

Research Review
Institute of Public Administration
2008-2013

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

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

Project number: Q 0523

© 2015 QANU

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

Report on the research assessment of the Institute of Public Administration

Contents

Foreword by the Committee chair	5
1. The review Committee and the review procedures	7
2. Research review of the Institute of Public Administration.....	9
Appendices	17
Appendix 1: Curricula vitae of the Committee members.....	19
Appendix 2: Explanation of the SEP scores	21
Appendix 3: Programme of the site visit.....	23
Appendix 4: Quantitative data.....	25

Foreword by the Committee chair

It was a pleasure for the Committee to visit the Institute of Public Administration at the Faculty Campus The Hague, Leiden University. The discussions with the members of the Institute were frank and very helpful in our task of providing an assessment of its research programme.

The Committee is very favourably impressed in general with the Institute and its contributions to academic research and graduate education. There are certainly some critical remarks contained in this report, but they should be read as attempts to improve an already strong programme. We were particularly concerned with the development of a plan that can capitalise on the strengths of the programme and integrate it even more with the activities in The Hague.

We would like to thank the members and staff of the Institute for their efforts in preparing for the visit and the excellent organisation that enabled us to work effectively.

Professor B. Guy Peters,
Chair of the Committee

1. The review Committee and the review procedures

Scope of the assessment

The Committee was asked to perform an assessment of the research at the Institute of Public Administration at the Faculty Campus The Hague (FCDH), Leiden University. This assessment covers the research conducted in the period 2008-2013. In accordance with the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015 for Research Assessment in the Netherlands (SEP), the Committee's tasks were to assess the quality of the Institute and the research programme on the basis of information provided by the Institute and through interviews with the management, research leaders, staff members and PhD candidates and to advise how this quality might be improved.

Composition of the Committee

The Committee was composed of the following members:

- Professor B. Guy Peters (chair), Maurice Falk Professor of American Government at the University of Pittsburgh and Professor of Comparative Governance at Zeppelin University, USA and Germany;
- Professor Wolfgang Drechsler, Professor and Chair of Governance at Tallinn University of Technology and Vice Dean for International Relations of the Faculty of Social Sciences, Estonia;
- Professor Arthur Ringeling, Professor Emeritus of Public Administration, Erasmus University Rotterdam, the Netherlands;
- Professor Amy Verdun, Jean Monnet Chair Ad Personam, Professor of Political Science at the University of Victoria (UVic), Canada.

A profile of the Committee members is included in Appendix 1.

Jasne Krooneman, MSc, was appointed secretary to the Committee by QANU (Quality Assurance Netherlands Universities). She was supervised and assisted by her colleagues Dr. Meg van Bogaert and Dr. Floor Meijer.

Independence

All members of the Committee signed a statement of independence to safeguard that they would assess the quality of the Institute of Public Administration and its 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 received the following detailed documentation:

- Self-evaluation report of the unit under review, including all the information required by the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP), with appendices;
- Nineteen key publications of the research programme, which were divided among the Committee members. Two key publications were read by all Committee members. Each Committee member read four additional key publications. The chair read five additional key publications.

Procedures followed by the Committee

The Committee proceeded according to the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015 (SEP). Prior to the first Committee meeting, all Committee members independently formulated a preliminary assessment of the programme. The final assessments are based on the documentation provided by the Institute of Public Administration, the key publications and the interviews held with the management and leaders and researchers of the programme. The interviews took place on 10 and 11 November 2014 (see the schedule in Appendix 3) in The Hague.

Preceding the interviews, the Committee was briefed by QANU about research assessment according to SEP, and it discussed the preliminary assessments and decided upon a number of comments and questions. It also agreed upon procedural matters and aspects of the assessment. After the interviews it discussed the scores and comments. The text for the Committee report was finalised through e-mail exchanges. The final version was presented to the Institute of Public Administration for factual corrections and comments, which were discussed by the Committee. The final report was printed after formal acceptance.

