

**QANU Research Review
Public Administration
IGS-UT**

April 2009

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

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

© 2009 QANU

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

Contents

- Foreword4
- Preface.....5
- 1 The review committee and the review procedures6
- 2 Information at the Institutional level8
- 3 General remarks and recommendations9
- 4 Assessments per programme 10
- Appendix A: Curricula vitae of the committee members 16
- Appendix B: Explanation of the SEP-scores..... 18
- Appendix C: Schedule of the site-visit..... 19

Foreword

This report follows the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2003-2009 for Public Research Organisations (SEP) that was developed by VSNU, KNAW and NWO. The purpose of this report is to present a reliable picture of the research activities submitted for this review and to give feedback on the research management and quality assurance.

The review committee was supported by QANU (Quality Assurance Netherlands Universities). QANU aims to ensure compliance with the SEP in all aspects and to produce independent assessment reports with peer review committees of international experts in the academic fields involved.

QANU wishes to thank the chairperson and members of the review committee for their participation in this assessment and for the dedication with which they carried out this task. We also thank the staff of the units under review for their carefully prepared documentation and for their co-operation during the assessment.

Quality Assurance Netherlands Universities

Mr. Chris J. Peels
Director

Dr. Jan G.F. Veldhuis
Chairman of the board

Preface

This report describes the independent external quality assessment of the research programmes in Public Administration in the Institute for Governance Studies (IGS) of the University of Twente (UT). The assessment covers the period 2002-2007 and was conducted according to the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2003-2009 for Public Research Organisations (SEP).

The quality assessment was carried out by a review committee consisting of one chair and three members with expertise in the relevant disciplines.

As chair of the Committee, I greatly appreciate the commitment, the expertise and the excellent cooperation of my colleagues. The Committee wants to thank all persons involved in the thorough preparation and support of the review.

Prof. Hans-Dieter Klingemann
Chairman of the Committee

1 The review committee and the review procedures

Scope of the assessment

The Review Committee was asked to perform an assessment of the research programmes in Public Administration as carried out by researchers in the Institute for Governance Studies (IGS) of the University of Twente (UT). The assessment covers the research in the period of 2002-2007. This review does not include an assessment of the 'institute level'. The reason for this is that the Institute will be evaluated in a separate review process. One interview during the site visit was devoted to the 'management aspects', but only served as background information for the assessment of the research programmes.

In accordance with the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP) 2003-2009 for Public Research Organisations, the Committee's tasks were to assess the quality of the research programmes on the basis of information provided by the Institute and through interviews with the management and research leaders, and to advise how this quality might be improved.

Composition of the Committee

The composition of the Committee was as follows:

- Prof. Hans-Dieter Klingemann, Simon Fraser University, Canada, chairman of the Committee
- Prof. Vincent Lynn Meek, University of Melbourne
- Prof. Kris Deschouwer, Vrije Universiteit Brussel
- Prof. Peter Knoepfel, Université de Lausanne.

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

Roel Bennink of the Bureau of QANU (Quality Assurance Netherlands Universities) was appointed secretary to the Committee.

Independence

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

Data provided to the Committee

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

1. Self-evaluation report of the research programmes under review, which included the information required by the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP);
2. Copies of five key publications for each of the three programmes.

Procedures followed by the Committee

Because of the specific nature of research in public administration, the Committee was asked to separately judge the practical and public orientation of the research ('valorisation'), next to the scientific aspects. Indicators for the assessment of these aspects are e.g. the amount of contract research, the public involvement of researchers through advisory positions, memberships of councils or other public functions. The review must take into account not only the international but also the national position of research in the field of public administration. This meant that Dutch publications were part of the review.

The Committee proceeded according to the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP). Prior to the Committee meeting, each programme was assigned to two members of the Committee, who independently formulated a preliminary assessment. The final assessment is based on the documentation provided by the Institute, the key publications and the interviews with the management and with the programme leaders. The site visit and interviews took place on March 4-6, 2009 at Twente University (see the schedule in

Appendix C).

