for new idea generation, for building internal and external networks, and from this perspective not only stimulate exciting research output, but also offer IMR scholars a head start when applying for large grant schemes.

Although the self-evaluation report raised many questions regarding the complexity of the Institute, the Committee finds the current structure fit for its purpose. IMR staff seems to have no problem navigating it and the presence of a collective governance culture ensures that in general very few conflicts arise. The Hotpots have been a key instrument in ensuring that a substantial volume of IMR’s research is multidisciplinary in nature. The Committee welcomes moreover that IMR has developed indicators to help monitor progress in realizing its multidisciplinary ambition. However, as will be explained in section 2.2.3, the time has come to reflect on IMR’s current multidisciplinary structure, and further develop it.

Within the specific structure of NSM, IMR optimally uses the room it has available for devising policies that improve the quality of research. The Committee was highly impressed with the high quality of the research services offered to IMR scholars. Moreover, in the review period IMR has built instruments that have been paramount to the improvement of research quality on the one hand, and the implementation of the multidisciplinary mission on the other hand. The strategy to develop inclusive instruments that subsequently allow the Departments to move in different speeds, in line with disciplinary traditions, is starting to pay off, as the majority of staff at IMR buys into the larger IMR strategy and clearly see the added value of being part of IMR. The publication guidelines have been important in raising the level of publications, while leaving ample room for individual researchers to build a portfolio.

2.2.2 Societal relevance
The Committee was pleased to learn that having societal impact is central in IMR’s mission, ambitions, and strategy. In its self-evaluation IMR reports on the criteria it has chosen to express the relevance of its research. The Committee consulted the impact case narratives, illustrating the diversity of impact pathways and themes of IMR research. During the site visit, the Committee had the possibility to discuss these cases more in depth with the IMR scholars and societal partners involved.
IMR considers the production and discussion of policy and practice-oriented output such as policy reports, presentations and workshops as a first important pathway to achieving impact. Secondly, training students and professionals is another way to impact society, governmental organizations, and businesses. The self-evaluation report mentions that the Radboud Management Academy (RMA) provides courses and seminars for professionals in the field of business administration. During the site visit the Committee learned that it is the ambition to further strengthen the RMA’s potential as a linking pin between IMR and societal partners (see also 4.1.2). Collaboration and institutional partnerships with societal groups are a third indicator for societal relevance. IMR has contacts with the local government, such as the municipality of Nijmegen and the Province of Gelderland, but also with regional and international businesses, ministries, and the Dutch and European parliaments. Research is carried out for or with these partners. In some cases societal partners are directly involved in research activities, for instance in case studies or in lab experiments. Also they can be part of supervision committees or sounding boards to monitor research project progress. Finally, individual researchers’ media appearances, participation in the public debate, and membership of advisory committees is also a means to achieve societal impact.

The Committee observed during the site visit that IMR researchers are intrinsically motivated to engage in activities that have an impact on society. It learned that they work with a wide range of external partners, are actively building networks and are open for collaborations. This image was confirmed during the meeting with the stakeholders during the site visit. The PhD candidates explained to the Committee that a reflection on the societal relevance of their research was a mandatory part of their research proposal, which is again an indicator that societal relevance is deeply entrenched in IMR's DNA.

The Committee explored the contribution of the Hot Spots to IMR's societal relevance. It learned that all Hot Spots collaborate with a variety of societal partners. The Hot Spots are active in education (at the bachelor/master level or in the framework of RMA) and produce practice- and policy-oriented output.

IMR management explained during the site visit that it aims to further improve IMR’s societal impact and make its impact more visible. The investment in research communication (now 0.8 FTE) is also seen as an important step in making IMR’s research more visible. Contacts with societal stakeholders now mostly take place on an individual or project basis and are dependent on individual researchers’ networking skills and preferences. In order to create a more systematic approach and to achieve visible impact, an Impact Team was installed in 2018. In the context of this team a systematic analysis of IMR's stakeholders, impact pathways, facilitators and barriers will be conducted. During the site visit, the Committee explored with different groups of interviewees the option of transdisciplinary research, where stakeholders are involved in the complete research cycle. This was considered a promising pathway by Committee and IMR representatives alike. The Committee took note of the fact that good practices already exist at the Departmental level, most notably in the Department of GPE.

Assessment of 'societal relevance' by the Committee

The Committee concludes that the ambition to be societally relevant and to have an impact on society lies at the very core of IMR’s mission. It highly appreciates that sustainability is part of the Institute’s mission. It is impressed with the wide range of external partners IMR scholars collaborate with, and the Institute’s openness to collaboration. All four Departments have deployed a wide array of activities that are relevant to society. The Hot Spots are multifunctional, conducting interdisciplinary research, providing teaching and reaching out to societal partners. In conclusion, they are of clear added value in generating societally relevant research.

The Committee is of the opinion that the Institute could now take this solid practice to the next level. It welcomes that an inventory of current connections to practice will be drawn up in the context of the impact team. The Committee stresses that this exercise information should lead to a real assessment of progress, so that IMR can move towards a more systematic approach of societal relevance, and maybe even towards transdisciplinary cooperation in carefully selected areas of impact. Being an institute of management research, IMR is moreover in the ideal position to reflect on how to measure engagement, innovation, and impact through qualitative and quantitative methods and to develop effective strategies to overcome the challenges related to engagement, innovation, and impact. The Committee agrees that the newly set up Impact Team has the potential to take the lead in this evolution.

2.2.3 Viability

On the basis of its SWOT analysis, IMR identifies several points of improvement, most of which have already been introduced above. First, IMR wants to further enhance the quality of its output. In order to achieve this, it plans to further raise the minimum score for academic publications, and to anticipate performance-driven differentiation of research time between its researchers (see also 2.2.1.1
and 2.2.1.3). Secondly, it wants increase incomes from the second and third stream funds (see also 2.2.1.1 and 2.2.1.3). As the measures to achieve this in the review period have not yet yielded the desired results, the Faculty Board has made this a priority for the period to come. It has installed an Advisory Committee and plans to continue to invest in grant support (see 2.2.1.3). Third, IMR wants to make the impact of its research more visible (see also 2.2.2). It wants to do so by investing in research communication, by making existing contacts more structural than ad hoc (with the help of the newly established Impact team), and by hosting more events in its new building. A fourth ambition is to increase the number of employed PhD candidates as this will contribute to the volume and quality of its research, and to thematic, theoretic and methodological innovation. It has set a target of 18 graduations per year, which can only be reached if IMR succeeds in acquiring more grants, and if success rates remain at a high level. The Doctoral School plays an important role in reaching this ambition (see also 2.3).

During the site visit, the Committee observed that IMR researchers, supporting services, doctoral schools, advisory committees are all committed to the multidisciplinary mission. They consider the Hot Spots as a clear added value (see also 2.2.1). The Committee explored IMR's governance structure (see 2.2.1.2) and earning capacity (see 2.2.1.1 and 2.2.1.3) in view of its viability.

**Assessment of 'viability' by the Committee**

Taking into account the findings discussed above and the observations made in sections 2.2.1 and 2.2.2, the Committee comes to the conclusion that IMR is very well equipped for the future. The Committee applauds that IMR has developed a future proof motto and mission, that provide ample room for its scholars to produce high-quality disciplinary, interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary academic research, as well as be relevant to society. The Institute's structure seems to be robust and is offering an appropriate balance between bottom-up initiatives and top-down steering. IMR leadership is doing a good job at cultivating a climate of collegiality and creativity. The Hot Spots have proven to be an excellent instrument both in creating interesting, future proof research and to create the networks that are key in applying for large grant schemes. Facilities, doctoral school and research services are of remarkable quality.

The Committee agrees that the time has come to use the publication guidelines as an instrument for research time differentiation in all Departments, as this will further improve research quality. These initiatives will allow IMR to address the fact that quality of research and the earning capacity varies considerably between Departments. Nevertheless, IMR should also proceed carefully and be aware of the risks involved. Any differentiation of research time should be in line with IMR’s mission and culture, and the assignment of research time should remain at the level of Chair Groups and Departments. Chairs and HODs are according to the Committee best suited to distribute research time, as they are aware of the specific context each staff operates in. The Committee observed that examples of good practice already exist in some Departments and advises to use the learning potential available in the organization.

The Committee concludes that the financial volatility is an issue that needs to be addressed in terms of viability. The Committee is of the opinion that the Hot Spots are a valuable instrument in improving IMR’s financial viability. The Committee supports the ambition of IMR to provide directions in how Departments can strategize about the division of income between the stream funds. The Committee does not advise to set an IMR wide benchmark for the ratio of income between stream funds. Rather, the Committee recommends IMR to ask Departments for a clearly defined earning strategy. Again, the Committee points at the fact that several good practices exist in the Departments regarding earning capacity, such as the pooling of third fund stream money to provide a steady income stream (GPE) or the use of different (internal and external) stream funds as a way to spread income risks (EB ad BA).