The Committee used the 5-point rating system of the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015 (SEP). The meaning of the scores is described in Appendix 2. It quickly became clear to the Committee that Public Administration is a field in which Dutch scholarship is of a remarkably high standard and strongly internationally competitive, implying that scores at the higher end of the scale (3-5) would be most appropriate. To allow greater differentiation in this rather narrow range, the Committee decided to extend the 5-point scale to a 9-point scale (1, 1.5, 2, ..., 4.5, 5) The .5 was used to indicate that an aspect is between two integer ratings.

The Institute has one research programme (The Politics and Administration of Institutional Change) and all of the research within this programme is carried out within the bounds of the Institute. Therefore, the Committee decided to integrate its assessment of both the Institute and its research programme.

2. Research review of the Institute of Public Administration

Programme: The Politics and Administration of Institutional Change
Research staff: 14.58 FTE of which 7.90 tenured (in 2013)

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

Quality and academic reputation

The Institute of Public Administration is one of the largest and oldest institutes of academic research and teaching in the field of Public Administration in the Netherlands, which has now been around for thirty years. Its research areas include classical ones such as Public Management and Public Policy through to European Governance and Security Governance.

Since January 2012, the Institute of Public Administration has been administratively embedded in the Faculty Campus The Hague (FCDH). The move to The Hague was partly motivated by the idea that research and teaching would benefit from a closer connection to the Dutch administrative and political institutions and the strong presence of national and international governing bodies in The Hague would be attractive to present and future students and researchers of the Institute.

The Institute's current research programme *The Politics and Administration of Institutional Change* was launched in 2001 and reflects Leiden University's close connection with the governmental institutions in The Hague. The programme concentrates on the analysis of the politics and administration of institutional change and is subdivided into four intersecting core areas: Public Sector Management, European Governance, Comparative Policy Analysis and Security Governance. According to the self-evaluation report, these four areas are linked in significant ways. Most of the research conducted at the Institute creates bridges between them and transfers insights and methodologies from one area to another. Typically, staff members contribute to more than one of these research areas.

According to the self-evaluation report, the numerous awards, invitations for keynote lectures, prestigious fellowships, invitations to participate on editorial boards received attest to the national and international reputation of the Institute and its individual researchers. Its standing is also demonstrated by the fact that the Institute is a leader and a valuable partner in several of the major professional associations such as the European Consortium of Political Research (ECPR), for instance soon providing the Convenor of the Standing Group on the EU (ECPR-SGEU). It is also active in the European Group of Public Administration (EGPA), the public Management Research Association (PMRA) the International Institute of Administrative Sciences (IIAS) and the European Master of Public Administration Consortium (EMPA). Recently the Institute was awarded a Jean Monnet Centre of Excellence (JMCE) (collaboration with Clingendael, The Hague University of Applied Sciences, Montesquieu Institute). This European award for excellence in European Studies is another indication of international reputation. In addition the Institute spearheads various large international research projects in the fields of Public Administration and Political Science with funding from outside. For example staff members are involved in FP-7 research projects

such as MaxCap, partnered with Free University of Berlin (7th Framework Programme, funded by the EU) and involved in other collective research projects that are competitive and difficult to obtain (through a rigorous peer review process) such as the various awards from NWO that staff members hold. Finally, staff members have been serving as external examiners on large granting agencies, again an indication of international reputation.

Assessment/remarks

The Committee notes that the academic reputation of this research institute has been outstanding for many years and continues to be so. In general, Dutch Public Administration institutes are considered internationally prominent and although the Committee did not assess any other Dutch Public Administration institutes during the current evaluation, the Institute of Public Administration at the Faculty Campus The Hague seems consistently among the top three of the best Public Administration research institutes in the Netherlands.

The quality and scientific relevance of much of the research are outstanding, as evidenced by the key publications, which have been placed in important international refereed journals. Many publications of the research lines in Public Sector Management, European Governance, and Comparative Policy Analysis have appeared in top 10% and top 25% journals in the field. The subfield of Security Governance is characterised by a somewhat different publication culture; lead publications by the department are placed in books rather than in refereed journals, although there have been some publications in major journals of international politics and security.