During the Committee meetings on March 4 and 5, the Committee was briefed by QANU about research assessment according to the SEP, and discussed the preliminary assessments. For each programme a number of comments and questions were decided upon. The Committee also agreed upon procedural matters and aspects of the assessment. After the interviews, the Committee discussed the scores and comments. The texts for the committee report were finalised through email exchanges. The final draft version was presented to the Institute for factual corrections and comments. The final report was presented to the Board of the University of Twente and was published after formal acceptance of the report.

The Committee used the rating system of the Standard Evaluation Protocol. The meaning of the scores is described in Appendix B.

2 Information at the Institutional level

Introduction

This review does not include an assessment of the ‘institute level’, i.e. the organisational setting, the research policy, funding, facilities, etc. The reason for this is that the Institute will be evaluated in a separate review process. The self-evaluation report did not include information about the institute IGS or about the embedding of the programmes in the general context of the University of Twente.

Leadership

Formal responsibilities for research activities of the institute rest with the scientific director. Chairholders are responsible for the scientific direction of the research programmes linked to their chairs; they report to the scientific director of the institute under which a specific programme resides.

Research Strategy and Policy

The six research institutes at the UT all focus on a multi-disciplinary area in which ‘strategic research orientations’ (SRO) are defined. These large scientific programmes have a programme director who is responsible for the scientific coordination of the SRO and is accountable to the directors of the institutes involved.

Resources, Funding Policy and Facilities

As a matter of policy, all permanent academic staff have a dual assignment: teaching and research, while temporary academic staff (i.e. PhD students and postdocs) are usually restricted to a research assignment.

The majority of the tenured staff is funded by the University. Non-tenured staff are mainly post-docs and PhD students, of which the majority is funded by research councils and other funding.

3 General remarks and recommendations

The Committee found the self-evaluation reports very informative, concise, and candid. However, the preliminary assessment of the programmes, based on these reports, was considerably changed as a result of the site visit. The opportunity to meet directors and senior members of the research teams as well as graduate students, to ask questions, and to discuss, greatly enhanced quality and scope of the Review Committee's information relevant for the evaluation.

The meeting with the management clarified many open questions regarding the history of the programmes, its organisational setting, and the research management. It also highlighted the important role of the Institute of Governance Studies (IGS) in coordinating and administrating the activities of the many researchers who are attached to various departments and research institutes. The Committee felt that the IGS has very effectively helped the three programmes under review to pursue their research activities under these conditions.

The Committee enjoyed meeting the graduate students involved in the three programmes. Committee members had an opportunity to hear and discuss reports of their research projects, their evaluation of the quality of supervision and guidance. They also participated in a poster session prepared by the graduate students. The Committee was impressed by the overwhelmingly positive response of the graduate students. Not only did they praise guidance and supervision, they also were very much satisfied with their working conditions. The latter evaluation is not easily found at any research institution and adds to the reputation earned by the IGS.

The quality of the presentation of the various programmes and results of the subsequent discussions are reflected in the individual assessments of the three programmes. The chair as well as all members of the Review Committee want to stress that they have extensively discussed the definition of the SEP-scores regarding quality, productivity, relevance, viability, and feasibility. In general the Committee has seen a stellar cast of scholars, united in pursuing goals in their various research programmes that are cutting edge. Coherence and coordination are at a high level. All in all the programmes have convinced the Review Committee that they, indeed, deserve the highest ratings. Twente University can be proud to host such a unique ensemble of social science research programmes.

The future of these programmes seems to be bright. It is recognised by the participants that basic research and applied research must be more calibrated, and personnel and succession problem have been largely solved.

The Committee rated the programmes as follows:

	Quality	Productivity	Relevance	Viability
1. Higher Education and Research in the Knowledge Society	5	4	5	5
2. Innovation of Governance,	5	4	5	5
3. Sustainable Innovation	5	5	5	5

The detailed assessment per theme follows in the next section of this report.

