

**QANU Research Review
Organization Studies**

January 2014

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

© 2014 QANU Q0471

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

Preface	5
1. The review committee and the review procedures	7
2. General remarks	9
3. VU University	11
VU University Amsterdam: Assessments per programme.....	17
VU programme: Organization & Processes of Organizing in Society.....	19
4. Tilburg University	23
Tilburg University: Assessments per programme	29
TiU programme: Organization Studies: Relational Perspectives on Adaptive Organizations	31
TiU programme: Human Resource Management (HRM): in search of balance.....	33
Appendices	37
Appendix A: Curricula vitae of the committee members.....	39
Appendix B: Explanation of the SEP scores.....	43
Appendix C: Programme of the site visit.....	45

Preface

The Evaluation Committee was assigned the task of performing an assessment of two institutes (the Faculty of Social Sciences, FSS, of the VU University Amsterdam and the Tilburg School of Social and Behavioral Sciences, TSB, of Tilburg University) and of three research programmes: one, Organization and Processes of Organizing in Society of the FSS and two, Organization Studies and Human Resource Management, of TSB.

Experts from Ireland, Finland, France, United Kingdom and the USA joined the Committee to cover the research areas of the three programs and the management of the institutes. Assessing quality is a complicated task, because many aspects and details are involved, but due to the excellent preparation of our visit by the institutes and the directors and members of the programmes it was possible to get all necessary information and to have an opportunity to “look behind the figures”.

The Committee worked as a team, the members were very open to each other’s arguments and have taken all decisions unanimously. As we had limited time for the site visits we had to be well prepared and work efficiently. This was made possible by the excellent support of the secretary of the Committee. I wish to thank the members of the Committee and the secretary very much for their input, patience with the chairman and contributions to the spirit of our good cooperation. Also, I want to thank the directors and members of the institutes and the programmes in particular, for their adequate information and open discussions that were crucial for the Committee to perform our task.

Prof. John Groenewegen
Chairman to 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 in Organization Studies at the VU University and Tilburg University. This assessment covers the research in the period 2007-2012. 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 programmes on the basis of the information provided by the institute and through interviews with the management and the research leaders, and to advise how this quality might be improved.

Composition of the Committee

The composition of the Committee was as follows:

- Prof. dr. John Groenewegen (chair);
- Prof. Nic Beech;
- Prof. David Collings;
- Prof. Philip Dewe;
- Prof. Joseph Galaskiewicz;
- Prof. Emmanuel Lazega;
- Prof. Eero Vaara.

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

Dr. Annemarie Venemans was appointed secretary to the Committee by QANU (Quality Assurance Netherlands Universities).

Independence

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

Data provided to the Committee

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

- Self-evaluation report of the unit under review, including all the information required by the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP), with appendices;
- Copies of five key publications per research programme.

Procedures followed by the Committee

The Committee proceeded according to the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015 (SEP).

Prior to the Committee meeting, each programme was assigned to two reviewers, who independently formulated a preliminary assessment. The final assessments are based on the documentation provided by the institutes, the key publications and the interviews with the management and leaders of the programmes and institutes. The interviews took place on 4 November in Amsterdam and on 5-6 November in Tilburg (see the schedule in Appendix C).

Preceding the interviews, the Committee was briefed by QANU about research assessment according to SEP, and the Committee discussed the preliminary assessments. For each programme and institute 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 finalized through email exchanges. The final version was presented to the faculty for factual corrections and comments. The comments were discussed in the Committee. The final report was printed after formal acceptance.

The Committee used the rating system of the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015 (SEP). The meaning of the scores is described in Appendix B.

2. General remarks

As noticed in the preface the Committee has only assessed two institutes and three programmes in the field of HRM/OS studies in the Netherlands. Nevertheless the Committee wishes to make a few remarks at the more general level of research in the Netherlands and its assessment.

1. Interpretation of the scores

The SEP uses a five-point scale scoring system, which might raise the impression that based on the scores a ranking is possible between the different programmes. The Committee, in consultation with the QANU representative present at the first meeting, came to the conclusion that such a ranking is not possible, because the programmes come from very different disciplines having each a research and publication culture of its own. Neither can the scores be interpreted as a ranking of the programme with respect to other programmes in the same field; sufficient information about other programmes was not available to the Committee for such a ranking. The Committee decided that the scores could only be interpreted according to the description of the meaning of the five numerical scores, which can be found in Appendix B of this report.

2. A balanced approach in research

In the self-evaluations as well as during the interviews, the Committee identified some general tensions in the research situation all managers and staff members are confronted with. On the one hand a guarantee of at least 40% research time is considered necessary to establish an appropriate opportunity to publish in top journals and to attract well-qualified personnel. This percentage is under pressure due to demand of the ministry to increase the number of contact hours with students, the time to be spent on organizing research grants including writing proposals, building relationships with stakeholders like industry and finally the increasing time that has to be spent on participation in multi- and interdisciplinary research institutes. The art of managing a research institute and the art to manage the research at individual level is about finding the right balance in that tension. Given the necessity to maintain the research time, the only options seem to be in increasing efficiency in teaching and in being successful in securing research grants.

3. External PhD students

All institutes and programmes the Committee studied, show a decrease of regular PhD students financed with so-called first stream money, an increase of regular PhDs financed with so-called second stream money (NWO, EU grants), and an increase of regular students financed with so-called third stream money (private and public stakeholders). Moreover, a trend of an increasing number of so-called external PhD students is clearly visible (here defined as students that are not funded by the university). The Committee learned that in general the Graduate Schools of FSS and TSB organize the programmes and procedures for the regular PhD students (students with an employee status) very well, but that the situation for the external PhD students is a mixed one. Often, attention is limited to the provision of access to the library and that the rest is left to the personal coaching of the supervisor. The Committee also learned that in general both the external students and the supervisors would prefer a more structured situation in which students can more easily meet with fellow PhD students both of the regular and external nature, that more possibilities to access courses would be available (can be also online) and that more possibilities to present the results of their work in an academic setting would be offered. These more regular contacts would contribute to the development of a better knowledge of the 'academic standards and customs'.

4. Multi- and interdisciplinarity

In general, multi- and/or interdisciplinary research is stimulated and interfaculty and interuniversity institutes of that nature are created. However, the Committee has the impression that the attitude at institute and programme level could be more pro-active with respect to developing that type of research, especially because multidisciplinary (different disciplines work separately together in one programme) and interdisciplinary (different disciplines are integrated into something new) research demands considerable effort of the researchers to invest in each other. Compared to mono-disciplinary research it is costly, whereas the outlets of top quality are relatively limited. In order to facilitate and stimulate multi – and interdisciplinary research more effort seems to be needed than “just” creating an institute and inviting individual researchers to participate.

3. VU University

3.1. The institute

The Faculty of Social Sciences (FSS) aims to strengthen research in specific domains of the social sciences: e.g. integration and diversity, religion and identity, security and conflict, media communication, societal participation, aging and the welfare state. These themes accommodate six disciplines and their research programs. Research programmes of FSS are:

- Constructing Human Security in a Globalising World (CONSEC);
- Communication Choice, Content, and Consequences: New Media, New Methods (CCCC);
- Organizations & Processes of Organizing in Society (OPOS);
- Multilayered governance in Europe and beyond (MLG);
- New Public Governance (NPG);
- PARTicipation In Society (PARIS).