Despite the quality of the different subcomponents, the exact connection between the four areas of research has not become altogether clear. The Committee believes there are opportunities for greater synergy among the fields and that interaction is already underway. More cross-fertilisation would stimulate all the fields. Also, the group relies quite heavily on 'normal science', which is what gets their articles and books published. The Committee believes that, in order to achieve true excellence, the group should move beyond that.

The Institute's researchers are on the leading edge; they contribute strongly to the field in terms of publications, grants and leadership. Both senior and junior scholars have done very well during the assessment period. Staff members have won major prizes for their work (such as the Jean Monnet Centre Ad Personam Chair; the best article award in European Union Politics in 2011, and the Haldane award for best article in Public Administration in 2013). Other evidence of a strong reputation is the editorship of journals.

The move to The Hague meant that the Institute had an opportunity to recalibrate and reprofile itself. In the assessment of the Committee the move was a promising change. The Institute should be able to benefit from the close proximity to government, international organisations like the International Criminal Court and Europol, but also to the Institute of Social Studies in The Hague. The Committee also wishes to emphasise the importance of maintaining good relations (and building on) faculties and departments within Leiden University (such as the Department of Political Science, but also the economists and lawyers). Cooperation can take on various forms, such as collaborating on research projects and grant applications, but also perhaps drawing on others for other forms of academic exchange.

In terms of a quality strategy, the Committee would like to encourage the scholars to think about where they want to be in the next six years and what strategies they would like to follow to obtain the scholarly output they wish to achieve. Who do they aspire to be? How can they measure themselves against this standard? The Institute's new leadership has only

recently been appointed and respective discussions are under way, so it is difficult to discern a concrete strategy as of yet, but the Committee trusts that needed strategic thinking is definitely forthcoming.

The Committee would like to offer a suggestion that was not discussed during the site visit, namely to consider the policy area of e-Governance. In international and also national Dutch comparison, the absence of a research unit or even just a contact person dealing explicitly and mainly with the Public Administration side of e-Governance is conspicuous. Given that in many respects e-Governance is the main challenge and also the primary focus of attention for Public Administration, both theoretically and regarding public sector demand, this field of specialisation could be considered as a future area of core competence for the Institute. The Institute could therefore consider creating such a position or unit, especially as the possibilities for synergies at Leiden University are very high.

Resources

During the 2008-2013 period, the number of staff of the Institute has grown considerably. The total number of Full Time Equivalent (FTE) staff increased from 14.30 in 2008 to 24.68 in 2013 (see Appendix 4). The Institute has employed a total of seven professors, five associate professors, seventeen assistant professors, and twelve PhD candidates over the entire assessment period. By default these persons could spend 30 percent of their time on research. In addition, the programme is supported by the expertise of institute members with limited part-time appointments or appointments in other subject areas. The Institute has also hosted several guest researchers. During the assessment period, the average age of the staff decreased, mainly due to the large influx of new staff at the assistant professor and PhD levels. Between 2008 and 2013, the Institute enrolled eight standard PhD candidates.

Over the assessment period, the financial resources available to the Institute have increased substantially. Direct government funding grew by 38% from 2008 to 2013, belatedly reflecting an expansion in the number of students trained in the educational programmes of the Institute. More importantly, the total of research organisation funding and EU funding has increased more than five-fold, due primarily to a string of successful NWO proposals (VENI, VIDI, Research Talent, and ERC-related). Funding through contract research is variable, but EU projects complement the total amount of resources available through this funding stream. In the period 2008-2013, the Institute successfully diversified its sources of funding.

Assessment/ remarks

It may be said that the Institute is going through a transition period in two respects. First the teaching obligations are becoming more intensive due the rapid growth of the number of students. And second, in the period reviewed a number of key researchers left the organisation in order to follow their career in another organisation. Recent hires at the professorship level are good, even if these new hires are still rather 'junior' full professors. The group as a whole is a relatively young one, talented, promising, of which a lot may be expected. But it is a group that is confronted with heavy assignments.