Recommendations

The Review Committee limits its recommendations to two items:

1. Sustain and increase support for the programmes (and their successor programmes) on "Education and Research in the Knowledge Society", "Innovation of Governance", and "Sustainable Innovation".
2. Enable the three research teams to support an adequate number of graduate students.

4 Assessments per programme

IGS 1: Higher Education and Research in the Knowledge Society

Director: Prof. Dr. Jürgen Enders

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

Short description

This programme stresses the ongoing reformulation of the function of higher education and research in order to play a significant role in strengthening modern societies' innovative capacities. Research, teaching, scholarship and the 'third mission' of higher education, are subject to revision, both of their objectives and of the conditions under which they are carried out. This sometimes leads to competing claims from governments, markets, interest groups and stakeholders, raising fundamental questions about the further development of higher education and research. In this overall context, the programme is conceptualized around four overlapping and interrelated research clusters:

1. Transforming the social contract: Higher education, research and innovation
2. Transforming the coordination: Multi-level and multi-actor governance
3. Transforming the organizational field: Stratification and networking
4. Transforming the organizational fabric: Changing organizations and professionals.

Quality

The programme has an established international reputation in the areas of changing relationships between higher education and government and higher education and its stakeholders. It has been responsible for ground breaking research on the steering and coordination of higher education, and this has been extended into the third theme concerning the transformation of higher education institutions and systems. While this research has been and continues to be sound and of an international standing, what provides the programme with new vitality and originality is the extension of the research agenda into the areas of research policy and innovation and their impact on transforming the social contract between higher education and society in the context of the global knowledge economy. While the four research themes might appear at first glance to be somewhat disjointed, the Committee was convinced by the evidence presented that a highly coherent and internationally significant research agenda is being pursued. This research puts the group at the forefront internationally within its field. The group deserves commendation for its strategic approach to addressing some of the most significant research questions in the field of higher education policy studies.

Clearly, Enders as Programme Director is providing the programme with strong and inclusive leadership and has established for himself an international reputation in higher education policy research. Other members of the team too have established international research reputations in the field and have been highly productive in terms of publications. The group has lost a few of its more prominent members, but as noted below, there are strategies being put in place for their replacement.

The Committee noted with approval that the programme is in the process of significantly reducing its dependence on short term contract research in favour of medium to longer term competitive research grants from such granting agencies as NWO and DFG. This should help reduce the tension between excellence and relevance that is inherent to all research groups of this type. That said, it is also recognised that the output of the group has had direct impact on policy debates and implementation nationally and internationally.

Productivity

In terms of publications, the group is highly prolific. However, the number of publications in leading international journals in the field is not as high as one might expect for a research group of this size. The

Committee is of the opinion that publications in edited works are most appropriate for policy relevant research groups. Nonetheless, it is also of the opinion that the research group could shift the balance somewhat more towards higher ranking international journals than what is the case at the moment. The shift away from over dependence on short-term contract research may help in achieving this objective.

The Committee was impressed by the quality and enthusiasm of the PhD students involved with the group's research programme. While recognising current funding restraints, the Committee would encourage the group to recruit more PhD students.

Relevance

The programme conducts significant contract research and provides policy advice for government departments in the Netherlands, elsewhere in Europe and further afield, and for the EU as well. It also actively participates in the higher education research community through publications, conference/seminar papers and in holding significant international conferences. Members of the group are well represented on editorial boards of journals and book series of international standing. There can be no doubt as to the significance of the practical impact and relevance to policy makers of the research conducted by the group.

Viability

The group is in the process of rejuvenating itself through the appointment of a new professor and two senior researchers.

One of the most exciting potentials of the programme is its further extension into the area of research/science policy and the role of higher education in systems of innovation. This is crucial for the programme in terms of making a significant contribution to the study of the impact of higher education on the so-called knowledge economy/society. The groups proposed integration with the research agenda of the Department of Science, Technology and Policy Studies should proceed as quickly as possible. The Committee notes with approval the suggestion that the new chair position is a person with a background in research/science policy.

