Life Sciences Institutes
University of Groningen

Groningen Biomolecular Sciences and Biotechnology Institute (GBB)

Centre for Evolutionary and Ecological Studies (CEES)

Centre of Behaviour and Neurosciences (CBN)

ASSESSMENT OF RESEARCH QUALITY
1998-2004

RuG

Rijksuniversiteit Groningen

Addendum to the Assessment of Research Quality Report 1998-2004:

Overview of scores of individual research programs of the Groningen Biomolecular Sciences and Biotechnology Institute (GBB)

University of Groningen
P.O. Box 72
9700 AB Groningen
The Netherlands

Groningen Biomolecular Science and Biotechnology Institute (GBB)
P.O. Box 14
9750 AA Haren
The Netherlands
Phone: +31 50 363 4203
Email: T.Hummel@rug.nl
Website: http://www.rug.nl/gbb

Addendum to the Assessment of Research Quality Report 1998-2004

GBB program scores

NOTES:
1. This addendum was designed on the basis of the orginal Assessment Report; the original report should be cited as following: Assessment of Research Quality, Life Sciences RUG / FMNS 1998-2004, University of Groningen, November 2005.
2. Details on the Peer Review Committee and program reports can be found in the original report

Photographs: Elmer Spaargaren, Groningen, NL
Original design: Dorèl en anderen, Groningen, NL

December 2005

Peer Review Committee members who assessed GBB:

Committee member	Expertise	Programs
Prof.dr. W.P.M. Hoekstra (chair)	Microbiology and plant biology	6
Prof.dr. M. Bolognesi	Biomolecular Sciences & Biotechnology	1-12
Prof.dr. A.J. Sinskey	Microbiology and Biotechnology	1-12
Prof.dr. R. Dantzer	Integrative Neurobiology	5

Assessment criteria according to the SEP and interpretation by the PRC

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. The members of the committee judged quality largely based on the discussions with the program leaders and the information in the self-evaluation reports, relying on their own knowledge and expertise. Relative citation impact as emerging from the bibliometric analysis by CWTS was helpful for the evaluation of the institutes, but played a minor role in assessing the quality of the research programs.

Productivity refers to the total output of the group; that is, the variegated ways in which results of research and knowledge development are publicised. Usually, quantitative indicators measure this. The output needs to be reviewed in relation to the input in terms of human resources. The committee used the productivity analysis provided by the management only in the final stage of the assessment, mainly for 'calibration' of program scores within each institute. The subcommittees first based the program's productivity on the information in the self-evaluation report, not only on numbers but also on the nature of publications. Both academic publications and dissertations were taken into account and for GBB patents were counted as well. Output numbers were primarily related to the research input of the tenured plus non-tenured staff, but the input of PhD students was not neglected totally. Given differences in publication culture, the committee paid little attention to differences in output : input ratios between the institutes.

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

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

Ratings

The SEP provides a five-point scale to allow for the attribution of a numerical score on each of the four criteria. The scores used in this assessment are excellent (5), very good (4), good (3), satisfactory (2), and unsatisfactory (1). It should be stressed that these scores can not replace the verbal judgements that supply more relevant information. A more extended description of this scale is as follows:

Excellent: work that is at the forefront internationally, and which most likely will have an important and substantial impact in the field. Institute is considered an international leader.

Very good: work that is internationally competitive and is expected to make a significant contribution; nationally speaking at the forefront in the field. Institute is considered international player, national leader.

Good: work that competitive at the national level and will probably make a valuable contribution in the international field. Institute is considered internationally visible and a national player.

Satisfactory: work that is solid but not exciting, will add to our understanding and is in principle worthy of support. It is considered of less priority than work in the above categories. Institute is nationally visible.

Unsatisfactory: work that is neither solid nor exciting, flawed in the scientific and or technical approach, repetitions of other work, etc. Work not worthy of pursuing.

For comparison to previous assessments the criteria are listed in the following table.

VSNU 1992-2002 (previous reports)		SEP 2003-2009 (this report)	
5	Excellent	5	Excellent
		4	Very good
4	Good	3	Good
3	Satisfactory	2	Satisfactory
2	Unsatisfactory	1	Unsatisfactory
1	Poor		

Nr.	Program leaders	Program name	Quality (Q)	Productivity (P)	Relevance (R)	Vitality & Feasibility (V&F)	Average program score
GBB1	A.J.M. Driessen ('03-present) J.S. Lolkema ('99-present) W.N. Konings ('98-'02) B. Poolman ('98-'99)	Molecular Microbiology / Biomembranes	5.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.9
GBB2	M. Veenhuis ('98-present) I.J. van der Klei ('00-present) W. Harder ('98-'02)	Eukaryotic Microbiology	4.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.6
GBB3	L. Dijkhuizen ('98-present) T. Hansen ('98-'01) H.A.B. Wösten ('98-'01)	Microbial Physiology	4.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.6
GBB4	O.P. Kuipers ('99-present) J. Kok ('98-'04) S. Bron ('98-'04) G. Venema ('98)	Molecular Genetics	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
GBB5	B.J.L. Eggen ('03-present) P.J.M. van Haastert ('03-present) D.B. Janssen ('01-'03) W. Kruijer ('98-'01)	Developmental Genetics	3.0	3.5	4.0	3.0	3.4
GBB6	J. Hille ('99-present) J.G.H. Wessels('98)	Molecular Biology of Plants	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.4
GBB7	E.J. Boekema ('02-present) A. Brisson ('98-'01)	Electron Microscopy	4.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.6
GBB8	P.J.M. van Haastert ('98-present) M.H.K. Linskens ('98-present)	Cell Biochemistry	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.3
GBB9	D.B. Janssen ('98-present) M.W. Fraaije ('99-present)	Biotransformation and Biocatalysis	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
GBB10	B.W. Dijkstra ('98-present) A.M.W.H. Thunnissen ('98-present)	Protein X-ray Crystallography	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.8
GBB11	A.E. Mark ('99-'04) R.M. Scheek ('98-present) H.J.C. Berendsen ('98-'99)	Molecular Dynamics	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.5	4.6
GBB12	B. Poolman ('99-present) G.T. Robillard ('98-'99)	Membrane Enzymology	5.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.9
Average Institute scores			**4.4**	**4.4**	**4.8**	**4.5**	**4.5**