The Institute might want to think about ways to attract more senior scholars, even if only through visiting professorships or the occasional guest lecture, but also beyond that. The Committee also noted that the group was quite homogenous, with many of the members of the Institute closely connected to the *Randstad* (the conglomeration of the four large cities in the west of the Netherlands) through their training and expertise. The Institute could try to

diversify its hiring and acceptance of MA and PhD candidates and perhaps encourage some occasional guest PhD candidates. The external PhD candidates who come to the Institute should be integrated as much as possible.

In terms of career progress, the Committee noted that there was no formal procedure for this. It occasionally seemed like a somewhat erratic process, and some high-quality assistant and associate professors might not fully know how to improve their careers at the Institute. The Committee considers this situation detrimental for the continued growth of the staff within the Institute. Although it is a practice that is widespread throughout the Netherlands, in international perspective it is a poor practice and each university, faculty and institute should work hard to improve this situation. If not, the best and the brightest will move away or will not even apply for junior or mid-career job openings. It could be beneficial to develop clearer and more formal procedures that are transparent and equitable, based on merit, so that those who are ready for promotion can apply for it as a part of their career path. This formalisation of procedures would form an important part of a retention strategy to reduce the loss in staff observed in the period under review and contribute to a healthier career development among junior and mid-career staff.

Table 2 in Appendix 4 gives a survey of the financial sources of the Institute. It makes clear that the amount of first stream finances has increased considerably during the years considered. Here the increasing number of students is the crucial factor. It has to be added that these revenues from an increased educational demand always come with the delay of several years. Also the second stream shows an increase, in particular in recent years.

Regarding resourcing through external funding, it seems that the Institute has been quite successful in attracting grant money from the second stream. There are currently nine grants from the *Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek* (NWO; Dutch Organisation for Scientific Research), which is a sign of an outstanding research ability as there is strong competition for those grants. European grants are fewer (two Jean Monnet grants from the European Commission, one grant through the 7th Framework Programme and one joint European Research Council and NWO grant). This Institute should be able to attract more funding from European sources. The Institute has performed well in terms of attracting other grants (from other foundations, institutes and one from the Danish equivalent of NWO).

The Institute has also had success in acquiring contract funding, although the documentation in the self-evaluation report does not indicate clearly the share that is allocated to the Institute. The Committee noted aggregates in the self-evaluation report, showing total funding at between 2.2 and 3.6 million euro per year.

The slow development of third stream funding however gives reason for concern. In particular the non-EU funds are lagging behind. If the Institute wants to realise its repeated claim to be active in actual public discussions and do research that is intensively connected to these discussions, serious efforts to acquire third stream money have to be made in the near future. Much of the contract funding is from EU sources; there should be more opportunities for developing this pool of funding casting a wider net, especially since moving to The Hague. It should be possible to acquire more third stream funding, although the Institute as a whole, and individual staff, should be very strategic in choosing what third stream funding would be suitable (and strategic) to attract.

Productivity

In the review period, the research programme produced 508 English publications and 326 Dutch and other language publications. Affiliated professors produced 16 publications in the same period. This record is admirable, but as regards the future trajectory, it should be noted that many of the publications were by individuals who have since left the Institute. Within the discipline of Public Sector Management, a total of 21 publications were published in top 25% journals, of which 5 appeared in top 10% journals in the field of Public Administration and Political Science. European Governance published 35 articles in top 25% journals, of which 23 in top 10% journals. For Comparative Policy Analysis these numbers are 19 and 10, respectively. The research field of Security Governance has another kind of audience, hence the research programme states that it is currently impossible to estimate clearly what the top publication outlets are. The Committee disagrees with that assessment. There are numerous good outlets for these kinds of publications and the Committee encourages this research field to strategise as to what academic journals would be attractive to publish in for the coming years.

Assessment/remarks

The output – primarily the scholarly one – is excellent and deserves special commendation. While there is always room for improvement, the Institute is very productive, especially in international comparisons. What is more, the productivity of the Institute is to a significant extent a result of the publications by both junior staff and senior staff.