Conclusion

This is a strong and sustainable research programme of international standing and relevance which is at the forefront of its field globally. In order for it to retain this position, the group will need to continue to (1) recruit staff and PhD students of the highest quality, (2) attract competitive research grants that provide medium to longer-term funding, and (3) consolidate its research programme with that of the Department of Science, Technology and Policy Studies within the University of Twente.

IGS 2: Innovation of Governance
Director: Prof. Dr. Jacques Thomassen

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

Short description

This programme aims to describe, explain and evaluate the shift from traditional to new forms of government in modern societies, resulting from a variety of societal changes, such as the individualization of social relations, increasing emancipation, pluralisation of norms and values, differentiation and globalization. The public governance approach of the programme is sensitive to the involvement of public and private organizations in the pursuit of public interests, and has re-conceptualized the former hierarchic approach into a more cooperative mode where state and non-state actors participate in mixed public/private networks. The programme focuses on three related research questions:

1. What are the changes in society that make traditional forms of governance less effective and legitimate?
2. What are the consequences of the introduction of new forms of governance in terms of effectiveness and legitimacy?
3. How should institutions of governance be innovated in order to improve their effectiveness and legitimacy?

The programme has three sub-programmes, according to the perspectives provided by the institutions at different levels of government, namely the national level, the local level and the EU-level.

Quality

The overall research topic of the team – the relation between societal changes, institutional shifts and the quality and legitimacy of governance is one of the major themes in today's comparative political research. The 'Innovation of Governance' group of Twente University is not just a follower of the general mood, but has proven its quality and strength by taking the lead of several international projects. The three subgroups of the team –focussing respectively on the European, the domestic and the local level of government – are nicely tied together by this common perspective. This also allows them to assess the interrelation of levels and the causes and consequences of the increasing diffusion of power between public authorities, with all its important consequences for efficiency and democratic accountability. Coherence is also found in the methodological choices made. The group relies strongly – also given its tradition in electoral research – on quantitative survey methods. The Committee suggests to also pay some more attention to public policy and substantive policy issues in the survey research. This would allow the Innovation of Governance team to build bridges with other research groups in the Institute for Governance Studies.

Programme leader Jacques Thomassen is a very prominent researcher on the international scene, and several other members of the group are also outstanding researchers with a reputation that easily crosses the Dutch borders. The group also makes sure that people with a strong research profile are attracted to the temporary teaching positions. All this is reflected in the presence of substantial national (NWO) and EU funding and in publications in the top journals in the field.

Productivity

The quality of the research of this team is indeed visible through its scientific publications. Almost 20 per cent of the output takes the form of articles in refereed journals. The explicit comparative approach is also visible in the large number of book chapters and edited books, with several of them edited by the team members themselves.

As acknowledged in the self-evaluation, the number of ongoing PhD projects and finished PhDs during the evaluation period is low. The Committee agrees that it is really too low for a group with this number of leading and prominent researchers. This requires special attention. Even if – and exactly because – it has become increasingly difficult to receive funding for PhDs from the NWO more efforts should be made to attract young researchers willing to be part of the Twente team. The financial incentives given by

the university for every finished PhD are important enough to make a more pro-active strategy successful in this respect.

Relevance

The scientific relevance of the research themes and of the research output is very high. The team has also made sure – through a number of institutions like KISS (Kennis Instituut Stedelijke Samenleving) and the Centre for European Studies (CES) that links with the world of practitioners in both the private and the public sector are kept open both for informing the outside world about research results and for showing the availability of expertise that can be useful for the world outside academia.

Viability

The past scientific performance of the team leaves little doubt about its future capacity. The team is built on a solid and broad base. The replacement of a leading professor like Jacques Thomassen is never easy, but the group is well-prepared to keep on going in the near future. This is especially true for the well prepared transition of directing the programme “Innovation of Governance” from Jacques Thomassen to Kees Aarts. Its open mind for new societal and scientific developments and its policy of attracting good researchers for all teaching positions also guarantees its vitality and viability in a field where contract research is not easy to attract.