The Committee is of the opinion that the decentralized policy and governance structure works well for IMR and has been key in binding its researchers to its mission. The autonomy of the Departments in this sense represent a clear strength, but also a potential weakness. For this structure to work well, the quality of the leadership at the Departmental level is of vital importance and needs to transcend mere line management. The Committee observed that IMR’s Departments differ from the perspective of the quality of research, societal impact, but also leadership and governance styles. Some of the management teams of the Departments take ownership of their future viability, and use the policy instruments provided by the Institute to further their policies at the Departmental level. Other Departments seem to see their own viability as something they have little impact on. The Committee is of the opinion that NSM and IMR need to ensure that strategic leadership is installed in all Departments. The Committee sees ample learning opportunities between Departments, as several excellent examples of strategic leadership are already present. The Committee concludes that IMR will need to address this in order to ensure that the quality of research and its societal impact progress evenly across Departments.
The Committee concludes that on the one hand IMR has succeeded in building a governance structure that accommodates its multidisciplinary mission. On the other hand, building the structure remains a work in progress. The Hot Spots are working well as a light, flexible and temporary structure, and that the temptation to organize them into more permanent structures is to be avoided since this might harm their flexibility and their accessibility. There is, however, a need to create a clearer vision on the lifespan of Hot Spots, how topics are renewed, and what happens once Hot Spots have exceeded the incubating stage. Also Hot Spots need to be structurally involved in classical line decisions like hiring and assessment of quality. How to balance flexibility and stability is a challenge which needs to tackled in the future.

Finally, the Committee sees clear potential for IMR to take the current setup one step further. This will on the one hand impact IMR’s viability in a positive way in the sense that it will allow the Institute to sustain its current advantage. On the other hand, a meta-reflection on the dynamic capabilities the IMR has developed and the key elements of its structure, will put the Institute on the map of institutional innovation, both nationally and internationally, and will allow the Institute to play a leading role towards other universities here who are all looking for models for multidisciplinary collaboration.

2.3 PhD programmes, training and supervision

The IMR Doctoral School was established in 2013 to provide a support platform for PhD candidates and their supervisors. The Committee learned from the self-evaluation report that the Doctoral School oversees the admission and quality assurance process, provides information and advice, develops policies and monitors their impact, signals problems concerning PhD candidates, and advises the Faculty Board on all matters regarding PhD candidates. The Doctoral School is clearly embedded in the governance structure of IMR and is in regular contact with other university bodies related to doctoral education. IMR takes part in a number of national research schools like TRAIL, NETHUR and NIG. Strategic collaborations for joint doctorates have been established with universities of Bologna, Galway and Roskilde, and with the University of Applied Sciences Arnhem Nijmegen. The work of the Doctoral School is complemented by the Junior Faculty Consortium, which offers informal seminars and community building activities, and the PhD Council which represents PhD candidates and advises the Doctoral School and IMR. The School also has a PhD Counsellor. The Committee learned from the PhD candidates that they feel integrated in the Departments, Chair Groups and Hot Spots.

IMR has three types of PhD candidates: employed, international with a scholarship (IPS), and self-funded or so-called external candidates. All candidates are registered as members of the Doctoral School at the start of their programme. The Committee learned during the site visit that admission guidelines have been set up for all prospective students. Whereas the internal, employed PhD candidates have already been through a selection process to acquire funding, IPS and self-funded candidates have to pass a selection procedure that is coordinated by the Doctoral School. The Committee learned during the site visit that although the Doctoral School still welcomes external PhD candidates, more attention is now paid to the screening of potential candidates. Only the most promising candidates are admitted, as success rates of external PhD candidates are considerably lower and IMR wants to carefully monitor the time investment of PhD supervision.

Regarding the content of the PhD programme, all PhD candidates are required to excel in their own area of research as well as to acquire a broader skill set for a range of possible career paths. The Committee learned that the Doctoral School proposes a 30 ECTS programme of courses (or 840 hours), with a 40:40:20 distribution between methodology, transferrable skills and content courses. Courses can be taken at IMR level, from Radboud University, the national Graduate Schools, as well as other academic institutions. As IMR’s disciplines are very diverse, no set programme has to be followed. For each PhD candidate, an individual programme is specified in the Training and Supervision Plan (TSP) at the start. The Committee learned that all PhD candidates also go through an induction programme. The PhD candidates explained to the Committee that they are happy with the flexibility of the programme and the quality of the courses offered. Importantly, PhD candidates have a budget to follow courses or summer schools outside of Radboud University, an opportunity that is highly valued by the students. The Committee also learned that PhD candidates can also obtain their University Teaching Qualification (UTQ) during their PhD if they want to, although courses in teaching skills are not counted as being part of the recommended 30 ECTS.

Supervisory teams consist of at least one full professor and one additional staff member with a PhD. The Doctoral School offers training to supervisors on their role. Agreements about supervision are specified in the TSP. All these measures aim to improve the quality of supervision. The Committee learned from the representatives of the PhD Council that a recent survey revealed PhD candidates to be very satisfied with the quality of supervision. PhD candidates know who to turn if problems arise. The Head of the Doctoral School emphasized that quality of supervision is high on the agenda, which is why workshops for supervisors are now being offered. Although this
is still voluntary, it is the ambition to make these courses mandatory.

The Committee learned from the self-evaluation report that the Doctoral School develops policy and procedures, collects management information, and monitors the quality of individual PhD candidates, the supervision process, and the overall programme. There are three crucial points in this process: the admission, the presentation to the Scientific Advisory Committee after the first 9 months (18 months for external PhD candidates), and the assessment of the manuscript through a committee appointed by the Dean. The Doctoral School has its own database for tracking PhD candidate progress, which in the near future will be replaced by a university-wide system, *Hora Finita*. The Committee talked at length about the first milestone after 9 months (for full-time)/18 months (for external or part-time). At this point in their trajectory, PhD candidates are evaluated based on a project proposal and work plan, and if possible their first research results. PhD candidates are required to submit their report, after which they are invited to defend it before the SAC. The Committee learned from the Doctoral Officer that PhD candidates are informed about this important milestone during the induction day. In addition cohort meetings are organized, one of which is dedicated to preparing the defence before the SAC. The Committee learned from the SAC that 16% of PhD candidates have a negative evaluation, after which they have to stop their PhD. However, more proposals are already flagged as requiring major revisions, after which the proposal can be withdrawn and improved. The Committee learned from the Head of the Doctoral School that after this first milestone, the monitoring of progress is left to the Departments. It is currently being considered to add an extra milestone at the level of the Doctoral School, an initiative, so the Committee learned, that would be welcomed by the PhD candidates.

The Committee learned from the self-evaluation that the duration of employed PhD trajectories after correction for part-time tenure, maternity leave, etc. is just above four years (see Table 8 in Appendix 3), yet self-funded PhD candidates take longer than employed and IPS candidates to finish their thesis. As the aim for the coming years is to have an average of 18 thesis defences per year, IMR remarks that this will require investment to increase the number of employed candidates and to improve the quality of supervision for all types of candidates.

IMR keeps track of its PhD alumni. 43% continue to work in academia (see Table 9 in Appendix 3), mostly at Dutch universities, but also abroad. Some become a teacher/researcher at a university of applied science. Another 40% work either for government or industry, such as consultancy. The majority of the alumni find employment within six months after their thesis defence; several alumni combine finishing their thesis with a new job, or use the time interval between manuscript submission and thesis defence to find a job. To offer career advice to PhD candidates seeking a career outside academia, Radboud University organizes regular events.

The Committee learned from the Head of the Doctoral School that PhDs are an important vehicle for progressing the research at IMR, and improving the number of PhD candidates is a strategic goal for the whole of the IMR. The overall community is relatively stable at about 200 PhD candidates. Yet it would be desirable to shift the balance towards more employed candidates whose primary focus is on pursuing a PhD. The efforts of the Doctoral School in this regard are focused on improving completion rates and supporting PhD candidates who experience work stress, through personal and institutional measures. The goal for 2025 is to contribute to increased viability of IMR by strengthening the PhD community by (1) further improving the involvement and institutional support of IPS and self-funded PhD candidates; (2) consistently applying risk assessment during selection and admission and using the new monitoring system *Hora Finita* for regular reviews of procedures and practices; (3) supporting PhD candidates nearing completion and providing orientation about academic and other career development perspectives; and (4) extending training programmes for new and potential supervisors, and intervention for experienced ones to create awareness of risks and challenges, to update them on new policies, and to share best practices. Furthermore, existing measures such as internal competitions, the fourth-year matching scheme, and the excellence scheme will be continued or intensified if possible. The Committee learned during the site that currently there is a very uneven distribution of PhD candidates across IMR staff, with a very high number who have none or one PhD candidates, and this is as an issue that needs to be addressed in view of IMR’s ambitions.

**Assessment of ‘PhD education’ by the Committee**

The Committee comes to the conclusion that IMR has a vibrant, well-designed PhD programme. The Doctoral School has introduced best practices that offer PhD candidates a safe research environment, in which the quality of supervision is monitored, and in which the candidates are taught skills necessary to pursue a career both inside and outside of academia. The Committee is pleased that PhD candidates feel embedded in IMR’s research environment. It found that students are offered a broad range of both disciplinary and general courses, which are of good quality. The Committee concludes that the job placement of IMR’s PhD candidates is strong and that adequate steps are taken to guide students in the process of finding a job after
the PhD be it inside or outside academia. The Committee highly values that PhD candidates' awareness is raised about the potential advantages and disadvantages of multidisciplinarity in their career perspectives. It was positive about the excellent quality of its leadership and services.