While the incentives are not always explicit, it is clear to the Committee that the Institute has created a culture and atmosphere that are focused on high-end scholarly publications. This focus has led to a large number of these high-end scholarly publications and a general presence of staff members publishing in all four research areas (Public Sector Management, European Governance, Comparative Policy Analysis, Security Governance). Other fields of output, such as the presence in national media and the national discourse, are also on an internationally very high level.

Societal relevance

Public Administration is a field of study with societal relevance at its heart. Modern Public Administration has been founded on it. It influences how researchers choose their priorities, their themes, their network and the duty of explaining the significance of their research to a wider public. The self-evaluation report highlights a number of ways in which the Institute claims to have an impact on society. An essential part of the mission of the research programme is to communicate the results of the research conducted to both academics and professionals in the Dutch government sector. Engagement of the programme with the world of practice is perceived as crucial to the quality of the research. In addition, given the fact that most of the funding comes from public resources, the programme feels responsible for contributing as much as possible to the issues in the fields of public debate and public policy in its areas of expertise. According to the self-evaluation report, the strong connection between research and policy does not mean that the Institute's research findings are by definition supportive of government policy. On the contrary, the research of the Institute is reportedly guided by principles of detachment.

Assessment/ remarks

The Committee considers societal relevance a complex criterion. It feels inclined to consider it not only in terms of the social, economic and cultural relevance of the research, as SEP 2009-2014 prescribes, but also in terms of political relevance.

This research programme shows it is conscious of this double obligation of Public Administration research. Nevertheless, a somewhat divided picture was presented to the Committee. Some research areas, such as European Governance and Comparative Analysis, seem to direct themselves predominantly to the academic relevance. In these areas, the conducted research has high literature citations and great methodology, but may be somewhat less concerned about what the results mean for the solution of societal or political problems. In other research areas, however, such as Public Sector Management and Security Governance, the societal relevance is considered to be much more important. In these research areas, the themes chosen and the questions asked have a strong and recognisable relationship to actual political and administrative issues.

One of the indications of the societal relevance of the research is the amount of contract funding. The Committee gained the impression that for applied research, the Institute's move to The Hague may increase the significance of the political and societal relevance. Perhaps more possibilities can be found by intensifying existing contacts with practitioners. Potentially, the move to The Hague also offers opportunities to conduct research financed by contracts with public organisations. In the years under review, the amount of contract research could and should have been higher, especially given the Institute's expressed intentions after the review in 2008. In the self-evaluation report, the aim for more contract-funded research is formulated again. The Committee would strongly advise the Institute to utilise the possibilities it has in its new context.

Strategy for the future

The 2012-2016 strategy emphasises that the Institute wishes to maintain its international and academic profile while at the same time aiming to build strong links with practitioners in public policy and management. The core of the 2012-2016 strategy consists of three types of activities: improving its performance in research organisation funding, nationally and internationally; increasing the volume of contract research; and increasing the number of externally funded PhD candidates. In the self-evaluation report it is described that the Institute has already partially realised this strategy and will maintain its focus on Public Sector Management, European Governance, Comparative Policy Analysis, and Security Governance.

Assessment/ remarks

The Institute has undergone a large number of changes in personnel, especially those in leadership positions. This has meant that a very clear strategy is not yet in place about how it will develop in the near future. The Committee believes that the Institute needs to develop such a strategy as quickly as possible, and it has been assured that this is in the making at the present time. The strategy should include building on the considerable strengths of the Institute in research and graduate education, and making even greater use of its location in the national capital. In addition, the Committee recommends – as has been stated previously – that the Institute focuses on integrating its several research areas more effectively and presenting a clearer image to the academic and professional communities. According to the Committee, it should also look into further integrating its activities with other academic programmes in The Hague and in Leiden.