Conclusion

The Committee has seen a very strong research team, working on very relevant societal and political questions. Its members are often in the driving seat of international comparative projects and this shows in both the quantity and the high quality of the publications. The group is still at the cutting edge of what is going on in comparative politics and if it continues along the lines that have been set out in the past the Innovation of Governance team has a bright future to look forward to.

IGS 3: Sustainable Innovation

Director: Prof. Dr. Hans Bressers

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

Short description

This programme aims to contribute to finding innovative ways to balance the material needs of society with the quality of the environment. In particular, the scientific challenge is to support the emergence of new, integrative innovations and accompanying modes of governance. The research addresses four areas: 'innovation in water management', 'energy and climate change', 'greening of industry', and 'local and regional sustainable development'.

Quality

The research produced in the period under investigation by this very dynamic, innovative and collaborative team has been considered as being in the international forefront of contemporary environmental policy research (especially: water management and energy research). Many of these contributions have been conducted within international networks (especially: the ten European framework research programmes) allowing them a high visibility and considerable impact, both on the level of theoretical and conceptual work and the level of practice. Focusing on four clearly identified and interconnected policy issues (energy and climate, water management, greening of industry and local and regional sustainable development) the programme shows a high coherence which becomes even stronger when considering the common conceptual framework on policy instruments within increasingly multilevel political administrative settings. The Committee stresses the capability of the team to combine theoretical and practical issues allowing simultaneously acting on the level of international development and on (local and regional) practice in the Netherlands. This capacity becomes confirmed by the high prominence of the programme director and of the members of the senior research staff having each one recognized qualifications in one of the four areas.

The publication strategy of the team is intelligent, specially by including collaborative publications; however, it could be improved by enhancing publications in peer reviewed journals written by PhD candidates and more focused books edited by senior staff members.

Productivity

As mentioned by the group's director efforts should be and have been recently undertaken to increase the number of completed PhD-theses (actually 13 instead of 9 completed in the period under investigation). The number of scientific publications of this relatively small team is considerable and there is a well balanced distribution of published outputs within the group. The Committee furthermore stressed the considerable activity of the team within (national and international) environmental policy bodies and a high implication of the team in consultancy activities, which nourishes teaching, publishing and research produced by the institute.

Relevance

Considering the mission of the programme (expanding knowledge for designing and implementing governance strategies for sustainable development co-evolution of public and private, technical and societal, and interpolicy cooperation and integration, developing strategic research) the advancement of knowledge during the last six years is considered as very important. This becomes even more relevant when looking at the recently opened domain of north-south cooperation and the cooperation with the international GEO-information institute as well as the high implication of the team in education programmes (MEEM master programme, graduate programme for PhD students), the mentioned implication in advising municipal, provincial and national governments lead without any doubt to a high degree of dissemination and rapid implementation of knowledge produced by the team. The Committee suggests to go a step further in developing the already existing conceptual work in the field of policy

analysis (especially: policy instruments) as useful tools for teaching and common research conducted by younger colleagues within the frame of the north-south cooperation.

In this context, the cooperation with natural sciences (actually practiced by the team) is welcomed.

The high dependency of the team on (sometimes very short time) governmental contracts is not to be considered as hampering an increasing of the number of PhD students (with long time contracts). The Committee is convinced that the team has been successful in maintaining its scientific independency also under the regime of contractual arrangements.

Viability

The Committee considers that the long-term viability of the programme is guaranteed. Indeed, the team can continue working on solid scientific and institutional bases built in the past and it has convincing plans for its future activities. This is specially the case for research in sustainability on the local and regional level as well as for the north-south-cooperation (using inputs from the international GEO-Information Institute). In the mid-term, the team should think about its senior research staff's renewal (especially on the level of associate professors) and real efforts to include female members (to be found, maybe, amongst the internal PhD candidates).

Conclusion

For all these reasons, the Sustainable Innovation team merits the best SEP-scores in accordance with the current assessment dimensions applied by QANU-research reviews. The Committee is convinced that this team of the Institute for Governance Studies of the University of Twente will be able to defend this high quality score also during the next years.