The Committee noted that employed PhD candidates now take on average about four years to finish their PhD, which is the nominal duration. The Committee finds that IMR has significantly improved its PhD trajectory over the review period. The procedures for admission are solid and the Committee values that all PhD candidates, also the external ones, are monitored. It is to be applauded that the Doctoral School offers training for supervisors. The Committee is of the opinion that the milestone at nine months is a very valuable instrument to support progress of PhD candidates as well as to improve the quality of their output. It highly values that this procedure is run by the SAC and that assessors external to the Department are involved. It recommends to install an extra milestone at a later stage in the PhD trajectory. This measure will help shorten PhD duration and improve efficiency and will thus support IMR's ambition to have an average of 18 thesis defences per year. In order to reach this goal, IMR will also have to increase the number of employed PhD candidates. The Committee points at the fact that improving IMR's earning capacity for second and third stream funding is a crucial step in realizing this ambition.

2.4 Policy on research integrity
The Committee learned from the self-evaluation report that IMR adheres to RU policies on research ethics, integrity and research data management (RDM). In 2015, the IMR established its Ethics Assessment Committee together with the Faculty of Law. The Committee learned during the site visit that between 2015 and 2018, it assessed 18 research proposals from an ethics point of view. The committee also informs researchers about ethical guidelines via its website. The Committee was pleased to learn that the committee tries to limit the bureaucratic burden of the assessment as much as possible. It consists of three members: the chairs of the Scientific Advisory Committees of each of the faculties, and one independent ethics expert.

To deal with integrity deviations, Radboud University has installed integrity protocols, an Integrity Committee and counsellors, in line with the national codes of conduct. To IMR's knowledge, no integrity violations have been reported by IMR researchers, or concerning IMR researchers.

The IMR Academy provides seminars on integrity and ethics. It offers for example the course on open science, which is part of the courses offered by the Doctoral School. Additionally, tailored-made sessions on RDM are offered by the data steward. The Committee learned during the site visit from the PhD candidates that they are introduced to ethics and integrity issues related to the PhD trajectory during the induction day. Beyond that, students can follow other courses offered by the university, but they are not compulsory.

As regards data storage IMR guidelines and policies follow Radboud University policy, which in turn follows national and international regulations. In 2017, the IMR appointed a data steward to support researchers with data management. Information sessions are held and courses are offered to make researchers aware of and acquainted with RDM policy. At university level, general support on research data is offered by Radboud University's Expert Centre Research Data.

Assessment of 'academic integrity' by the Committee
The Committee is of the opinion that the IMR has satisfactorily effectuated policies and protocols to address research ethics, integrity and storage and management of research data, all of which are aligned with national and international standards. It has appointed various personnel as confidential advisors, tries to pressure its research staff to take responsibility in these matters, and offers PhD candidates obligatory trainings.

2.5 Policy on Diversity
Diversity is part of NSM HR policies with a main focus on gender and international background. The Committee learned from the self-evaluation report that selection and appraisal committees have to meet certain diversity targets, the description of job vacancies is screened for discriminatory wording, and committees have to account for their decision to invite or not invite female candidates. Noteworthy is the fact that the GENDER Hot Spot provides expertise on this topic.

Regarding gender, IMR reports that, compared to the national average (20.9% in 2017), IMR has a relatively high percentage of female full professors (32.4% in 2018). The number of female PhD candidates is also comparatively high (see Table 6 Appendix 3). In the period 2013-2018 several measures were taken which include the promotion of three female associate professors to full professors (thanks to the Westerdijk Talent Scheme of the Ministry of Education). Female assistant and associate professors are actively encouraged to take part in the Mohrmann programme for female academics offered by
the university. The stipend was awarded to six female IMR researchers. Coaching is also offered by the HR programme. The Dutch science foundation NWO offers additional funds to female academics who have submitted excellent research proposals, the so-called Aspasia funds. Between 2013-2018, two female academics at IMR obtained funding in this way.

IMR states the international character of its staff can be demonstrated in two ways. First, all researchers regularly attend international conferences, participate in international networks and projects, and are members of editorial boards of international journals. Second, it has a funding scheme for international visiting scholars, and Radboud University offers the Radboud Excellence Initiative for this purpose, where IMR has been successful on three occasions.

Third, IMR looks at the international composition of its staff. Between 2013 and 2018, the number of international researchers increased from 19.2% (28 nationalities) to 26.5% (34 nationalities), mostly because of the increase in the number of IPS scholarship candidates from Indonesia, China, and other countries. Radboud University offers special support for international staff members through HR support and the International Office.

**Assessment of ‘diversity policy’ by the Committee**

The Committee is of the opinion that good measures have been taken to increase the number of female professors. As a result, gender diversity at IMR is well above average and also represented in key leadership.

Regarding the international character of its staff, the Committee values the number of international networks IMR scholars participate in, and appreciates that initiatives have been taken to attract visiting scholars and to increase the proportion of international staff. It welcomes that in particular its PhD population reflects a growing cultural diversity.

Nevertheless, Committee would welcome more initiatives geared at attracting international staff and staff from non-Dutch or minority backgrounds. The Committee urges IMR, the Faculty and Radboud University to provide incentives in order to increase staff diversity in nationality and minority status. The aspired diversity is not a goal in itself but should be seen as a means towards an end; a more diversified research agenda and greater attention to issues that are of significance to marginalized social constituencies.

**2.6 Research facilities**

In 2018, IMR moved to its new location, with newly built facilities. In its self-evaluation report, IMR provides an overview of its facilities, which include database services and four labs. The Individual Decision Lab enables experiments on individual decision-making processes. The Group Decision Lab offers facilities for research into collective decision-making processes. The Mobile Lab is the mobile equivalent of the Individual Decision Lab and the Group Decision Lab. The Map Table can be used to visualize complex planning and design-issues and to develop and test scenarios and games. During the site visit, the Committee visited the Individual Decision Lab and the Group Decision Lab. It was introduced to the experiments that have taken place in the labs in the recent past, and was pleased to see that the work that has been done has led to impressive research output. It learned that all Departments run experiments in the Individual Decision Lab, and that experiments led to publications in multidisciplinary journals. The Committee learned that the lab holds a semi-annual meeting with experimenters regarding issues with strong emphasis on experimental economics methodology.

Next to IMR’s use of existing databases, for example from the Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS), IMR researchers have also created a number of proprietary databases through primary data collection. Examples are the Global Data Lab, which develops instruments for monitoring and analysing the status and progress of societies, particularly those in developing countries; the Database for DFID project; the Political Parties and Populism Expert Survey (POPPA).

From 2016 onwards, IMR has participated in ODISSEI (Open Data Infrastructure for Social Science and Economic Innovations), a network of Faculties set up to develop a sustainable research infrastructure for the social sciences in the Netherlands. ODISSEI gives researchers access to large-scale, longitudinal data collections to answer new, multidisciplinary research questions and to investigate existing questions in new ways.

**Assessment of ‘research facilities’ by the Committee**

The Committee is of the opinion that the IMR’s facilities are in top condition. The new building provides excellent facilities, and the Committee was pleased to see that space is foreseen to hold workshops with external stakeholders. The Committee was very impressed with the lab infrastructure, and the way this infrastructure helps to implement IMR’s multidisciplinary mission.
3. Recommendations regarding the Institute for Management Research (IMR)

In this section the Committee lists its specific recommendations for IMR’s future. These recommendations should be read against the background of the Committee’s assessment of IMR in section 2.

3.1 The quality of the research institute

The Committee advises IMR to

- Bring its governance structure to the next level. This implies developing a clear vision on the governance and lifespan of Hot Spots. The Committee recommends that Hot Spot representatives are formally embedded and involved in classical line decisions like hiring and assessment of quality while keeping the structure of the Hot Spots itself light and flexible;

- Engage in a meta-reflection on the dynamic capabilities it has developed in addressing and learning from multidisciplinarity as this will put the Institute on the map of institutional innovation;

- Increase its monitoring of performance progress (e.g. PDCA) in all key areas of IMR policy;

- Use the publication guidelines as an instrument for research time differentiation in all Departments, as this will further improve research quality. However, any differentiation of research time should be in line with IMR’s mission and culture, and the assignment of research time should remain at the level of Chair Groups and Departments.

- Develop strategic leadership capacities in all Departments in order to ensure that the quality of research and its societal impact progress evenly across Departments.

- Increase the Institute’s strategic capacity by developing a more diverse revenue structure, particularly increasing research grant acquisition. The Committee supports the ambition of IMR to provide directions in how Departments can strategize about the division of income between the stream funds. The committee does not advise to set a IMR wide benchmark for the ratio of income between stream funds;

- Create learning opportunities among Departments, as several excellent examples of strategic leadership, regarding differentiation of research time and earning capacity among other themes, are already present;
• Make an effective assessment of progress of the societal impact of IMR's research, based on the information gathered by the Impact Team, so that IMR can move towards a more systematic approach of societal relevance, and maybe even towards transdisciplinary cooperation in carefully selected areas of impact;

• Further develop its analysis of stakeholders' interest in and engagement with the Institute's research output. The goal would be to develop robust measures for and other means of interpreting and determining the impact of Department research beyond traditional scholarly measures of research impact.

3.2 The institute's PhD programmes
The Committee advises IMR to

• install an extra milestone at a later stage in the PhD trajectory, organized in the same way as the nine-month milestone, as a measure to further improve PhD duration and efficiency as well as research quality;

• increase the earning capacity regarding the second and third fund stream in order to work towards the ambition of having more internal PhD candidates, a precondition for having more PhD defences.