OPOS results from a merger of the departments of Culture, Organization and Management (COM), with an organizational anthropological tradition, and Organization Science, which built on sociological and organizational-psychological approaches.

FSS is one of the twelve faculties at VU University Amsterdam (VU). Since 2008 the University Board stimulated the Faculties to organize their research in interfaculty research institutes. In accordance with this university policy, FSS researchers participate in interfaculty research institutes, such as ACCESS, AGCI, NI and CLUE.

The FSS is directed by the Faculty Board, consisting of the dean, associate deans for education and research, and the managing director. The programme leaders and department heads share responsibility for research within FSS. The Board therefore develops its policies in direct interaction with the department heads. The self-evaluation report states that in practice the Board allows the department heads and programme leaders a large managerial independence in the financial and scientific organization of their research programmes.

Assessment/remarks

The Committee did not review the research policy of FSS as such, but reviewed FSS from the specific perspective of the impact of the institute's policy as an environmental factor on the management of the OPOS programme.

Not so much in the self-evaluation report, but certainly during the interviews with the Faculty board, researchers and PhD students, the Committee learned about the specific culture of "sovereignty in private circles" and of "high solidarity, consensus building, egalitarianism and commitment". Staff involved are aware of the specificity of the institute's culture that binds them together and of the positive impact it has on the quality of their work. Two main characteristics of FSS, which connects well with their culture, are the problem-centered research and interdisciplinary approach. The Committee appreciated this vision, but it recognized that this vision is not well articulated in documents like the self-evaluation report. The Committee recommends to formulate and to discuss internally the nature and value of the institute's culture more explicitly and to relate this to a more explicitly formulated vision, goal and strategy for the future. The Committee considers this especially important in relation to strategies and policies to safeguard at least 30% and ideally 40% research time for the staff of the institute. This is particularly important for researchers who undertake ethnographic research requiring them to be

present in organizations for prolonged periods of time. (See also our remarks below on that issue).

3.2. Quality and academic reputation

FSS aims to seek and rewarding talent. This is achieved through setting ambitious criteria for professorship appointments, tenure tracks and (temporary) promotions. Individual staff members are expected to publish steadily in general and frequently in high impact outlets, be well-cited, acquire grants, and supervise successfully PhD students. Additional data the Committee received list a number of researchers and publications that have contributed substantially to the scientific debate. Prestigious awards and grants have been won by a number of researchers.

Assessment/remarks

The Committee considers the quality and academic reputation of FSS to have great potential, due to its problem-centered and interdisciplinary approach. It noticed that most researchers in the institute operate at an international level and publish articles in high impact journals, conferences, books and book chapters.

During the interview, the Dean made clear that the ambition of the Faculty is to increase the number of publications in top journals, while maintaining the valuable culture of the institute. In the discussions with especially the researchers it was noticed that there is a tension between introducing measures to increase production in top journals and maintaining the culture. Both the Board and the staff realize that something has to be done about the guarantee of at least 30% research time; this necessity has become evident in the problems filling vacancies. To keep top talent in the institute and to attract new talent requires a research culture in which research time is guaranteed, but not independently of performance of individual researchers. Options that were discussed during the interviews with the Dean and the researchers concerned a differentiation of research time of for instance a guaranteed time of 50% for the top talents who have shown to be able to realize ambitious targets and for instance 20% for the researchers with less capabilities in that respect. Neither the dean, nor the researchers were enthusiastic about such measures and were very concerned about the negative impact of such type of incentives on the general climate in the institute and the collegial attitudes of the staff members. The general feeling at FSS is that such policies would not connect well with the existing culture within the institute. The good news is that the different groups in the institute are aware of this tension and that a discussion on solutions cannot be longer postponed. The downside is that no easy solutions are available.

3.3. Resources

During the assessment period there was an increase and then decline in fte tenured staff and an increase of non-tenured staff.

Total funding rose over the years from €84.42 million in 2007 to €92.60 million in 2012. The percentage of direct funding decreased from 60.98% in 2007 to 50.82% in 2012. The percentage of funding by research grants increased from 14.10% in 2007 to 20.32% in 2012), and the percentage of contract funding increased from 9.34% in 2007 to 21.46% in 2011.

	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		2012	
Faculty of Social Sciences	N	Fte	N	Fte	N	Fte	N	Fte	N	Fte	N	Fte
Tenured staff	103	32.52	114	37.58	121	39.06	126	40.75	128	32.67	124	29.68
Non-tenured staff	35	6.34	43	10.35	47	11.56	57	15.89	65	16.90	49	18.10
PhD-students	77	45.56	81	41.75	92	46.90	93	48.67	94	45.38	85	44.82
Total research staff	215	84.42	238	89.68	261	97.52	277	105.31	287	94.95	258	92.60

	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		2012	
Faculty of Social Sciences	Fte	%	Fte	%	Fte	%	Fte	%	Fte	%	Fte	%
Direct funding (1)	60.98	72	60.49	67	63.75	65	67.93	65	56.58	60	50.82	55
Research grants (2)	14.10	17	15.93	18	13.87	14	15.33	15	16.90	18	20.32	22
Contract research (3)	9.34	11	13.26	15	19.90	20	22.05	21	21.47	23	21.46	23
Total funding	84.42	100	89.68	100	97.52	100	105.31	100	94.95	100	92.60	100

Note 1: Direct funding by the university / KNAW / NWO.

Note 2: Research grants obtained in national and international scientific competition (e.g. grants from NWO, KNAW and European Research Council).

Note 3: Research contracts for specific research projects obtained from external organizations, such as industry, governmental ministries, European Commission and charity organizations.

Assessment/remarks

The Committee noticed that the Faculty has clearly grown in the level of research funding since 2007. It has successfully increased the percentage of external funding, both from research grants and contract research. However, to maintain this level and to achieve more international funding, more professional support for the acquisition of external funding seems needed. Otherwise researchers will have to spend too much of their valuable research time for funding.

An area of concern is the reducing time allocated to research. During the interview with the Faculty Board the Committee learned that even 30% guaranteed research time is problematic. The Committee is of the opinion that research time should be increased to preferably 40%, which seems to be a common standard at Dutch universities. If researchers have no guarantees in that respect, the Faculty Board must be aware of the fact that it will be more and more difficult to keep top talent in the institute despite the existing positive culture; it will also be difficult to fulfil vacancies with top talent and consequently to increase publications in top journals.

The Committee realizes the dilemma the Faculty faces in making the right decision with respect to balancing research, education and valorisation at institute level and with respect to differentiating at the level individual researchers. It seems that there is no faculty system to reward researchers who excel. The self-evaluation report states that recently, policy to simulate research was partially transferred to departments. During the site visit, the Faculty mentioned that it supports good researchers, and that it could be considered to introduce a differentiation in research time. If and how such a strategy could be implemented is not clear, yet.

However, there is a need to discuss and decide how to best devise and manage a workload model that appropriately incentivizes and rewards excellent research, and which maintains a feeling of fairness amongst staff. As mentioned above the Committee noticed that the faculty is aware of this problem and has confidence in the capabilities of the board and the staff to deal with the dilemma and solve the issue.

3.4. Productivity

The Faculty provided additional information on the number and type of output of the Faculty's researchers.