PhD training and supervision

The Institute conducts an active PhD programme. Eight PhD candidates were enrolled in the Institute between 2008 and 2013. The PhD programme is embedded within the Research School NIG, where the Institute joins forces with Erasmus University Rotterdam, KU Leuven, Delft University of Technology, the University of Antwerp, Utrecht University, the University of Tilburg, Radboud University Nijmegen, VU University Amsterdam, Twente University and Maastricht University. NIG aims to provide PhD training courses at an advanced level, adapted to the needs of the candidates. The curriculum consists of a combination of courses and tutorials. The total course load consists of 1120 hours (40 EC).

Between 2008 and 2013, six external PhD candidates obtained their degree. For the supervision of external PhD candidates, Faculty Campus The Hague has established the Leiden University Interfaculty Dual PhD Centre The Hague. This programme focuses on the special circumstances and ambitions of PhD candidates who wish to combine work on a dissertation with their professional practice. A PhD candidate at the dual PhD centre always starts in the pre-PhD phase, unless it is evident that s/he already possesses the necessary academic skills and knowledge.

From 2008 to 2013, ten PhD candidates were awarded a doctorate, based on their research conducted within the institution. In the same period, five PhD candidates obtained a doctorate from the Institute, but conducted their research outside it. The majority of PhD candidates do not obtain their PhD degree within four years. For most of them, the time to formally complete the PhD trajectory was up to six years. Some delays are explained by their teaching activities in the Institute.

Assessment/remarks

The Committee finds that the PhD training provided at the Institute is of excellent quality. Four out of the five standard PhD candidates that enrolled between 2005 and 2009 have graduated, while one candidate dropped out. One concern may be the time that PhD candidates take to complete their PhD dissertation (two of the four graduates completed in five years, another candidate took six years to complete and the final candidate needed seven years, cf. Table 4, p. 26), especially since some external funding schemes are moving towards a three-year funding model for PhD candidates.

It was less clear to the Committee how other types of PhD candidates were integrated into the PhD training programme. The Committee wonders whether the external or dual PhD candidates are not reported clearly in the self-evaluation report, how many of these candidates are there, and what is known about them.

What is very impressive is that all ten PhD graduates, which graduated since 2003 have found academic positions. Four prizes were awarded for PhD theses (three theses in total) and two PhD candidates received 'cum laude'.

Conclusion

The Institute of Public Administration at the Faculty Campus The Hague, Leiden University, is engaged in a significant programme of research and education and is certainly one of the top Public Administration research programmes in the Netherlands and thereby in Europe. It is extremely productive and has turned out a number of PhD graduates who have themselves

become academics holding tenure track Assistant Professorship positions. The Institute has also been successful in attracting significant amounts of research money from the EU.

Nevertheless, the Committee believes there is potential for even greater success for this Institute. To achieve it, the Institute will need to consider several important aspects of its development. One is to integrate the four research areas more fully. Also, the current research style of the group relies quite heavily on 'normal science', and the Committee would like to see the group move beyond that in order to achieve true excellence. In addition, the Institute should develop more contract funding from sources other than the EU. None of these challenges is insurmountable, and indeed they are within rather easy reach of an institute with a talented academic staff and an increasing sense of common purpose.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Curricula vitae of the Committee members

B. Guy Peters is Maurice Falk Professor of American Government at the University of Pittsburgh. He is also professor of Comparative Governance at Zeppelin University in Germany. He earned his PhD at Michigan State University in 1970 and has three honorary doctorates from European universities. He is currently co-editor of the *European Political Science Review* and on the editorial boards of a number of other journals, and is also founding President of the International Conference on Public Policy. He is a consultant for organisations such as the World Bank, UNDP and UNICEF. His recent publications include *Pursuing Horizontal Management: The Politics of Coordination, and Rewards for High Public Office in Europe and North America*, with Marleen Brans, and *Strategies for Comparative Political Research*.