3.3 The institute's policy on research integrity
No recommendations

3.4 The Institute's diversity policy
The Committee advises IMR to
1. continue working towards a more balanced gender distribution;
2. develop more initiatives geared at attracting international and diverse staff and successfully onboarding them.

3.5 The Institute's research facilities
No recommendations
4. Assessments per department

4.1 Department of Business Administration

Chair: Prof. dr. Yvonne Benschop
Total research staff in 2018: 34.7 FTE
Assessment:
- Research Quality: 2
- Societal Relevance: 2
- Viability: 2

4.1.1 Organization, mission and research objectives of the Department

The department of Business Administration (BA) is composed of five chair groups, and its researchers are closely involved in at least three Hot Spots (ID, Innovation, GENDER). Its research programme was recently renewed. The main theme focuses on ‘Responsible Organization’, which is fully aligned with the overall research programme of IMR, and further discerns three research themes: setting responsible goals; providing organizational conditions; and transforming organizations. This new research programme builds on the Department’s ten years of experience in engaged scholarship. It was conceptualized involving researchers from all different Chair Groups.

In 2018, the Department of BA had a research staff of 34.7 FTE. Although the Department’s scientific staff has remained more or less stable over the review period (17.8 FTE in 2018), there has been a substantial decrease of employed PhD candidates (13.7 FTE in 2013 versus 4.3 FTE in 2018). However, the FTE accounting for IPS candidates has risen strongly (from 1 FTE in 2013 to 10 FTE in 2018).

4.1.2 Assessment of the Department

Research Quality

On the basis of the information gathered before and during the site visit, the Committee concludes that the Department of BA truly participates in IMR’s collective mission. During the site visit, the Committee observed that although this is a Department with five different Chair groups, it is a tight-knit community. The renewed research programme has managed to unite most of the Department’s research in one framework, has further increased the researchers’ enthusiasm for research, and has contributed to the creation of an open research culture. The Committee values that the Department actively deploys the instruments available to further develop research staff.

The quality of research has clearly improved over the review period. In total, 393 refereed articles were produced, averaging 9.5 refereed articles per FTE research staff over the review period. Not only did the number of refereed articles increase, the average AIP score also improved (from 0.55 to 0.68). The percentage of publications in top tier journals has increased from 49% in 2013 to
79% in 2018 in the first and second quartile. Importantly, the percentage of publications in the fourth quartile is very low. All this indicates that the Department strives for quality rather than quantity.

The Committee studied IMR’s performance on indicators of scientific recognition, other than publications. It observed that IMR’s researchers have significant impact as editors of international journals. The number of submitted grant applications has significantly increased, yet the number of funded projects has remained the same (see also ‘viability’). One possible explanation is that this is due to strong competition. This has also caused a decrease in PhD candidates (36 defended thesis in the review period, or 2 defended theses per member of the research staff over the review period).

Based on these observations, the Committee comes to the conclusion that the Department conducts very good, internationally recognized research.

**Societal Relevance**

The Committee comes to the conclusion that BA researchers are involved in many interesting projects and have impact in several distinct ways. First, research insights are disseminated to a broader audience in various ways: books, reports, practitioners’ publication, public debates, and keynotes. BA scholars are moreover actively involved in the professional education of RMA. They take part in the Academy’s new initiative ‘Trending topics’ where researchers, on the basis of a recent publication in top journal, participate in an interactive debate with RMA alumni. Another example is BA researchers’ support of RMA’s two-day masterclasses.

Second, the Department is oriented towards developing tools and interventions in organizations. The Committee highly values how the gender training provided by the Department has raised awareness and understanding of gender inequality that also resulted in hiring more women in a male dominated organization like the university.

Finally, the Department’s active involvement in several Hot Spots stimulates interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary collaboration with internal and external stakeholders.

Based on these observations, the Committee comes to the conclusion that the Department makes a very good contribution to society.

**Viability**

The Committee is of the opinion that the Department’s chosen research focus is future proof. However, although the Department has been doing research on themes regarding responsible governance since many years, it remained unclear to the Committee how the Department’s head start translates into an advanced view on what it takes to be(come) a Responsible Organization.

To make the Department’s vision on this topic more visible, the Committee suggests the Department engages in a strategic exercise of how it positions itself vis-à-vis its three research themes. For example, regarding setting responsible goals: what are these goals (what not), how to set and approach the goals? And how is this different than what is currently assumed or studied? Currently, the framework of three themes appears to be a structuring framework of ongoing research that indeed unites the research internally. Yet, its appeal to external parties might be improved through reflecting on the specificity of the Department’s stance on these three themes and from this, identifying and developing a future research direction that would characterize the department as truly being the international expert on Responsible Organization.

The Committee learned from the preparatory documents and during the site visit that the BA Department has a high dependence on the first fund stream. In 2018, 85% of the Department’s funding originated in the first fund stream. Whereas one might argue that this represents a steady stream of income, it also implies high teaching loads, which may impact the Department’s viability. The Department is however very well aware of this challenge and is constantly seeking alternative sources of income.

The Committee highly values that the Department takes ownership of its viability. As a reaction to not getting individual grants, it actively seeks structural collaboration with its stakeholders, as an alternative to acquire a more balanced distribution of stream funds. The Committee is of the opinion that further developing this ‘Plan B’ into an explicit strategy, would further increase the Department’s resilience. The spreading of risks is a necessity for the viability of this Department and its ambition to create more research-intensive junior positions and PhD positions.

Finally, the fact that the Department coordinates three Hot Spots and is well-aligned with IMR’s policy and mission also reflects positively on its viability.

Based on these observations, the Committee comes to the conclusion that the Department is very well equipped for the future.
4.1.3 Recommendations
The Committee advises the BA Department to

• monitor BA staff’s teaching load;

• define and emphasize the knowledge it has derived from its ten years of experience studying the ‘Responsible Organization’, and turn it more explicitly into a strategic strength;

• investigate additional ways of further reducing reliance on first stream financing;

• further develop the current practice to look for alternative funding with its stakeholders into a deliberate strategy;

• increase the visibility of its research and impact.

4.2 Department of Economics and Business Economics

Chair: Prof. dr. Joris Knoben
Total research staff in 2018: 25.5 FTE
Assessment:
- Research Quality: 2
- Societal Relevance: 2
- Viability: 1

4.2.1 Organization, mission and research objectives of the Department
The Department of Economics and Business Economics (EB) is organized in four Chairs, and its researchers are closely involved in at least four Hot Spots (INNOVATION, ID, GLOCAL, GAINS). EB’s research is driven by real-world economic problems, puts the economic dimension of these problems in an interdisciplinary context, and results in actionable outcomes that help overcome these problems. Research in the Department is rooted in the overall topic of ‘Governance of Economic Behaviour’. EB focuses on three main research areas that are linked to each other and to the mission: Institutions and Individuals; Organizational Networks; and Behavioural Decision Making.

In 2018 the Department of EB had a research staff of 25.5 FTE, a clear increase compared to the 15.1 FTE research staff in 2013. The rise has been the sharpest in the category of PhD candidates (5.8 FTE in 2013 to 10.9 FTE in 2018).

4.2.2 Assessment of the Department

Research Quality
During the review period, the Department produced 162 refereed articles, averaging 7.8 articles per FTE research staff. The number of refereed articles gradually increased over the review period. The average AIP dropped slightly from 0.71 to 0.66, but remains at a high level. It has strong share of top quartile publications in the AIP rankings. During the site visit, the Department explained that many of its publications are in the top 10% of the AIP rankings, so that quality of their publications is higher than registered by that ranking. There are also several publications in very prestigious journal outlets which give remarkable visibility and recognition to the Department. 15 PhD theses were defended in the review period, or 2 defended theses per member of the research staff over the review period.

Regarding research goals, consistent with the Institute’s multidisciplinarity mission, the Department values and has expressed strong openness to publications outside of traditional economics publication outlets. This is relatively unique for an Economics Department, and makes the Department especially notable. This stance is reinforced by its recruitment philosophy that favors hiring individuals well trained as economists but also interested in and capable of producing research in multidisciplinary contexts. In addition, the Department is particularly active in IMR Hot Spots (INNOVATION, ID, GLOCAL, GAINS), as well as in other forms of inter-departmental and inter-university research.

Other positive measures of research quality include the following. The Department sees IMR research criteria as minimal criteria, and aspires to significantly increase the number of PhD candidates. It pursues a flexible strategy of grant targeting aimed at tailoring applications to the best possible granting agencies. It has been successful in developing collaborative relationships with other institutions. It is active in developing new data sets for multidisciplinary research. Particularly impressive is its increasing presence with respect to: Sustainable Development Goals; Healthy Brain, Health and Economic Behavior, and Healthcare Governance; local and regional economic development.

Overall, the Department conducts very good, internationally recognized research. It has successfully combined traditional disciplinary research with multidisciplinary concerns. The Department is well respected by peers in other universities, and it is reasonable to expect it to gain in reputation in the future.

The principle constraint on further improvements is the size of the Department, which is small compared to many well-known economics departments. Nonetheless, it is
making impressive progress and making the best use of its resources by increasing the numbers of PhD candidates and through the addition of a number of new assistant professors on tenure track.