According to the self-evaluation there are large shares of refereed articles (33% of output) and book chapters (30%). Publications aimed at professionals and at the general public (21%) demonstrate the societal relevance of the research. This mix of scientific output and valorisation is stimulated within FSS.

Faculty of Social Sciences	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Refereed articles	183	199	181	221	203	219
Non-refereed articles (1)	13	15	18	22	19	13
Books	10	14	10	16	18	16
Book chapters (2)	160	181	214	213	179	129
PhD-theses	13	15	19	17	21	14
Professional publications (3)	92	104	129	121	72	88
Publications aimed at the general public (4)	6	11	18	34	59	12
Other research output (5)	45	52	46	55	41	46
Total publications	522	591	635	699	612	537

Note 1: Articles in journals that are non refereed, yet deemed important for the field

Note 2: Includes conference papers (published & retracable)

Note 3: Publications aimed at professionals in the public and private sector ('vakpublicaties'), including patents and annotations (e.g. law).

Note 4: Also known as 'populariserende publicaties'.

Note 5: Other types of research output: inaugural lectures, editorships of books and special issues of journals, and official reports.

Assessment/remarks

The productivity of FSS is good. The Committee appreciates the mix of output. The Committee members are impressed by the key publications they have read. The Committee applauds the idea to publish more in high impact papers, which is a necessity according ruling academic standards to become an even more prominent institute internationally.

3.5. Societal relevance

All programmes of FSS have links to societal institutions and members deliver input in societal debates. Social and economic valorisation of the research is apparent from media appearances, participation in public debates, lectures to laymen audiences, participation in political committees, third contract research for societal organizations and business organizations, presented in the descriptions of specific research programs. There are established relationships with the Netherlands Institute for Social Research (SCP; policy oriented), Scientific Council for Government Policy (WRR) and Rathenau Institute (center for research and debate on science and technology).

Assessment/remarks

The societal relevance of FSS is impressive. It fosters an active interaction with a large number of colleagues in the field within the affiliated organizations. There is a focus on interesting areas of interdisciplinary research, a strong focus on engagement with stakeholders, organizations and society more generally.

3.6. Strategy for the future

The FSS strategy for the future includes several major points:

- Consolidate the management that has been proven to be successful in the past period;
- Strengthen the focus on a limited number of research themes, and increase visibility; the organization of a large majority of FSS research in a small number of VU University interfaculty research institutes will increasingly facilitate this strategy;
- Increase the international orientation in grant writing and in recruitment of talented students and staff;
- Improve procedures to ensure ethical quality and integrity of research;
- Take measures to protect substantial research time of selected individual teaching staff members.

Assessment/remarks

The Committee is positive about the way the institute is managed: problems and solutions are discussed in an open dialogue. However, a more explicit vision, focus and strategy are required, and choices about the appropriate themes and interfaculty research institutes need to be made. Different levels in the institute are aware of the problems of recruiting the desired well-qualified personnel and all levels are aware of the need to look for solutions to guarantee research time. The Committee suggests that the Faculty Board puts this issue high on their strategy agenda and makes good use of the good climate and positive attitude that exists at staff level in finding the rightly balanced solution.

3.7. PhD training and supervision

In 2012, the Faculty staff supervised 230 PhD students. These included PhD students employed by FSS, PhD students funded but not employed by FSS and external PhD students. In 2012, the intake was thirteen PhD students employed by FSS, four PhD students funded but not employed, and 31 external PhD students.

The self-evaluation report states that admission to the Graduate School is based upon finalizing the selection procedure. Employed PhD students receive a 12-months contract. Extension depends on a positive outcome of the assessment after eight months based on a detailed research proposal and a literature review or first paper. An external candidate is selected on motivation, academic degree, knowledge of English; academic references, preliminary research plan, endorsement by a FSS professor, and pays an annual fee.

PhD students from the one programme we studied in depth told during the site visit that they write a Training and Guidance Plan within three months after admission. According to the self-evaluation this includes elaborated work appointments (including teaching – not exceeding 5% of the total workload), a detailed work plan for the first year, a detailed training program, and the supervision structure. Students have at least one co-supervisor in addition to their own supervisor. There are also agreements in respect to the authorship in case of co-authorship with one or more supervisors. The PhD training programme is tailored to the needs of the individual students.

Assessment/remarks

The Committee has spoken to a very enthusiastic group of PhD students who enjoy a large degree of independence. The attitude of PhD students well reflects the general culture of the

institute. The Committee applauds the participation of PhD students in research groups, which are very informal and open to everyone interested.

The Graduate School seem to work well and during the site visit it became clear that students, from the programme we studied, are very satisfied with the guidance they get from the institute and supervisors. The regular PhDs have ample opportunity to develop their own ideas, collect own data and explore new theories. They receive good education with enough possibility to 'tailor make' the programme for their specific research. The monitoring process is transparent, they have ample opportunity to meet each other, staff members and to have contacts with visitors.

However, the Committee feels there is room for improvement. First of all, the Faculty does not seem to have a clear idea about the optimal number of PhD students that should enrol in the Faculty. The Committee recommends including in the more explicit vision, goals and strategy discussed above, also explicit policy goals with respect to the number of PhD students, especially the external ones.

Second, with respect to the external PhD students the Committee recommends to develop a more explicit and better structured program including courses, access to specific digital courses, possibilities to meet each other and to meet regular PhD students, to present parts of their work, and the like (see also the general remarks section).

VU University Amsterdam: Assessments per programme

The committee assessed the following programme of the Faculty of Social Sciences of VU University:

	Quality	Productivity	Relevance	Viability
Organization & Processes of Organizing in Society	4.5	4	4.5	4

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

VU programme: **Organization & Processes of Organizing in Society**
Programme coordinator: Prof. dr. P. Groenewegen
Research staff 2012: 6.32 fte tenured, 21.26 total fte

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

Short description

The central mission of Organization & Processes of Organizing Society (OPOS) is to advance understanding of processes of organizing in a society of organizations. The mission translates into the following objectives:

- to conduct high quality empirical research with a national and international appeal in organization studies,
- to apply new perspectives and to unravel different forms and levels of ‘organization’, and
- to conduct research with high societal relevance and to maintain strong ties with societal stakeholders.

Quality

Research output shows a high degree of originality, and some publications are clearly at the forefront of research on networks and ethnographic organizational analysis on a global scale. The nature of research being carried out in the programme was impressive, and the empirically-rich studies compare very well at an international standard. The production of more ethnographically-based monographs would be beneficial in representing the quality of the work produced and it would also be worth considering the full range of journals targeted to ensure that there are sufficient publications in the senior ranks of journal on an on-going basis

The understanding of key issues of research displayed by the PhD students was a credit to the programme.

The atmosphere and culture of the programme was supportive of high quality work. The topic-oriented groups and informal departmental culture work very well to support both the junior scholars and the whole research community.

Productivity

There is increasing pressure in the system and the time for research is being reduced at the same time as other demands (such as student expectations) are increasing. Against this background, the level of engagement with organizations, detailed, longitudinal studies being conducted and quantity and quality of publications is a great achievement.

Relevance

The problem-centered approach means that a considerable amount of work is highly relevant to organizations and other bodies involved as sponsors, users and participants in the research. This is shown not only in the publications, but in the ways in which researchers and practitioners

collaborate in bigger or smaller projects. Members of the programme have close ties with various types of organizations and this makes the programme an exceptional one in terms of its engagement with society. The committee was especially impressed by how critical perspectives could be turned into a productive dialogue with practitioners. Some of the doctoral theses provided excellent examples of the blending of criticality with practicality and this approach is one that fits well with the theoretical basis of the programme and the needs of businesses and organizations.