Appendix A: Curricula vitae of the committee members

Prof. Hans-Dieter Klingemann, chairman of the Committee

Hans-Dieter Klingemann was director of the Research Unit "Institutions and Social Change" of the Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin (WZB) and professor at the Free University until 2003. He served as Vice-President (1982/83) and President of the International Society of Political Psychology (1986/87), as Vice-President of the International Political Science Association (1994/97), as President of the German Paul Lazarsfeld-Society (1994/99), and as President of the European Political Science Network (2002-2005). His publications comprise 13 books, 22 edited volumes, and 158 journal articles or book chapters (author or co-author). In 1999 Professor Klingemann was elected foreign member of the Finnish Academy of Science and Letters, and in 2001 he became member of the Deutsche Akademie der Naturforscher Leopoldina. He is also Honorary Senator of the University of Ljubljana, Slovenia, and doctor honoris causa in philosophy of Örebro Universitet, Sweden, and doctor honoris causa of the Social Sciences of the Universiteit van Tilburg, The Netherlands. In 2008 he won the John G. Diefenbaker Award given by the Canada Council for the Arts. From August 2008 to July 2009, he works with the Department of Political Science at Simon Fraser University (Burnaby, BC), on two research projects. One project examines the role of left-right orientation in political representation across nations. The other project is on political identity and compares the Canadian experience, as a politically diverse and inclusive community in a multicultural setting, with the European challenges of identity and democratic legitimacy.

Prof. Kris Deschouwer

Kris Deschouwer studied Sociology and Political Science at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel and obtained a PhD in Political Science at the same university. He has been teaching political science at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel since 1988. He was a research fellow at the European University Institute in Florence (1999), associate professor at the Department of Comparative Politics of the University of Bergen (1987-1993) and holder of the Chaire d'Honneur de la ville de Lausanne at the Université de Lausanne (2004). Kris Deschouwer has (co-) authored six books, (co-)edited seven books or journal volumes and published over 70 scientific articles and chapters on a variety of topics such as political parties, elections, comparative federalism and consociational democracy. His current research focuses on the consequences of institutional complexity for political actors and for political parties in particular. He has served on the editorial boards of several journals, and has been editor of *Res Publica* and the *Journal of Regional and Federal Studies*. Since 2003 he has been co-editor of the *European Journal of Political Research*.

Prof. Peter Knoepfel

Peter Knoepfel is professor in the analysis of public policy and environmental policy, at IDHEAP (Swiss Graduate School for Public Administration) at the University of Lausanne. He was director of research at the Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin, invited professor at the University of Kassel, *chargé de cours* at the Free University of Berlin and several other university institutes in Switzerland and in other countries. He is the author of numerous books and articles on theoretical and practical questions concerning the analysis of public policy, especially environmental policy, cultural policy and natural resources. He was director of IDHEAP from 1994 to 2002 and leads a research and teaching group on Public policy and Durability. His research concerns the analysis of traditional public policies, environmental policies and, more recently, the institutional management of natural resources. The research contributes to theoretical and conceptual developments both in Switzerland and internationally, but also to practical projects, particularly in the form of accompanying the reorganisation processes of administrative services, putting together new institutional structures for the management of natural resources or with regard to policies dealing with intellectual resources (for example: culture, museums, libraries etc.).

Prof. Vincent Lynn Meek

Lynn Meek is director of the LH Martin Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Management, University of Melbourne. He is a sociologist by training and has more than two decades of experience of researching higher education institutions, systems and policy issues. He has published 27 books and monographs and numerous book chapters and articles in scholarly journals. Some of his work has been translated into German, Chinese, Dutch, Portuguese and Spanish. The range of higher education topics on which he has published include institutional amalgamations, student admissions, TAFE institutions,