**Societal relevance**

The Department’s research objectives – institutions and individuals, organizational networks, and behavioral decision making – are especially appropriate to the multi-dimensional nature of human society, and thus allow for greater engagement with societal stakeholders than a traditional focus in economic research on market behavior. The adoption of new methods of empirical research in economics (for example, experiments and random controlled trials or RCTs) has allowed the Department to undertake research in new domains of investigation beyond the traditional subjects of economics research. The RCT method creates new data sources tied to their subjects of investigation, and their employment produces a less compartmentalized research output more appropriate to the multi-dimensional nature of human society. Though these methods are relatively new to economics, they have a long history in medical science. Their use in the Department’s research makes it possible for researchers to collaborate with socially relevant research in health and medicine. The opportunities to use new methods distinguish the Department compared to other universities and work to attract top young researchers at the assistant and associate level who choose IMR because of and not despite its multidisciplinary composition.

Overall, the Department makes a very good contribution to society. It has built its research objectives around societal relevance and those objectives are fundamentally important to the development of a sustainable society. Further, the Department explicitly emphasizes that societal relevance is a pre-eminent concern in economics research.

**Viability**

The Department’s strategy towards staff deserves particularly high marks in regard to viability. Despite its small size, the Department has adopted governance principles that can be expected to build a strong, broad base for research across the Department. Two governance principles it employs are central to this.

First, it emphasizes growing the Department ‘from the bottom up’ rather than ‘top down’ in focusing on developing the research activity of assistant professors and supporting PhD candidates rather than primarily relying on the research of senior individuals. This should produce greater diversification in research and thus a greater ability to respond to changing and different social priorities.

Second, its interpretation of the IMR research time differentiation principle is particular advantageous to Department viability. As emphasized in the Department’s presentation, research time differentiation only occurs downward, that is, with respect to less productive individuals, and not upward, that is with respect to more productive individuals. At the same time, downward adjustments are designed to allow recovery, or for individuals to re-establish prior levels of research time. The strength of this interpretation is that it reduces the likelihood that research output becomes concentrated in a small number of researchers while other researchers permanently lose the ability to carry out research. In a small department, this runs the risk of reducing the quantity and perhaps also the quality of research generated.

Overall, the Department is very well equipped for the future. Its size is a challenge but it has adopted governance strategies that compensate for this. In addition, its success in regard to societal relevance contributes to its viability. If the Department is small, its outreach is a strengthening factor.

### 4.2.3 Recommendations

The Committee advises the EB Department to

- investigate employing alternative research outlet quality ranking systems that may especially value multidisciplinary research. Research on traditional research outlet quality ranking systems in economics suggests that impact scores for publications in top-ranked journals are disproportionately high relative to non-top journals and that impact scores for publications in generalist outlets are disproportionately high relative to applied and small and new field research.

- investigate additional ways of further reducing reliance on first stream financing.

- open up regular discussion within the Department regarding what other possible research objectives might be investigated, since society’s development is a continually evolving process. This could reinforce the Department’s commitment to multidisciplinarity, and help identify new sets of stakeholders interested in the Department’s research output.

- further develop its analysis of stakeholders’ interest in and engagement with the Department’s research output. The goal would be to develop measures for and other means of interpreting and determining the impact of Department research beyond traditional scholarly measures of research impact.
• share its research time differentiation practice with other Departments in a wider discussion within IMR regarding how differentiation of research time promotes viable multidisciplinary research.

• further investigate and evaluate the role and success of recruiting professors of practice, and examine how a differentiation of tasks is consistent with sustaining a cohesive Department.

4.3 Department of Public Administration and Political Science

Chair: Prof. dr. Ellen Mastenbroek (as of September 2019)

Total research staff in 2018: 20.6 FTE

Assessment:
- Research Quality: 2
- Societal Relevance: 2
- Viability: 3

4.3.1 Organization, mission and research objectives of the Department

The Department of Public Administration (PA) and Political Science (PS) consists of two Chair Groups. Together, both PA and PS researchers, from their respective angles, all contribute to answering questions on Institutional change and legitimacy. Per Chair Group two main themes can be distinguished. For Political Science the themes are ‘Sustainable Democracy and Political Representation’ and ‘Conflict at the Crossroads of the National and the International’. For Public Administration they are ‘Challenges in institutional change’ and ‘Challenges regarding institutional legitimacy and performance’. Its researchers are involved in at least four Hot Spots (EUROPAL, GENDER, GLOCAL, GAINS).

In 2018 the Department of PA/PS had a research staff of 20.6 FTE, a clear decrease compared to the 25.2 FTE research staff in 2013. The decline has been the sharpest in the category of post docs/others (3.4 FTE in 2013 to 0.3 FTE in 2018).

4.3.1 Assessment of the Department

Research Quality

The PA/PS Department today has 10.3 FTEs scientific staff, representing an all-time low during the period from 2013 to today. A number of layoffs in 2017 triggered by budget cutbacks have been replaced by a number of recruitments in 2018 and 2019, which bodes well for the future. During this period the Department’s staff has published 312 journal articles, averaging 11.9 refereed articles per FTE research staff. In 2018 alone there were 64 articles published. 29% of the articles were published in Q1 journals. 22 PhD theses have also been completed in this period, averaging or 1.9 defended theses per FTE scientific staff. These are clearly impressive numbers. True, a large proportion of these publications are in Q4 journals and there have been some fluctuations in the publication activity over the past six years, but overall it is clear that this is a very productive academic research environment.

There are however also some causes for concern. Research quality should not be measured only in the ‘absolute’ but also in relation to the Institution’s overarching mission. While productivity overall is high, it appears as if a fair amount of that productivity does not directly contribute towards IMR’s mission and research objectives. The Department’s two subcultures, PS and PA, perform slightly differently in this respect. Engaging in inter-disciplinary work on the broad range of themes under the IMR mission agenda appears to come rather easily to the PA scholars. This pattern is not surprising; Public Administration is in itself a multi-disciplinary research area. However, much of the research delivered by the PS community, while frequently published in leading outlets, does not reflect an inter-disciplinary approach.

The political science research themes presented in the self-evaluation also strike the reader as rather conventional and mainstream political science themes. Thus, while the PA scholars appear quite comfortable in the inter-disciplinary setting of the IMR, political scientists seem more inclined to pursue hardcore political science research questions. That having been said, we also note that political science and public administration each chair two of the six Hot Spots.

Furthermore, there are areas of research to both PS and PA that would speak more directly to the IMR research objectives—public management, governance studies, policy analysis, urban politics, social change and network analysis, just to name a few—that are conspicuously absent in the Department’s research agenda. These themes are at the juncture of PS and PA, and certainly relevant to the IMR as a whole, yet the Committee has found very few studies indeed on these issues.

The explanation to this pattern could simply be that these research areas are not the field of expertise of the PS or PA scholars, but that would in turn raise questions about recruitment strategies. With only slight exaggeration it appears as if there are some skills in the Department, particularly in the PS section, that might not be essential to the pursuit of the IMR’s mission and research objectives, and at the same time some insufficiency of skills that would be very useful indeed for the department to join
groups conducting inter-disciplinary research. This seems particularly clear in the case of the potential contribution of PS and less so with regard to the PA group. In that respect, the critique raised concerning this issue by the 2013 evaluation still stands, unfortunately.

Based on the observations described above, the Committee comes to the conclusion that the Department conducts very good, internationally recognized research. Political science earns this recognition mainly by delivering very good mainstream political science research whereas Public Administration's research is of equal quality but more oriented towards interdisciplinary research.

**Societal relevance**
The Department delivers research of high societal relevance. The PA group is successfully engaging disciplines within the IMR while at the same time also aligning with stakeholders outside the institution. As was pointed out in interviews, approaching stakeholders is essentially a win-win situation. This may to some extent be quite simply attributable to the nature of the subject matter. However, PA as a discipline is increasingly often criticized for lacking societal relevance, so the IMR PA group should be commended for not going down that path.

The PS group of scholars, too, have interactions with stakeholders—the referendum study being a case in point—but overall their preference seems to be more to contribute to the intra-disciplinary discourse.

The societal relevance of the Department's work is manifested by the fact that almost 30% of the Department's budget comes from third stream funds. If the Department could also land a major research grant in fields of high societal relevance that would create a powerful synergy between research and stakeholder engagement.

Based on these observations, the Committee comes to the conclusion that the Department makes a very good contribution to society.

**Viability**
The Committee recognizes that in the past period, the Department has worked hard to build for a better future, even in the difficult financial context it was faced with in 2017 and early 2018. Notwithstanding the Department's efforts, first stream funding accounts for almost 70 percent of the Department's budget for the 2013-2018 time period. In 2018, only 1.6 percent comes from second stream funds (compared to 17% in 2013). The Committee is of the opinion that PS-PA could have managed the situation better by assuming a more strategic and forward-looking approach. The Committee notes that in 2019, the Department has been hiring extensively and it has also been successful in grant acquisition. While this bodes well for the future, these developments are too recent for the Committee to give them full consideration.

As discussed above (see ‘Research Quality’), the Committee observed that the Department’s research agenda is less aligned to IMR research objectives. The current Committee emphasizes that the 2013 Committee already strongly recommended to bring the research more in line with IMR objectives. The Committee stresses that the Department now needs to take clear steps in this regard, as the current situation continues to have a negative impact on the Department's viability. While appreciating the Department's commitment to the Hotspots, the Committee remarks that the alignment of research is also an area the Department could assume a more strategic and forward-looking approach in.