The external PhD students are a further example of the high level of engagement between researchers and companies and organizations.

Viability

People in the research programme appear to share the vision and the values of combining intensive and ethnographic research with outcomes for both theory and practice. There is significant buy-in to the ideas of relevance, interdisciplinarity and the culture is highly valued by members of the programme. This all bodes well for the future. However, it would be beneficial to make the strategy of the faculty as well as that of the programme more explicit (it was clear in verbal presentations but not in the written documentation) and more ambitious. Currently, the stated aims speak of consolidation, but there are adventurous ideas and approaches, which could be articulated so as to make a bigger impression on both outsiders and insiders.

However, the Committee is very concerned about the environmental and university-specific trends that seem to reduce time for research and allocation of resources. It is also concerned about the ability to retain and attract the best people, as this is paramount to be able to maintain the competitiveness of the programme. This is becoming challenging because of the career advancement system, which seems slow, and compensation, which appears restricted vis-à-vis international comparators. The style of research and engaged scholarship undertaken is time-hungry and needs to be supported in order to maintain quality and reach to a variety of organizations and industries.

Conclusion

The Committee's overall impression was of a highly supportive programme culture in which there was a very professional approach to empirical research, a suitable focus on interesting areas of interdisciplinary research, very strong engagement with organizations and society, and research outputs being published both in accessible ways and in top journals.

The merger of the departments of Culture, Organization and Management (COM) and Organization Science has brought about something quite distinctive, and it is clear that programme members identify with the purpose of producing impactful, problem-centered research. There are particular strengths in ethnographic approaches and network analysis.

There are certain challenges in the system, which need to be managed, not least concerning resources. This extends to issues about retaining and attracting the best researchers, and not all the current systems (e.g. the career structure) are as conducive to this as they need to be. The Committee would also suggest that the programme would benefit from a more clearly articulated and more ambitious strategy.

Management are aware of the need for a balance between programme focus and academic freedom, and this appears to be working both for staff and PhD students. As the programme

moves to the next stage of development, there a clearly articulated strategy and effective support structure for performance should be worked upon, but at the same time there should be flexibility to deal with specific challenges related to recruitment for example.

It is also important that, as a community, clarity is achieved on which top journals should be targeted, how work will be developed appropriately to maintain and enhance the 'hit rate', and how the securing of grant funding, which has improved dramatically recently, is also maintained.

4. Tilburg University

4.1. The institute

The Tilburg School of Social and Behavioral Sciences (TSB) is one of the five Schools of Tilburg University. TSB has two broad guiding principles:

- Provide excellent, research-based education in the areas of Psychology, Sociology, Organization Studies and Human Resource Studies;
- Conduct research at the frontiers of core areas of the social and behavioural sciences.

According to the self-evaluation report the TSB research programmes are characterized by a multidisciplinary perspective. The research at TSB is targeted at valorization, i.e. that research contributes to products of value to society. In addition to a strong focus on valorization, the research of TSB is also fundamental in addressing critical topics in basic social and behavioural sciences.

TSB is managed by the Management Team (MT), chaired by the Dean. The Dean is responsible for the daily management of the School and is assisted by the Managing Director. The Dean has the final responsibility and decision authority on all matters related to education and research. The Managing Director is head of the TSB Service Divisions, including the Faculty Office, the Human Resources Division, and the Education and Research Institute (ERI). The ERI is responsible for: preparation and execution of the faculty's education and research policy, including quality assessments; monitoring of student progress (at the Bachelor, Master and doctoral level); international affairs; organization and scheduling of all education-related activities; and the TSB Graduate School.

Research activities at TSB are organized in ten research programmes in the social and behavioural sciences. Each department has a Program Leader (at the rank of full professor), who is in charge of the department's research program. In addition to the disciplinary research programmes, researchers at TSB collaborate intensively in multidisciplinary research centres.

Assessment/remarks

The Committee reviewed TSB from the perspective of their impact as an environmental factor on the management of the programmes Organization Studies and Human Resource Management.

In line with the university wide approach, TSB has developed a clear vision, well-defined objectives and a transparent strategy to realize its goals. In short the message is "focus and excel". When means are limited and cooperation inside the institute and between faculties is desired, then a well-focused coherent research strategy facilitates individual researchers in selecting topics, which connects to the research of colleagues within and outside their own group. However, a well-defined coherent research strategy at institute and program level can also become too much of a constraint for individual researchers, including PhD students. The art of managing a research institute and programme is about striking the right balance between providing structure and focus on the one hand and allowing for autonomy and flexibility on the other. The Committee learned from the interviews with the various members of the scientific community of TSB that the management strikes the balance well: enough structure to facilitate production in high quality outlets and enough autonomy for creative and independent research. To realize the right balance the board of the institute focuses on a monitoring and facilitating role leaving decisions about the

allocation of resources, cooperation and the specific content of research projects to the lower administrative levels.

4.2. Quality and academic reputation

According to the self-evaluation the research of TSB is internationally embedded and recognized. All research programs have strong collaborations with international top institutes in Europe, the United States of America and at other institutes worldwide. TSB stimulates high-quality, empirical research that is publishable in international top journals with a high impact factor in their specific research areas.

The self-evaluation report shows that Faculty members of TSB are editors of international journals and are often asked to serve on national and international review committees. Several staff members have received national and international awards.

During the site visit the Committee learned that at TSB, lecturers, associate professors and professors are evaluated according to the MERIT principle of quality measurement. MERIT stands for:

- Management (perform organizational tasks)
- Education
- Research
- Importance (contribute to the valorization objectives of TSB)
- Team (collegial)

Assessment/remarks

The Committee recognizes the important work done in the previous years. The quality of research is impressive. There is a strong participation in scientific and societal debates in a range of disciplines and policy issues. The good reputation of the researchers is demonstrated by their roles as journal editors and conferences organizations, and the presence at the institute of visiting professors, who are top researchers in the field.

The Committee learned during the interviews that the Faculty is structured to ensure the development of high quality education and research. The Faculty encourages collaborations through research centres, it understands the need to embed a strong research culture in the different groups within TSB, acknowledges the importance of quality and relevance and rewards through mechanisms that can enhance the research budget.

The Committee applauds the MERIT model that provides a good guidance to discuss and evaluate how individual researchers perform on a broad range of tasks. It allows for evaluating past performances and for making plans for the future in which the allocation of time is adapted to a changing focus. Also the document on the tenure track system that the institute provided during the site visit demonstrates that the management aims at a transparent structure which allows individual researchers to timely communicate with management about desired changes in focus, work load, and the like.

4.3. Resources

TSB employs over 400 employees. The research faculty increased from 88 full time equivalents (fte) in 2007 to 121 fte in 2012. However, the number of tenured staff remained more or less constant. The number of PhD-students increased from 45 fte in 2007 to 63 fte in 2012.

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Tenured staff	28	30	30	32	30	28
Non-tenured staff	15	23	31	32	29	30
PhD-students	45	51	61	64	69	63
Total research staff	88	104	122	128	128	121
Support staff	21	24	26	33	29	31
Total staff	109	128	148	161	157	152

As stated in the self-evaluation, the TSB research budget is allocated to the departments based on the number of scientific staff in each department, revenues of individual and other research grants, the number of defended dissertations, and participation in the Research Master program. The Faculty Board explained during the site visit about the incentive system it adopts in which 25% of grant money can be used freely by the departments.