Wolfgang Drechsler is Professor and Chair of Governance at Tallinn University of Technology and Vice Dean for International Relations of the Faculty of Social Sciences. He has a PhD from the University of Marburg and an Honorary Doctorate from Corvinus University Budapest. He has served as Advisor to the President of Estonia, as Executive Secretary with the German Wissenschaftsrat during German Reunification, and as Senior Legislative Analyst in the United States Congress as an APSA Congressional Fellow. His main areas of interest are Non-Western, especially Chinese and Islamic, Public Administration; Public Administration, Technology and Innovation; and Public Management Reform generally. Aside from Europe, his regional focus is on the ASEAN countries and China, and he has most recently been a Visiting Professor at the Central University of Finance and Economics in Beijing and at the University of Malaya in Kuala Lumpur.

Arthur Ringeling is Professor-Emeritus of Public Administration at Erasmus University Rotterdam, The Netherlands. He studied political science at the Free University, Amsterdam, was associate professor at the University of Nijmegen and was appointed as full professor in Rotterdam in 1981. Areas of interest are the development of Public Administration, police studies, and problems of democracy and public policy. At the moment he is dean of the Metropool programme of the Netherlands School of Public Administration in The Hague and chair of the Accreditation Committee of the European Association for Public Administration Accreditation. Among his publications are: *Het imago van de overheid* (The Image of Government, second edition 2004) and *Between Remoteness and Involvement* (2007). He advised public organisations on a variety of issues.

Amy Verdun is Jean Monnet Chair Ad Personam, Professor of Political Science in the Department at the University of Victoria (UVic) in Canada, of which she was the Chair from 2010-June 2013. She is author or editor of seventeen books, recent ones being *Mapping European Economic Integration* (Houndmills: Palgrave-Macmillan 2013), *Ruling Europe: The Politics of the Stability and Growth Pact* with Martin Heipertz (Cambridge University Press 2010) and *Innovative Governance in the European Union* co-edited with Ingeborg Tömmel (Lynne Rienner Publishing). She is co-editor of the *Journal of Common Market Studies*, one of the leading international journals on European integration. She was the recipient of the 2009 Craigdarroch Silver Medal for Excellence in Research at the University of Victoria. With Donna Wood she co-edited a special issue of *Canadian Public Administration*, on the theme 'Comparing Modes of Governance in Canada and the European Union: Social Policy in Multilevel Systems'. From Sept 2014-Jan2015 she is a Fellow at the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study in Wassenaar.

Appendix 2: Explanation of the SEP scores

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

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

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

Societal relevance covers the social, economic and cultural relevance of the research. Aspects are:

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

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

Appendix 3: Programme of the site visit

	<i>Time</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Participants</i>
Monday 10 November 2014	12:45	Arrival	
	13:00-15:30	Lunch	
		Introduction Standard Evaluation Protocol	Dr. Floor Meijer Jasne Krooneman, Msc.
		Short outline Public Administration	Dr. Caspar van den Berg Dr. Dimiter Toshkov
		Committee meeting	
	15:30-16:15	Welcome by the Dean Meeting with the Faculty Board	Professor dr. Bernard Steunenberg Mr. drs. Rolf Oosterloo MPA Mikal Tseggai
	16:15-16:30	Break	
	16:30-17:30	Meeting with Institute Management	Professor Dr. Kutsal Yesilkagit Professor Dr. Sandra Groeneveld Dr. Jelmer Schalk Dr. Caspar van den Berg Drs. Wanda den Boer Nadine Stokkink
	17:30-18:00	Committee meeting	
18:30	Dinner		

Tuesday 11 November 2014	09:00-10:00	Meeting with Program Board (professors)	Professor Dr. Kutsal Yesilkagit Professor Dr. Sandra Groeneveld Professor Bernard Steunenberg Professor Dr. Frits van der Meer Professor Dr. Edwin Bakker Professor Dr. Arco Timmermans
	10:00-10:30	Tour in Faculty Building & Break	Dr. Caspar van den Berg Representative Living Lab
	10:30-11:15	Meeting with Staff (associate professors and assistant professors)	Dr. Antoaneta Dimitrova Dr. Ruth Prins Dr. Trui Steen Dr. Patrick Overeem Dr. Dimiter Toshkov Dr. Toon Kerkhoff Dr. Rik de Ruiter Dr. Maarja Beerkens
	11:15-11:30	Break	
	11:30-12:30	PhD presentations and meeting	Carina Schott, MA Elitsa Kortenska, Msc Petra van den Bekerom, Msc. Mark Reijnders, MA Msc. Eduard Schmidt, Msc.
	12:30-13:00	Lunch	
	13:00-15:00	Committee meeting	
	15:00-15:30	Presentation of preliminary results	All staff members
	16:00-17:00	Optional visit to the <i>Mauritsbuis</i> (museum)	
	18:30	Dinner	