Based on these observations, the Committee comes to the conclusion that the Department makes responsible strategic decisions and is therefore well equipped for the future.

**4.3.3 Recommendations**
The Committee advises the PA/PS Department to

- target in future recruitment research areas where PS and PA are currently weak; where the two sections can collaborate; and where the department as a whole can make a stronger overall contribution to inter-disciplinary work;

- make further efforts to align PS with the research strategy and mission of the IMR;

- explore the possibilities of further strengthening the linkages to existing and potential stakeholders by developing internships and opportunities for members of staff to create more continuous links with agencies and municipalities;

- increase PS-stakeholder interactions by exploring mutual interests in areas such as public policy (elected officials, policy advisors, public servants), representation (political parties, organized interests, the media) and governance (issue-based networks, public servants, private businesses);

- increase the Department's strategic capacity by developing a more diverse revenue structure, particularly increasing research grant acquisition;
use management instruments that are available to the Department such as research time redistribution to help attain key strategic goals like aligning PS with the IMR mainstream in terms of research objectives and strategies.

4.4 Department of Geography, Planning, and Environment

Chair: Prof. dr. Arnoud Lagendijk
Total research staff in 2018: 35.8 FTE

Assessment:
Research Quality: 2
Societal Relevance: 1
Viability: 2

4.4.1 Organization, mission and research objectives of the Department

The Department of Geography, Planning and Environment (GPE) seeks to understand how places on different scales are politically and materially shaped, experienced and governed. It aims to contribute to the development of more sustainable and equitable places. The Department has three core themes: (1) Bordering and migration, (2) Climate and energy, biodiversity and water, (3) Urban/place development and mobility. It is divided into three subunits: Geography, Planning and Environment, each represented by a Chair: (1) Human Geography, (2) Planning Studies, (3) Environmental Governance and Politics. Its researchers are involved in at least four Hot Spots (EUROPAL, GLOCAL, IEBE and ID).

In 2018 the Department of GPE had a research staff of 35.8 FTE, a clear increase compared to the 29.9 FTE research staff in 2013. The evolution of the different subcategories is however mixed: although scientific staff and postdocs have remained more or less at the same level, the FTE of ‘regular’ PhD candidates has dropped from 15.2 FTE in 2013 to 11.2 in 2018. However, the FTE accounting for IPS candidates has risen dramatically (from 1 FTE in 2013 to 11 FTE in 2018).

4.2.1 Assessment of the Department

Research Quality
Although there are many chances of cooperation and synergies between the three subunits of GPE mentioned above, the internal structure of the Department seems to be quite heterogeneous. This structure has both strengths and weaknesses. On the one hand, the internal heterogeneity fosters interdisciplinary research, which is surely a strength of the Department. On the other hand, the personal endowment of the three subgroups is small compared to the usual size of respective departments at other universities and thus the chance to get an international visibility is limited.

The scientific staff comprises ca. 8 FTE and ca. 5 FTE postdocs, being fairly stable over the review period. In relation to the number of tenured scientists the number of PhD candidates is pretty high, being stable over time and referring to the vivid academic environment of the Department. As mentioned above, a specific strength of the Department is the rising number of IPS candidates coming mainly from China and Indonesia and contributing to the increasing internationality of the Department.

With regard to the limited personnel endowment the scientific output of the whole Department is fairly impressive. The Department produced a total of 229 refereed articles over the review period, averaging 7.0 articles per FTE research staff. The number of refereed academic articles fluctuated between 25 and 47 per year, showing a clear upward tendency within the period under review. Also, 20 PhD theses were defended, averaging 2.4 defended theses per FTE scientific staff. On the one hand, the publication productivity can be assessed as fairly good in relation to the volume of staff. On the other hand, the number of professional contributions (journal papers, book chapters, reports) has decreased significantly, apparently due to personnel changes in the planning and environmental studies subunits. This may be seen as a shift towards a more academic profile of the whole Department, however apparently not at the cost of societal collaboration (see below).

The overall mission of the Department and the focus on three core themes are highly appreciated. The three core themes are well developed and internationally visible. They fit very well in the mission of the Department as well as in the overall IMR mission.

Based on these observations, the Committee comes to the conclusion that the Department conducts very good, internationally recognized research. In spite of the limited size, the Department is successful in elaborating research themes with an international visibility and recognition like – among others – the research groups on bordering/migration and urban development/mobility.

Societal relevance
The research activities of the GPE Department are clearly aligned to societal issues. All subgroups are working on themes of high societal and political relevance, partly in the context of international research networks, partly in collaboration with mostly public stakeholders. This dedication fits very well in the mission and research objectives of the IMR.
The research profile of the GPE Department is not only predominantly interdisciplinary and in a broad sense applied, but partly even transdisciplinary. This type of research is characterized by close collaborations between societal stakeholders (mainly public authorities, but also firms, NGOs, and other mainly public agencies) on the one hand and the research groups on the other. The collaboration consists of joint definitions of the research themes and a dissemination of the results into the societal practice. In this respect the Department can serve as a vanguard for a more society-oriented research of the whole IMR. The distinct alignment to societal issues corresponds with the relatively high proportion of external funds, which the Committee applauds. However, this evolution also presents some challenges in view of the Department’s viability (see below).

Based on these observations, the Committee comes to the conclusion that the Department makes an outstanding contribution to society.

**Viability**

The information on viability given by the self-evaluation report and acquired during the site visit convey the assessment of an overall effective governance structure. The endowment with personnel and monetary resources has been rather stable over time. The Department has been particularly successful in attracting funding from the second and third fund stream (24.6% and 30.1% respectively in 2018), resulting in a decline of the first fund stream even below 50% of the whole research funding (e.g. in 2018). On the one hand, this clearly mirrors the success of acquiring external funds, and for this the Department should be applauded.

However, a few factors have to be mentioned that may impair the research capability of the GPE Department in years to come. First, the success in attracting external funding may result in a growing dependency on quickly shifting public discourses that do not always meet the specific scientific competences of the Department. The growing dependency on external funding also leads to an increasing imbalance between a small number of permanent staff on the one hand and a growing number of temporarily employed scientists with a precarious job perspective on the other. The Committee was however pleased to see that a strategy has been developed in the form of CentUR, where external research funding is pooled to ensure a steady income stream and keep a group of researchers on permanent externally funded positions. Second, the strong orientation towards practical issues may lead to a trade-off between societal dissemination (e.g. with reports in the Dutch language) and scientific excellence (with papers in high-ranking journals). The GPE Department is aware of this conflict, but seems to manage this challenge fairly well as the publication figures show.

Third, the GPE Department is responsible for a Bachelor Program and three Master Programs (according to the three subgroups of the Department) with a high influx of master students from other universities. This reflects the attractivity of the GPE Department for students who are interested in the master programs with an inter- and transdisciplinary profile, however at the expense of the scientific personnel suffering from a high teaching load that confines the research capacity of the Department.

Concerning the future, the GPE Department has developed thoughts on improving the acquisition of external research funding, on strengthening research cooperation both within the IMR as well as with external partners and on coping with the challenges of the increasing number of foreign PhD candidates. The Committee acknowledges these thoughts, yet suggests furthermore a reflection on the structural bottlenecks mentioned above that seem to hamper the research capacity.

Based on these observations, the Committee comes to the conclusion that the Department is very well equipped for the future.

**4.2.3 Recommendations**

The Committee advises the GPE Department to

- Develop further the format of transdisciplinary research that can contribute to the specific profile of the Department;

- Carefully balance the growing dependency on quickly shifting public discourses with the specific scientific competences of the Department;

- Mitigate the increasing imbalance between a small number of permanent staff on the one hand and a growing number of temporarily employed scientists with a precarious job perspective on the other;

- Considering the trade-off between societal dissemination and scientific excellence as a consequence of the orientation towards practical issues;

- Monitor GPE staff’s teaching load.
5. Response of the Institute

We are grateful for the positive assessment and constructive recommendations from the evaluation committee. It is a confirmation of the strategy that we have developed and implemented in the past years, to create a multidisciplinary research institute to study responsible governance for sustainable societies. And it recognizes the commitment and engagement of our researchers to create an open culture where collaboration is initiated and appreciated.

The committee has shown clear appreciation of our research program, and the related research programs of the Departments and the Hot Spots. The topics of our research are highly relevant, both to society and to academia, in particular because of our multidisciplinary approach. We take the positive evaluation of the committee as an encouragement to pursue and further build on our research agenda, in the various disciplines represented in our institute and the Hot Spots. One of the things that we would like to take up is to engage our academic staff in working towards a more visible and recognizable narrative of IMR that starts from a focus on the most urgent and complex societal challenges that we have to address.

Most of the recommendations of the committee align with the strategy and plans that we have developed in four important areas.