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Direct funding ¹	50,8 fte 61 % ³	64,2 fte 62 % ³	78,1 fte 62 % ³	81,0 fte 51 % ³	82,2fte 49 % ³	77,7 fte 52 % ³
Research grants ²	21,7 fte 23 % ³	22,5 fte 18 % ³	22,2 fte 18 % ³	22,8 fte 29 % ³	23,3 fte 29 % ³	24,3 fte 25 % ³
Contract research ⁵	16,5 fte 10 % ³	20,6 fte 14 % ³	25,3 fte 13 % ³	26,8 fte 13 % ³	25,6 fte 15 % ³	22,2 fte 18 % ³
Other	6 % ³	7 % ³	7 % ³	6 % ³	7 % ³	5 % ³
Total funding	K€ 12.036	K€ 13.326	K€ 14.821	K€ 16.650	K€ 16.964	K€ 14.172

¹ direct funding by the University

² research grants obtained in national and international scientific competition (e.g. grants from NWO, KNAW, EU/ERC, ESF)

³ research contracts for specific research projects obtained from external organizations, such as industry, governmental ministries, European Commission and charity organizations.

Assessment/remarks

The Faculty has steadily grown in research funding and staff in the period 2007-2012. It has successfully increased the percentage of external funding, both from NWO and from European research grants and contract research.

Personnel are encouraged to apply for grants of high quality funds and are individually rewarded when their applications are successful. The Committee considers the incentive model very appropriate in the culture of TSB. However, it recommends to more carefully developing a strategy to obtain more large international grants because future financing of research will depend more and more on external funding.

4.4. Productivity

The School stimulates high-quality, empirical research that is published in international top journals with a high impact factor in their specific research areas. The self-evaluation report provides information on the number and type of output of the Faculty's researchers. These data show that there is an increase in the number of refereed articles from 2007 until 2011.

Research output	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Refereed articles	327	371	407	442	455	477
Non-refereed articles	0	1	0	1	1	1
Books	18	31	16	24	31	18
Book chapters	113	151	129	113	158	98
PHD theses	38	27	30	46	41	45
Conference papers	0	0	0	0	0	0
Professional publications	127	170	162	135	153	104
Publications aimed at the general public	8	4	7	3	4	6
Total publications	631	755	751	764	843	749

Assessment/remarks

Staff at all levels are very well aware of the need to be productive and to publish regularly in top ranked journals. By guaranteeing 40% research time TSB is in the position to realize the expected goals. The Faculty encourages not only a good performance with respect to high quality publications, but aims at the realization of a balance between research, education and management tasks by means of the MERIT model. In times of political pressure to increase the 'contact hours with students' and of simultaneously diminishing research funds from the ministry, the management of TSB and the individual staff members have to be creative in order to maintain the 40% research time. Increase of efficiency in teaching (for instance the clustering of master students in groups around specific research topics) and application for grants of national and international funds, should offer the way out. However, that demands careful guidance of the management and coaching of the staff.

Although there is a strong emphasis on ISI publications with high impact factors it is also recognized that publications in more 'specialty journals', which cover a more limited domain and often also address the professionals in the field, are a great value to TSB. Some of these specialty journals that embrace a particular subject area or discipline are just as powerful in their impact and relevance to the discipline and society and should not be considered in anyway inferior to those listed by ISI. The specific research groups decide about the relevancy of the different journals and the right mix.

4.5. Societal relevance

The self-evaluation report states that one of the main themes of the strategic plan of Tilburg University is to continuously strengthen the scientific quality and societal relevance of research. The University's motto "Understanding Society" further emphasizes the focus on social relevance in the University's teaching and research mission. TSB plays an essential role in the University's research efforts that take place with this profile as background. The multidisciplinary research centres of CØRPS, TIBER and CIR have high societal impact, and other research at TSB also does well in valorization of science.

Furthermore, a considerable part of the staff is said to perceive participation in the public debate and/or policy involvement as part of their work. Individual staff members perform advisory roles in Committees, boards and seminars and appear in the media to disseminate their findings to a broader audience. Several staff members write articles or books for the general public.

Assessment/remarks

The Committee learned that TSB and its researchers play an important role in societal discussions on a wide range of topics. Across the board, TSB takes the societal relevance of its work as an important aspect of academic research and stimulates staff to be active in that respect. During the

interviews the Committee also heard about differences at programme level and noticed that sometimes the drive to contact and work together with for instance industry is more driven by the desire to acquire data than by the motivation to solve a specific societal problem. Both motivations are legitimate, but it seems important for the management to have transparency about how stakeholders are involved and for what reasons.

During the site visit the Committee learned that connections to industry are mainly established and enacted at programme level – not institutional level – because industry prefers to deal directly with the researchers involved and not the other way around.

Several researchers have been rather successful in presenting their findings and insights to a wider audience through popular books and newspaper columns; others played leading roles in initiatives to present research to a wider audience. Part of the institute's policy is to collaborate with external PhD students, and the research programmes entertain long-term research collaborations with companies and organizations.

4.6. Strategy for the future

To ensure the future quality of research the Faculty will focus on three main topics:

Research funding

The primary focus will be on areas in which TSB Faculty already has strong and established expertise in order to maximize chances of securing competitive research funds. TSB will also improve the administrative structure to facilitate the bureaucratic aspects of the grant application process.

As valorization of research will become increasingly important, TSB will promote the acquisition of industry- and foundation-sponsored research and create resources to compensate of under-recovery of indirect costs that is typical of these types of funding sources.

Promoting collaborative research:

TSB will stimulate the continuation and initiation of intra-university, national and international collaborative research projects and consortia. TSB will also emphasize the importance of joint projects with collaborators in the region (e.g., hospitals, public and mental health organizations, industry, and insurance companies) and actively participate in initiatives such as BrainPort and Midpoint Brabant. The goal is to further develop the valorization of research, increase the number of external PhD students and establish mutually beneficial collaborations.

Training and retention of (junior) faculty:

TSB will expand its efforts to improve the quality of its Graduate School to further improve the education experiences of the PhD students and enhance their professional competitiveness. TSB will also facilitate career development of junior (non-tenured) Assistant Professors to maximize their chances of tenure based on a successful teaching and research portfolio.

Assessment/remarks

The Committee concludes that TSB has been able to run successful research programmes in the evaluation period. There is a clear indication in the self-evaluation report that strategies are being put in place to support the strengths and counter the weaknesses.

4.7. PhD training and supervision

The self-evaluation pointed out that the Graduate School TSB offers an education program, consisting of a general component for all PhD students with an appointment at TSB and a topic-specific component tailored to the needs of the PhD candidate and the specific demands of the project. To guarantee a solid PhD training and successful completion of the dissertation project, the supervisors and the PhD student establish a training and supervision plan at the onset of the appointment. The general education component includes courses such as academic writing, presentation skills and workshops on methodology and statistics. PhD students are also expected to attend international conferences and to present their work at these conferences.