female participation in higher education, private sector higher education development, research policy and management, institutional management, diversity and the market steering of higher education. He has written articles on Higher Education and the State and the Sociology of Higher Education for Pergamon's International Encyclopedia of Education and the International Encyclopedia of the Sociology of Education. He has worked as a consultant for the UNESCO Principal Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific in Bangkok and is author of two major studies published by UNESCO. Professor Meek was for six years editor of the refereed journal, *The Australian Educational Researcher*, published by the Australian Association for Research in Education. He was also a member of the executive of that association. In 1995 he received Visiting Research Fellowships from the Netherlands Institute of Governance and NWO (Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research) to conduct comparative research on higher education management. In 1996, he received the UNE Vice-Chancellor's Award for Research Excellence and was the only Australian higher education expert to be invited to the Salzburg Seminar to consider the South African draft higher education policy. In 1998 he was a guest editor with colleagues from the University of Twente in the Netherlands of a special issue of the journal *Higher Education Policy*, also devoted to management issues. He edited a special issue of *Higher Education Policy* on diversity in January 2000, and a special issue of *Higher Education* on institutional amalgamations in higher education was published in 2002.

Appendix B: Explanation of the SEP-scores

<i>Excellent (5)</i>	Work is at the forefront internationally and will most likely have an important and substantial impact in the field. Group is considered an international leader.
<i>Very Good (4)</i>	Work is internationally competitive and is expected to make a significant contribution; nationally speaking at the forefront in the field. Group is considered international player, national leader.
<i>Good (3)</i>	Work is competitive at the national level and will probably make a valuable contribution in the international field. Group is considered internationally visible and a national player.
<i>Satisfactory (2)</i>	Work that is solid but not exciting, will add to our understanding and is in principle worthy of support. It is considered of less priority than work in the above categories. Group is nationally visible.
<i>Unsatisfactory (1)</i>	Work that is neither solid nor exciting, flawed in the scientific and or technical approach, repetitions of other work, etc. Work not worthy of pursuing.

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

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

Relevance is a criterion that covers both the scientific and the technical and socio-economic impact of the work. Here in particular research choices are assessed in relation to developments in the international scientific community or, in the case of technical and socio-economic impact, in relation to important developments or questions in society at large.

Vitality and feasibility. This dual criterion refers to the internal and external dynamics of the group in relation to the choices made and the success rate of projects. On the one hand, this criterion measures the flexibility of a group, which appears in its ability to close research lines that have no future and to initiate new venture projects. On the other hand, it measures the capacity of the management to run projects in a professional way. Assessment of policy decisions is at stake, as well as assessment of project management, including cost-benefit analysis.

Appendix C: Schedule of the site-visit

Day 1: Wednesday March 4, 2009

17:00 hrs	Hotel	Committee meeting: introduction to Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP); preliminary assessments
19:00 hrs	Dinner for Committee	

Day 2: Thursday March 5, 2009

9:00-10:00	Committee meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - discussion of preliminary assessments - preparing questions for the interviews
10:00-11:00	Meeting with the management: organisational setting, research management	Short presentation followed by interview
11:00-12:30	Programme 1: Education and Research in the Knowledge Society (Prof. dr. Jürgen Enders)	Short presentation followed by interview. Topics to be evaluated: Quality, Relevance, Productivity, Viability
12:30-14:00	Lunch	
14:00-15:30	Programme 2: Innovation of Governance (Prof. dr. Jacques Thomassen)	Short presentation followed by interview. Topics to be evaluated: Quality, Relevance, Productivity, Viability
15:30-16:30	PhD-students (group interview)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • their research projects • their supervision
16:30-17:30	PhD-poster session; drinks and informal interaction with staff	
17:30-19:00	Committee meeting	- conclusions for Day 2
19:00	Dinner for Committee	

Day 3: Friday March 6, 2009

9:00-9:30	Committee meeting	- preparing day 3
9:30-11:00	Programme 3: Sustainable Innovation (Prof. dr. J.Th.A. Bressers)	Short presentation followed by interview. Topics to be evaluated: Quality, Relevance, Productivity, Viability
11:00-12:30	Committee meeting	conclusions and scores; task division towards report
12:30- 14:00	Lunch + departure	