First, regarding the organizational structure of the IMR, the committee expected that the complexity of our organizational structure could create tensions, but found during the site visit that the combination of vertical Departments and horizontal temporary Hot Spots works well and could in fact be an example for other research institutes. The committee recommends us to take it to the next level, in particular by improving the relationship between Departments and Hot Spots, for example by involving the Hot Spots in line decisions. This recommendation is entirely in line with the next steps that the Faculty Board aims to undertake. We expect that the committee’s recommendation will help us in achieving this goal. Departments are to remain the crucial organizational units for securing the state-of-the-art development of disciplinary expertise and knowledge in research and education. Hot Spots are the crucial Hubs and Infrastructures for organizing collaboration within IMR on research, but more importantly, for facilitating a much more explicit outward orientation. We aim to keep these Hot Spots flexible and ‘light’. The alignment of Hot Spots and Departments and their embeddedness in the IMR as a matter of ‘soft’ governance rather than heavily formalized decision procedures. This requires however an organizational climate of trust and mutual respect, which can be strengthened by creating liaisons between the various epistemic research communities in our Institute. The Hot Spot coordinators and the research coordinators of the Departments have an important role in this.

---

1 An earlier version of this response has been prepared by the then Vice-dean for Research Prof.dr. Sandra van Thiel and sent to the Executive Board of the Radboud University on 31 March 2020. Sandra van Thiel has left our university in Spring 2020. The new Vice-dean for Research, dr. Jan-Kees Helderman, entered office on October 1st, 2020.
The committee was impressed with the quality of the research support and facilities available to our researchers. In the field of HR further investments in academic leadership and diversity could be possible, according to the committee. We agree and will continue to implement our plans in this respect, as for example laid out in the report Promising Applications (on academic leadership) and the new HR memorandum which will be decided upon in mid-2021. A final point regarding support functions that the committee made refers to the availability and use of management information. There are currently several projects ongoing at the level of the university to improve the availability and quality of management information, in which our Faculty participates.

Second, the committee discussed at length (in a positive way) the use of our system for the measurement of research performance, in particular publications, to take decisions about the amount of research time for individual researchers. As noted by the committee, this concerns decisions by Departments and Chair Holders, based on the quality of research output. We will continue this practice, following the example of the Economics Department, being aware of the potential risks and necessary conditions as pointed out by the committee, such as the teaching workload. The recent evaluation has shown that most researchers are familiar with the system and have no problems in using it. Research time differentiation will be on the agenda for the coming years. However, we do think that publication guidelines alone are a poor instrument for deciding on research time because this would indeed not be in line with our mission and culture. Secondly, it is only at the level of Chair Groups and Departments that these different talents and tasks can be considered and where research time can be weighted of against all the other demands and conditions that matter in the private and work lives of our staff.

The committee also recommends to develop a good way to demonstrate the impact of our research. We agree with this recommendation, as it fits with our strategy but also with the new direction of the government when it comes to research policy: the impact of research has become a very important indicator in the new evaluation protocol. We aim to make progress on the assessment of societal impact and relevance of our research. We will also work on ways to better account for the societal impact, in line with the latest Strategy Evaluation Protocol 2021-2027 (VSNU, KNAW, NWO). Our learning experiences during the evaluation of the IMR have already provided us with a number of ideas how to ‘measure’ and present the impact of our research. We take the committee’s positive assessment on this point – in particular regarding the GPE Department and the Hot Spots – as indicative for support of our direction here. The impact team, the ongoing analysis of stakeholders and the hiring of associate professors of practice will take it to the next level.

A third important theme in the recommendations is the committee’s advice to create a more diverse stream of revenues, from different types of grants and subsidies, in order to reduce our dependence on the first stream fund. We agree with this objective and have started discussions with the Departments about how to achieve this. For example, the Business Administration Department has an active agenda on this topic, GPE uses Centur for this purpose, and the Department of Public Administration and Political Science has recently been granted a series of grants as a result of its strategy to target specific competitions and scouting the talents of individual researchers. The Departments and IMR will build on such activities in close collaboration. However, the way in which the Faculty has organized the funding streams and budget allocations needs to be overhauled as well, to create more positive incentives to obtain external funds and more clarity about the allocation of budgets. To that end, we are working on a coherent set of financial and organizational incentives to develop a more outward oriented orientation of our researchers.

Fourth, an important aim in our strategy is to increase the number of PhD candidates. To this end, we aim to increase grants acquisition as explained above, but we will also invest in the quality of supervision, both for the benefit of the PhD candidates but also for supervisors. We are happy to follow the recommendation of the committee to install an extra milestone in the third year of the PhD candidate’s trajectory, which will also be facilitated by the implementation of the central monitoring system Hora Finita of Radboud University in 2020. The Doctoral School has already initiated a series of workshops for supervisors to increase their quality of supervision, and for PhD candidates who are struggling to finish their dissertation. This approach will be extended in the coming years. Based on the positive assessment of the committee we are confident that IMR is on the right track to become known, also internationally, as an excellent research institute for the study of responsible governance for sustainable societies. An additional benefit of the evaluation is that we hope it will enable us to develop a research master program for our students, to turn them into the best researchers in this field and further contribute to IMR’s research quality.

Nijmegen, 8 February 2021
On behalf of the Faculty Board,

dr. Jan­Kees Helderman
Vice-­dean for Research and IMR Director
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Appendix 1: Short Curricula Vitae of the Evaluation Committee members

Patrick Kenis (Chair) is Full Professor and Head of Department at the Department Public Governance, School of Economics and Management, Tilburg University, the Netherlands. He received a PhD in Political and Social Science from the European University Institute, Florence, Italy. He held positions at Antwerp Management School, Antwerp, Belgium, TIAS (the School for Business and Society), Tilburg, the Netherlands, the Department of Policy and Organization Studies, Tilburg University, the Free University, Amsterdam, the University of Konstanz, Germany and the European Centre for Social Welfare Policy and Research, Vienna, Austria. He has been teaching at Bachelor, Master and PhD-level on Organization Theory and Design and Networks. He is also teaching in Executives Programs in different schools and in different fields such as health, innovation, public management, industry and education. His principal research object is organizational networks and collaborative governance. He published widely on this and related topics in international journals like the Academy of Management Review, Organization Studies, Journal of public administration research and theory, Public Administration, International Public Management Journal, European Journal of Political Research.

Hans Blotevogel studied geography and completed his PhD in 1972 and his habilitation in 1980 both at the Ruhr University of Bochum, Germany. In 1983 he became full professor of human geography at the University of Duisburg, Germany. In 2004 he moved to the University of Technology of Dortmund where he was appointed as a full professor of spatial planning.

From 2012 until 2017 he was a full professor of spatial research and spatial planning at the University of Vienna, Austria. In Duisburg he was Vice Dean and Vice Rector of the University (1986-93). He was chairman of the committee of elected referees for geography of Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, President of the Association of German Geographers, President of the Academy for Spatial Research and Spatial Planning (Hannover), and Chairman of several scientific advisory boards. He is member of some scientific academies, among others the Austrian Academy of Sciences (Vienna), and the Academia Europaea (London). He published extensively on urban and regional development in Northrhine-Westphalia and Western Europe in both a historical as well as an applied perspective. He published books and articles on the theory of central places, history of spatial planning, demographic issues and metropolitan development. In 2018 he was the main editor of the Handwörterbuch der Stadt- und Raumentwicklung (4 vol.).

John B. Davis (PhD, philosophy, University of Illinois, 1983; PhD, economics, Michigan State University, 1985) is professor emeritus of economics at Marquette University in the U.S. and professor emeritus of economics at the University of Amsterdam in the Netherlands. He has been a visiting professor at the University of Paris Sorbonne, Cambridge University, the University of Reims, Erasmus University Rotterdam, and Duke University. He has taught over two dozen different courses and been involved in the supervision of over a dozen PhD students. He was president of the History of Economics Society and Association for Social Economics. He has authored or edited over twenty books and over two hundred papers and articles. He received the Marquette University Sigma Xi Award for Distinguished Scientific Achievement in 2006 and the Thomas Divine Lifetime Achievement Award from the Association for Social Economics in 2007. He was formerly editor of the Review of Social Economy, formerly co-editor of the Journal of Economic Methodology, and is currently editor of the Routledge Advances in Social Economics book series.

Maddy Janssens is a Full Professor at the Department of Work and Organisation Studies, Faculty of Economics and Business, KU Leuven, Belgium. She received a Ph.D. in Organizational Psychology from KU Leuven and a M.S. in Organization Behavior, Kellogg Graduate School of Management, Northwestern University in 1992. She held visiting positions at INSEAD (1996), Stern School of Business, New York University (1999), and Melbourne Business School (2010). She was the scientific lead of SUS.DIV, a European Network of Excellence on Sustainable Development in a Diverse World, consisting of 34 partners, co-financed by the European Commission, Sixth Framework Programme (2005-2011). Currently, she is the campus dean of Faculty of Economics and Business, Leuven. Her research on diversity, multicultural teams, interorganizational collaboration, and language and translation in international business has been published in leading academic journals such as Academy of Management Review, Organization Studies, Journal of International Business Studies, Organization, Journal of Management Studies, Human Relations and Academy of Management Journal. Between 2015 and 2018, she was associate editor of Journal of Management Studies.

Jon Pierre is Professor of Political Science at the University of Gothenburg, Sweden and adjunct professor at the University of Pittsburgh. He has also served as Chair in Politics at the University of Strathclyde 1996-1999 and as Professor of Public Governance at the University of
Melbourne, 2013-2018. His field of expertise is public administration, public management and urban politics. His most recent books in English include Governing the Embedded State (Oxford University Press, 2015) (with Bengt Jacobsson and Göran Sundström); (ed) The Oxford Handbook of Swedish Politics (Oxford University Press, 2015); Comparative Governance (Cambridge University Press, 2016) (with B. Guy Peters); and The Next Public Administration (Sage, 2018) (with B. Guy Peters). His work has also appeared in journals such as Administration and Society, Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, Public Administration and Journal of Politics.