The PhD coordinator of the Graduate School monitors the progress of individual doctoral students and their projects. There are yearly performance evaluations with the head of the department or his/her designee, and the PhD coordinator holds a progress interview with each PhD student on a yearly basis. The system of PhD progress evaluation informally also includes creating a challenging scientific atmosphere in which each PhD student is stimulated to expand his or her scientific creativity and contribute to the shared mission of the institute. The institute aims to achieve this by regular meetings and intensive personal supervision by the daily supervisor.

Regular PhD students are assigned a limited teaching task, now set to a maximum of 10%.

Assessment/remarks

The Institute has a cohort of qualitatively good PhD students. About one third finish within 4 years, an additional one third within five years.

The committee interviewed PhD students from two programmes about their supervision, research facilities, graduate school, and possible constraints of their research. Members of the Committee were impressed by the quality and enthusiasm of the students they met with. Overall, PhD students feel guided and supported by their supervisors and institution. The PhD students we met are autonomous in defining their research topics, collecting their data and building their theoretical frameworks.

However, the Committee feels there is room for improvement. The support for external PhDs does not sound developed to the extent needed. External PhD students have access to university facilities and are invited to participate in relevant meetings, but there is no focus on their training. The institute could not give a clear answer on the number of external PhD students at TSB. The Committee strongly recommends to track external PhD students and more train and guide them (see also the general remarks section).

Tilburg University: Assessments per programme

The committee assessed the following programmes of the Tilburg School of Behavioral Sciences at Tilburg University:

	Quality	Productivity	Relevance	Viability
Organization Studies	4.5	5	4	4
Human Resource Management	4.5	4.5	5	4.5

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

**TiU programme: Organization Studies: Relational Perspectives on
Adaptive Organizations**

Programme coordinator: Prof. dr M. Meeus
Research staff 2012: 3.9 fte tenured, 11.82 total fte

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

Short description of the programme

The research programme focuses on organizational adaptation: to respond successfully to changing environmental pressures, organizations continuously must learn to renew themselves internally and externally, in structure and behaviour, and at multiple levels. The research aim of the programme is to increase the understanding of organizational adaptation for which it employs a relational perspective. This relational perspective considers organizations as made up of internal and external relations (e.g., between employees, within or between teams, or between a variety of organizations), which accommodate interaction. These relations and interactions provide organizations with means that enable adaptation and result in sustained performance, learning, and innovation.

Quality

Research output shows high levels of quality defined by the criteria above. The programme's relational analytical perspective is applied with great success to issues such as creativity, alliances, composition and coordination of effective teams, but also in the area of multilevel adaptiveness of organizations, temporary organizations –an exciting and agenda setting achievement. With respect to a relational perspective on organized collective action, the team has certainly reached a high level competing and in some aspects excelling, at the global level.

The theory-driven, empirically-rich studies are often published in top journals together with outside affiliate researchers. The Committee encourages the programme continue to maintain a strong presence in the top organizational journals in the next six years.

Productivity

All of the works reflect the programme's research priorities. Members share the vision of being a world renowned department doing basic research in the field of organizational studies and the number of articles published, given the number of persons working in the programme, is very high. Against this background, the level of engagement within organizations, with detailed, longitudinal and multilevel studies being conducted and quantity and quality of publications, is a great achievement. While it may seem difficult to imagine, as they achieve greater efficiencies in teaching and add personnel, their productivity could become even higher.

Relevance

The programmes priority is clearly to increase the number of top level publications. Its members nevertheless have to balance between impact factor scores and reaching multiple audiences. This does not question the relevance of members' work to organizations and other bodies involved as

sponsors, users and participants in the research. One example of high level of engagement between researchers and companies/organizations is the investment in external PhD students. However, the Committee encourages closer working relationships with business, government, and non-profit organizations where the emphasis is not solely on gathering data from them, but on furthering the mission of these organizations. The Committee applauds the Center for Innovation Research as a step in the right direction. It also applauds the strong support for valorization that it found among the five researchers and three program leaders it interviewed.

Viability

There are many indicators of programme vitality. The members of this programme share a core culture of professionalism that values competition and discipline. They bring in stakeholders, stress interdisciplinarity and adapt to changes in the environment. Their presence on editorial boards is impressive, and their outreach internationally is also impressive. PhD students are very mature in terms of the level of socialization and understanding of key issues of research that they display.

However, the message sent by these indicators of vitality is blurred by other signals: losing several persons over the last six years could be more than just an ordinary way of life. Current heads of the programme seem to be able to handle this turnover to the advantage of the programme, i.e. see new opportunities to secure new lines to replace departures. However, the Committee is concerned that this turnover could be a sign of future instability. In addition, a diversity issue feeds into this situation, since women seem to be grossly under-represented. Unfortunately, the Committee is still unclear about the situation and if there is a problem in retaining women. However, it does know that there are no female tenured faculty now. While this was not cited as a weakness by the department in their SWOT analysis, the Committee knows that the leadership is aware of this problem (it was discussed during the meetings) and will correct the situation with the help of the Institute.

Conclusion

The Committee's overall impression was of a highly focused, coherent and supportive programme in which there is strong sense of professionalism, impressive commitment and very high levels of performance in terms of publications in clearly identified, leading journals. The programme is committed to demanding, high quality empirical research, combining ethnography, surveys, archival analysis, statistical and network modelling. They identify strongly with the discipline of organization studies, are strongly self-selected, are free to choose their research topics (including most PhD students), are strongly motivated and are quite happy to be in this intellectual adventure and team orientation. Their topics and research agendas are very current and central to organizational studies today.

In spite of this unusual, genuine, and successful degree of unified performance culture, concerns have been voiced about what a high level of turnover means in this programme. There seem to be future challenges including, for example, stronger competition in terms of promotions and salary. A diversity issue also seems to feed into these worries.

TiU programme:	Human Resource Management (HRM): in search of balance		
Programme coordinator:	Prof. dr M. van Veldhoven (as of 1-4-2013) and Prof. dr J. Paauwe (up to 1-4-2013)		
Research staff 2012:	2.09 tenured, 6.51 total fte		
Assessments:	Quality:	4.5	
	Productivity:	4.5	
	Relevance:	5	
	Viability:	4.5	

Short description of the programme

The main focus of the HRM programme is on investigating the linkages between HRM and relevant outcomes for employees and organizations alike, i.e. a balanced approach. The *vision* is that in order to understand HRM and its outcomes, it is important to start out from the employment relationship between employers and employees, and to take into account that both organizational outcomes and employee outcomes are multi-faceted, that the HRM process involves multiple actors at multiple levels, and takes place in an organizational as well as an institutional context. The *objective* of the programme is to develop theories, constructs and methods that will improve our understanding in two main areas, one focusing on HR management, well-being and performance, and the other focusing on HR development, talent and learning.

Quality

Research by group members is regularly published in leading international outlets and the key journals within the discipline. The Committee also notes the publication of a number of impactful and important monographs around the central themes of the department.

It is clear that research quality is high as defined by SEP criteria. There is evidence of originality, with some of the research influencing and shaping the research agenda on the balance between HR and performance and individual wellbeing for example. International and national scholars are attracted to the group; another status marker illustrating the esteem the group is held in. The esteem is also evidenced by the awards, fellowships and keynote addresses that have honoured members of the group.

Notwithstanding the evident emphasis on research and a strong desire to protect research time, teaching appears to be also valued within the group. Indeed, the fact the teaching appeared to be research lead and aligned with research interests appeared to be valued by faculty and no doubt contributed to the translation of research.