Appendix 4: Quantitative data

Table 1 Total number of research FTEs in each job category

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Tenured staff ¹	5,18	5,49	5,10	5,96	7,20	7,90
Non-tenured staff	1,87	0,49	0,00	0,24	0,85	1,73
PhD candidates	2,84	3,21	2,46	4,13	4,92	4,95
Total research staff	9,90	9,19	7,56	10,33	12,97	14,58
Support staff (OBP en O&O)	4,4	4,98	4,97	9,47	11,43	10,1
Visiting Fellows	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL STAFF	14,30	14,17	12,53	19,80	24,40	24,68

1. Comparable with WOPI-categories HGL, UHD, UD

Table 2 Funding sources (in thousands of euros)

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
1 st stream funding	2.205,50	1.986,70	2.059,10	2.526,80	2.771,45	3.028,21
2 nd stream funding	65,10	59,60	31,90	136,30	337,53	413,53
3 rd stream funding	142,90	147,00	161,40	178,30	76,38	13,23
3 rd stream funding EU	61,10	2,50	7,60	18,00	10,20	114,50
TOTAL FUNDING	2.474,60	2.195,80	2.260,00	2.859,40	3.195,56	3.569,47

Table 3A English language output

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Refereed articles	22	13	15	24	23	36	133
Non-refereed articles	2	0	1	2	3	1	9
Books (monographs)	1	1	1	0	2	2	7
Books/journal special issue (editing)	2	1	1	2	2	1	9
Book chapters	14	19	12	18	9	9	81
PhD-theses	3	3	2	1	0	1	10
Conference papers and invited talks	27	29	31	45	44	52	228
Professional publications	2	4	5	3	4	1	19
Publications aimed at the general public	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Book reviews	3	3	1	1	1	2	11
TOTAL PUBLICATIONS	76	73	69	97	88	105	508

Table 3B Output in Dutch and other languages

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Refereed articles	7	8	5	5	1	6	32
Non-refereed articles	11	1	0	0	0	2	14
Books (monographs)	1	3	2	3	4	2	15
Books/journal special issue (editing)	3	0	1	1	0	0	5
Book chapters	22	6	6	7	4	4	49
PhD-theses	1	2	0	0	1	0	4
Conference papers, invited talks, etc.	1	2	3	26	17	15	64
Reports	3	2	5	6	6	3	25
Other professional publications (articles)	15	8	5	15	5	8	56
Publications aimed at the general public	11	3	4	18	12	11	59
Book reviews	0	0	0	1	0	2	3
TOTAL PUBLICATIONS	75	35	31	82	50	53	326

Table 3C Output affiliated professors

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Refereed articles				5	1	1	7
Non-refereed articles				3			3
Books (monographs)			1	1		1	3
Books/journal special issue (editing)							0
Book chapters					1		1
Publications aimed at the general public				1			1
Book reviews				1			1
TOTAL PUBLICATIONS			1	11	2	2	16

Table 4 Number and success rate of standard PhD candidates (completed and in progress), 2005-2009

Enrolment			Success rate (graduated after)				Total			
Start year	Enrolment (m / f)		Total	4 years	5 years	6 years	7 years	Total graduated	Not yet finished	Dis-continued
2005	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
2006	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
2007	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
2008	1	0	1	0	0	1	-	1	0	0
2009	1	0	1	0	1	-	-	1	0	0
TOTAL	4	1	5	0	2	1	1	4	0	1