Appendix 2: Programme of the site visit IMR

Day 1: Wednesday 13 November 2019
Location: Fletcher Landgoed Hotel Holthurnsche Hof, Zevenheuvelenweg 48a, 6571 CK Berg en Dal
14.30 Chair and secretary committee meet with Dr Chris Mollena (Policy advisor Radboud University) for programme logistics and procedures
15.30 Site visit preparation by the Committee (Plenary Committee only)
17.30 Welcome to Committee
18.30 Dinner (Committee only)
20.00 Further preparation of the site visit (Committee only)

Day 2: Thursday 14 November 2019
Location: 00.240 Ulbo de Sitter conference room, Elinor Ostrom Building, Nijmegen School of Management, Heyendaalseweg 141, 6525 AJ Nijmegen
08.00 Taxi from hotel to campus
08.30 Welcome, presentation and interview with Director of the Institute, Dean of the Faculty, Heads of the Departments and Head of IMR Research Services
09.15 Committee: discussion of findings and writing

Meetings key representatives of the Departments
09.30 Business Administration
10.15 Committee: break, writing and change of group
10.45 Economics & Business Economics
11.30 Committee: writing and change of group
11.40 Geography, Planning & Environment
12.25 Committee: writing
12.40 Lunch (Committee only)

Meetings key representatives of the Departments - Continuation
13.30 Public Administration & Political Science

Day 3: Friday 15 November 2019
Location: 00.240 Ulbo de Sitter conference room, Elinor Ostrom Building, Nijmegen School of Management, Heyendaalseweg 141, 6525 AJ Nijmegen
08.00 Taxi from hotel to campus
08.30 Committee only: wrap up and discussion
09.00 Meeting Faculty Board
09.45 Committee: discussion of findings, writing and break
10.15 Meeting Head of Doctoral School
10.45 Committee: writing and break
11.00 Meeting key representatives of the IMR PhD Council and PhD candidates
11.45 Committee: writing and break
12.00 Tour of IMR labs
12.30 Lunch (Committee only)
13.00 Committee: preparing last interview and eventual question for additional interview
13.30 Meeting Director of the Institute and Dean of the Faculty
14.00 Committee: writing session and preparing brief presentation of conclusions
16.45 Brief presentation of preliminary conclusions, open to all IMR staff
17.00 Drinks
Appendix 3: Quantitative data on the institute’s composition and financing

1. IMR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scientific staff</td>
<td># fte</td>
<td># fte</td>
<td># fte</td>
<td># fte</td>
<td># fte</td>
<td># fte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-docs/other</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD candidates</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPS candidates</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total research staff</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support staff</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total staff</td>
<td>202.8</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>244.7</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>258.8</td>
<td>247.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Research staff 2013-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel costs</td>
<td>k-€</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>k-€</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>k-€</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other costs</td>
<td>7.245</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>7.889</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>8.200</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9.810</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10.367</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9.896</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Funding and expenditures in fte and k-euro, 2013-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMR Publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refereed articles</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book editorships</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book chapters</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD theses</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference papers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic speeches</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total academic publications</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal contributions</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book chapters</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book editorships</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference papers</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book reviews</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total professional publications</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of publications</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Publications IMR 2013-2018
Table 6: Percentage of IMR female academics in 2013 and in 2018 compared to national average in 2017

Table 4: Article Influence percentile scores of journal publications (left) and percentage of journal publications per quartile (right), IMR 2013-2018.

Table 5: Trends in percentage of journal publications IMR 2007-2018, based on impact factor of journal.

Table 6. Percentage of IMR female academics in 2013 and in 2018 compared to national average in 2017.
The publication guidelines were evaluated in December 2018 (see Appendix). The results show that the guidelines are understood and accepted by most scholars. Based on the evaluation, only a few minor changes were considered necessary (e.g., to improve the lists of accepted book publishers). However, there is no consensus on the need for measurement of publications as such, and some researchers feel that the IMR norms should be higher and more in-line with standards in their own discipline. The guidelines were designed to accommodate different publication cultures, and, given the trends shown above, are effective.

There has been an increase in the number of individual and collaborative grant applications (see figure A-6). There are many different funding schemes to which our researchers apply in addition to the well-known Dutch science foundation NWO and the EU programmes. The appendix includes overviews of the different programmes and success of applications. Success rates vary per programme and funding agency, and international competition has increased strongly. Overall, IMR researchers have been most active and successful when applying for international funding schemes, particularly in the case of collaborative grants.

The publication guidelines were evaluated in December 2018 (see Appendix). The results show that the guidelines are understood and accepted by most scholars. Based on the evaluation, only a few minor changes were considered necessary (e.g., to improve the lists of accepted book publishers). However, there is no consensus on the need for measurement of publications as such, and some researchers feel that the IMR norms should be higher and more in-line with standards in their own discipline. The guidelines were designed to accommodate different publication cultures, and, given the trends shown above, are effective.

There has been an increase in the number of individual and collaborative grant applications (see figure A-6). There are many different funding schemes to which our researchers apply in addition to the well-known Dutch science foundation NWO and the EU programmes. The appendix includes overviews of the different programmes and success of applications. Success rates vary per programme and funding agency, and international competition has increased strongly. Overall, IMR researchers have been most active and successful when applying for international funding schemes, particularly in the case of collaborative grants.
2. Departments

2.1. Department of Business Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table B1-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPS candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-docs/other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Research staff 2013-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stream fund</th>
<th>2013 fte</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2014 fte</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2015 fte</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2016 fte</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2017 fte</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2018 fte</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st fund stream</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd fund stream</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd fund stream</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. Research funding 2013-2018

| Refereed articles | 72 | 53 | 56 | 73 | 66 | 73 |
| Books | 3 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| Book editorships | 4 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 |
| Book chapters | 62 | 27 | 22 | 8 | 21 | 18 |
| PhD theses | 8 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 3 |

Table 12. Academic publications 2013-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average AIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| % Publications AIP per quartile |
| 80% | 50% | 0% |
| Q4 | Q3 | Q2 | Q1 |

Table 13. Article influence percentile score and journal publications in quartile rankings, 2013-2018
2.2. Department of Economics and Business Economics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scientific staff</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-docs/other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD candidates</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPS candidates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14. Research staff 2013-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st fund stream</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd fund stream</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd fund stream</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15. Research funding 2013-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refereed articles</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book editorships</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book chapters</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD theses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16. Academic publications 2013-2018

![Average AIP](chart.png)

![% Publications AIP per Quartile](chart2.png)

Table 17. Article influence percentile score and journal publications in quartile rankings, 2013-2018
2.3. Department of Public Administration and Political Science

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013 #</th>
<th>2014 #</th>
<th>2015 #</th>
<th>2016 #</th>
<th>2017 #</th>
<th>2018 #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scientific staff</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-docs/other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD candidates</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPS candidates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18. Research staff 2013-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st fund stream</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd fund stream</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd fund stream</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19. Research funding 2013-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refereed articles</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book editorships</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book chapters</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD theses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20. Academic publications 2013-2018

Table 21. Article influence percentile score and journal publications in quartile rankings, 2013-2018
2.4. Department of Geography, Planning and Environment

### Table 22. Research staff 2013-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013 # fte</th>
<th>2014 # fte</th>
<th>2015 # fte</th>
<th>2016 # fte</th>
<th>2017 # fte</th>
<th>2018 # fte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scientific staff</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-docs/other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD candidates</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPS candidates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 23. Research funding 2013-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013 # fte</th>
<th>2014 # fte</th>
<th>2015 # fte</th>
<th>2016 # fte</th>
<th>2017 # fte</th>
<th>2018 # fte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st fund stream</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd fund stream</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd fund stream</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 24. Academic publications 2013-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refereed articles</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book editorships</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book chapters</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD theses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 25. Article influence percentile score and journal publications in quartile rankings, 2013-2018

---

Note: The tables and figures are placeholders as the actual data is not provided in the image. The tables represent typical academic research funding, staff, and publication metrics over a period from 2013 to 2018. The figures demonstrate trends in research quality metrics such as average article influence percentiles and journal publication quartile rankings.
Appendix 4: Explanation of the categories utilized

Extended description of the 4-point scale for categorizing the quality along three criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Research quality</th>
<th>Relevance to society</th>
<th>Viability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>World leading/excellent</td>
<td>The research unit has been shown to be one of the few most influential research groups in the world in its particular field.</td>
<td>The research unit makes an outstanding contribution to society.</td>
<td>The research unit is excellently equipped for the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>The research unit conducts very good, internationally recognized research.</td>
<td>The research unit makes a very good contribution to society.</td>
<td>The research unit is very well equipped for the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>The research unit conducts good research.</td>
<td>The research unit makes a good contribution to society.</td>
<td>The research unit makes responsible strategic decisions and is therefore well equipped for the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>The research unit does not achieve satisfactory results in its field.</td>
<td>The research unit does not make a satisfactory contribution to society.</td>
<td>The research unit is not adequately equipped for the future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>