Productivity

Productivity is strong and there is a clear trend of greater success in higher ranked outlets. There is little doubt that work from the group, particularly in the HR performance and well being stream, is regularly published in world leading outlets as evidenced through the sample publications provided. Strength of the research strategy is a thematic coherence in the outputs of the group which reflects the central research themes of the group.

There is a clear trend of consistent levels of high quality publications in the group. A publication level of around 5 ISI journals per fte is quite impressive. The quality level is evident through 2.81 ISI top 25% per fte in 2012. Notwithstanding the emphasis on levels of high quality publications the group have remained committed in their desire to contribute to practice and the professions that embrace their discipline. Productivity at the level of professional publications is strong and it is here that the group has a considerable impact. This strategy clearly aids the industry engagement discussed below.

Outputs also appear in a range of outlets reflecting the disciplinary backgrounds of the group including management, organization studies and applied psychology. This further enhances the reach of the group in disseminating their work. There is a strategy of targeting both top-level outlets while also publishing in the dedicated HRM and HRD journals, which may have a lower ISI ranking. This balanced strategy is to be commended. However key to maximizing the impact of the group's research is ensuring that the conditions to publish research in the highest quality outlets are emphasized as a point of departure for all research. An understanding of these requirements did come through in discussions with faculty and PhD students who had a clear understanding of the theoretical and empirical requirements of publishing at the very highest level.

Although citation levels are reasonable, as the group continues to build international profile and given the increasing representation of HRM and HRD outlets on the ISI, we would suggest that citation impact be considered as a benchmark of impact.

Relevance

The Committee considered the valorization of research as a key strength of the group. This is evident through the People Management Centre, which seems very successful. It is also evident through company financial support for internal PhDs such as Shell.

The Committee also notes the appointment of a Senior Researcher with an explicit agenda to bridge the gap between theory and practice and to engage with the practitioner community.

The group is mindful of publishing in professional outlets to support their relationships with organisations and professional bodies, which undoubtedly contributes to their reputation in this community. Research led programmes as is this one, are acutely conscious of presenting research in a way that is understandable, transferable and readily available to share and be used in informing, professional standards, and organizational goals and objectives. It is clear that the group operates across a range of activities that allows it to share its skills and knowledge with the Human Resource profession and to cement its impact on day to day practice and the evolving nature of the profession.

International recognition is also evidenced through the ranking of one member of the group amongst the UKs 25 most influential international HR thinkers.

Viability

The group seems to have a clearly articulated strategy. The strong international partnerships with international institutions such as King's and Cornell and the role of international mentors are noteworthy. The appointment of a special mentor for female faculty is a very positive move. This also reflects an alignment between SWOT and strategy. Additionally, the international visitors

programme also offers good opportunities for collaboration for faculty with leading international scholars.

From a viability perspective, the strength of the master's programme bodes well for the group. However, funding is quite biased towards internal funding and as acknowledged in the SWOT analysis, increasing external funding represents an important strategy moving forward. Further while the group may be considered large when compared to other Dutch HR groups, by international comparisons the group is relatively small. Currently, the three staff members fully dedicated for teaching also reduce the potential research impact. However, the Committee does acknowledge that the leadership is working with these three faculties to include research allocation in their workloads.

Conclusion

The Committee formed the impression that there was a high level of coherence in the research of the group bound together by a balanced and pluralistic perspective of the relationship between, on the one hand, HR and performance outcomes for individuals and organizations and, on the other, between theory and practice. The research was themed into two areas focused on: (a) HR, well-being and performance and (b) HR development, talent and learning. There was a very strong research culture within the group supported by well developed national and international networks. There is little doubt that the group is internationally recognized as a significant contributor to advancing theory, practice and research. The group leads the field of Human Resource Studies in continental Europe.

The performance of the group is clearly underscored by a collegiate and supportive environment with strong leadership by senior professors and a clearly defined strategy. This strategy captures a balance of rigor, multi methods, creativity and impact. It is balanced across research, practice and theory development in this way providing outputs that attract national and international recognition, and impact on practice. The programme is strongly embedded in a network that includes top universities and scholars in the field of Human Resources from around the world. The programme, School and university have managed to protect 40 per cent research time in times of budget cuts. The Committee considers this commendable and would argue that maintaining this time for research would be central to maintaining the strong research performance of the group.

The Committee would caution that although large by national comparisons the programme is small by international comparisons. In terms of maximizing the viability of the programme moving forward, the Committee would point to the importance of building and maintaining a critical mass of faculty and PhD students to continue to build the profile of the group internationally.

Appendices

Appendix A: Curricula vitae of the committee members

Nic Beech is Vice-Principal for Governance, Planning and Policy at the University of St Andrews and Chair of the British Academy of Management. Previously, he has been Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Head of the School of Management at the University of St Andrews, Lead Fellow of the ESRC UK Advanced Institute of Management and prior to that was Head of the Department of Management at the University of Strathclyde. His research interests are in management practice, change and the construction of identity in the music industry, health, financial services and creative industries. He is a fellow of the Royal Society of Arts, the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development, the British Academy of Management and the Academy of Social Sciences. He has been voted by HR Magazine one of the UK's most influential thinkers on HR.

David Collings is Professor of HRM at Dublin City University Business School, where is he also head of the Human Resource Management and Organisational Psychology Group. He is also a Visiting Professor at King's College London. Previously he was on the faculty at the University of Sheffield in the UK and the National University of Ireland, Galway and a Visiting Research Fellow at Strathclyde Business School. His research focus on management in multinational corporations with a particular emphasis on staffing and talent management issues. His work in these areas has been published in outlets such as the *Journal of World Business*, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *Human Resource Management*, and *the Industrial and Labor Relations Review*. He has edited six books, most recently *Routledge Companion to International HRM*, with Paula Caligiuri and Geoff Wood (Routledge, 2014). He sits on a number of editorial boards including the *Journal of World Business*, *International Journal of Human Resource Management* and Human Resource Development Quarterly. He is Editor of the *Human Resource Management Journal* and former editor of the *Irish Journal of Management*. He is permanent chair of the EIASM workshop on Talent Management.

Philip Dewe is Vice-Master of Birkbeck and Professor of Organizational Behaviour in the Department of Organizational Psychology, Birkbeck, University of London. He graduated with a Masters degree in management and administration from Victoria University in Wellington, New Zealand and with an MSc and PhD (in Organizational Psychology) from the London School of Economics. After a period of work in commerce in New Zealand he became a Senior Research Officer in the Work Research Unit, Department of Employment (UK). In 1980 he joined Massey University in New Zealand and headed the Department of Human Resource Management until joining the Department of Organizational Psychology, Birkbeck, University of London in 2000. Research interests include work stress and coping, appraisals and emotions. He is a member of the editorial board of *Work & Stress* and the *International Journal of Stress Management* and an Associate Editor of the *American Journal of Health Promotion*. He has written widely in the area of work stress and coping.

Joseph Galaskiewicz is Professor of Sociology and has a courtesy appointment in the School of Government and Public Policy at the University of Arizona. Prior to coming to Arizona he was Professor of Sociology and Professor of Strategic Management & Organization in the Carlson School of Management at the University of Minnesota. He received his Ph.D. in Sociology from the University of Chicago. Professor Galaskiewicz has expertise in organizations, networks, nonprofits, and urban community. He is the author of *Exchange Networks and Community Politics* (Sage, 1979), *Social Organization of an Urban Grants Economy* (Academic Press, 1985), *Advances in Social Network Analysis* (co-edited with Stanley Wasserman) (Sage, 1994), and *Nonprofit Organizations in an Age of Uncertainty* (co-authored with Wolfgang Bielefeld) (Aldine de Gruyter, 1998). In addition he has published in all the major sociological and organizational studies journals. He has served on the editorial boards of the *Academy of Management Journal*,

Administrative Science Quarterly, the American Sociological Review, and others. He is currently on the Advisory Panel for the Sociology Program at NSF and is past president of the Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action. He is working on several projects including a newly NSF funded study which will allow him to continue research on the distribution and use of organizational resources by residents in the Phoenix metropolitan area. Using survey data on residents, archival data on establishments, mapping tools and spatial econometrics he will assess how the organizational demography of the area has changed and if the activities and utilization patterns of residents have changed in the wake of the Great Recession and changes in the numbers and composition of establishments in the neighbourhoods and suburbs.

John Groenewegen is an economics graduate of Erasmus University Rotterdam and the University of Maastricht where he received his PhD in 1989. Before joining in 1979 the Rotterdam School of Economics at Erasmus University Rotterdam, he was affiliated with the Ministry of Welfare and Cultural Affairs for two years. From 1998 to 2002 he was vice dean of the Rotterdam School of Economics responsible for the curriculum. He was appointed as full professor of 'Institutional Economics' in 1999 at the Rotterdam school of Economics of Erasmus University Rotterdam (EUR). In the same year he was also appointed at the University of Utrecht (UU) in 'Comparative Institutional Analysis; the Dutch and French Economic Systems Compared' (he stayed at UU until 1 November 2004). As off 2004 he is appointed as full professor of 'The Economics of Infrastructures' at the Faculty Technology, Policy and Management of the Technical University in Delft (TUD), The Netherlands. He is past president of the Association for Evolutionary Economics (AFEE), past general secretary of the European Association for Evolutionary Political Economy (EAEPE) and president of the Dutch-Belgium Association of Institutional and Political Economy (VIPE). He has been member of the editorial board of the Journal of Economic Issues and of the board of the Foundation of the Journal of Institutional Economics.

Emmanuel Lazega is professor of sociology at the Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Paris. After his PhD (University of Geneva), he was a post-doc and lecturer at Yale University, starting his career at the Universities of Versailles, Lille, and Paris-Dauphine. He is an honorary senior member of the Institut Universitaire de France, co-director of the Observatory of Intra- and Inter-Organizational Networks, and a fellow of the European Academy of Sociology. His current research projects focus on the dynamics of multilevel networks in organizations and markets, with a special focus on social mechanisms helping actors in such settings manage the dilemmas of collective action (contemporary forms of solidarity, social control, socialization, and regulation). He is currently a member of the editorial boards of *Social Networks* and *International Sociology*. He is the author and co-editor of several books, both substantive (*The Collegial Phenomenon: The Social Mechanisms of Cooperation Among Peers in a Corporate Law Partnership*, Oxford University Press; *Conventions and Structures in Economic Organization: Markets, Networks, and Hierarchies*, Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing; *Micropolitics of Knowledge*, New York, Aldine-de Gruyter) and methodological (*Réseaux sociaux et structures relationnelles*, Presses Universitaires de France).

Eero Vaara

Eero Vaara works as a Professor of Management and Organization at Hanken School of Economics in Helsinki, Finland. He is a permanent Visiting Professor at EMLYON Business School, France, a Distinguished Visiting Scholar at Lancaster University, UK, and an Adjunct Professor at Copenhagen Business School, Denmark. He received his PhD at Helsinki School of Economics. His research interests focus on organizational and institutional change, strategic practices and processes, multinational corporations and globalization, management education, and methodological issues in organization and management research. He has worked especially

on discursive and narrative approaches. His work has been published in leading journals and several books, and he has received several awards for his contributions. Among other things, he has served as the Chair of the European Group for Organizational Studies (EGOS) and on the Board of Governors of the Academy of Management (AOM).

Appendix B: 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 publicized. 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.
- valorization 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 organizations, 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 C: Programme of the site visit

Monday 4 November

Time	Part	Collocutors
9:00 – 11:00	Preparatory meeting	Committee only
11:00 – 12:00	Faculty Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prof. dr Anton Hemerijck, • Prof. dr Leo Huberts
12:00 – 13:00	<i>Break</i>	
13:00 – 14:00	Programme leaders OPOS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prof. dr Peter Groenewegen • Prof. dr Marcel Veenswijk • Dr Sierk Ybema
14:00 – 15:00	Researchers OPOS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr Frank de Bakker • Dr Kees Boersma • Dr Julie Ferguson • Dr Dick de Gilder • Dr Ida Sabelis
15:00 – 15:15	<i>Break</i>	
15:15 – 16:15	PhD students OPOS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greetje Corporaal • Nicoletta Dimitrova • Ludo Glimmerveen • Sander Merkus • Annemiek van Os
16:15 – 17:30	Committee meeting (drafting conclusions)	Committee only
17:30 – 20:30	<i>Dinner</i>	
20:30	<i>Travel to Tilburg</i>	

Tuesday 5 November

Time	Part	Collocutors
8:30 – 9:00	Welcome at Auberge	Philip Eijlander, Rector TiU
9:00 – 10:00	Preparatory meeting	Committee only
10:00 – 11:00	Programme Leaders OS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prof. dr Marius Meeus • Prof. dr Roger Leenders • Prof. dr Leon Oerlemans
11:00 – 11:15	<i>Break</i>	
11:15 – 12:15	Faculty board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prof. dr Klaas Sijtsma • Prof. dr Willem Johan Kop • Drs Hans Dieteren
12:15 – 13:30	<i>Lunch</i>	
13:30 – 14:30	Researchers OS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr Victor Gilsing • Dr Petru Curseu

Time	Part	Collocutors
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr John Bechara • Dr Joerg Raab • Dr Rob Jansen
14:30 – 15:30	PhD students OS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tom de Groot • Ronald Levering • Remco Mannak • Helen Pluut • Gertjan Lucas • Aafke Raaijmakers • Walter van den Berg
15:30 – 15:45	<i>Break</i>	
15:45 – 17:15	Committee meeting (drafting conclusions)	Committee only
18:00	<i>Dinner</i>	

Wednesday 6 November

Time	Part	Collocutors
9:00 – 10:00	Preparatory meeting	Committee only
10:00 – 11:00	Programme Leaders HRS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prof. dr Jaap Paauwe • Prof. dr Marc van Veldhoven
11:00 – 12:00	Researchers HRS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr Kerstin Alfes • Dr Marloes van Engen • Dr Charissa Freese • Dr Dorien Kooij • Prof. dr René Schalk • Dr Marianne van Woerkom
12:00 – 13:00	<i>Lunch</i>	
13:30 – 14:30	PhD students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Susanne Beijer • Judith van den Broek • Dr Sjoerd van den Heuvel • Ruud van Keulen • Dr Brigitte Kroon • Christina Meyers
14:30 – 15:00	Committee meeting (drafting conclusions)	Committee only
15:00 – 15:30	Oral presentation by the chairman	
15:30 – 16:30	<i>Drinks</i>	