

# **Research Review**

## **Human Geography and Planning 2007-2012**

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](mailto:info@qanu.nl)  
Internet: [www.qanu.nl](http://www.qanu.nl)

Project number: Q0456

© 2014 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 evaluation of research in Human Geography and Planning at the University of Groningen, Utrecht University and the University of Amsterdam

## Contents

<b>Foreword by the committee chair</b> .....	<b>5</b>
1. The review committee and the review procedures .....	7
2. General remarks.....	9
<b>Assessment at Institute and Programme level</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>3. Research review University of Groningen</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>4. Research review Utrecht University</b> .....	<b>23</b>
4A. The institute .....	23
4B. Programme level.....	31
<b>5. Research review University of Amsterdam</b> .....	<b>45</b>
5A. The institute .....	45
5B. Programme level.....	53
<b>Appendices</b> .....	<b>65</b>
Appendix 1: Curricula vitae of the committee members.....	67
Appendix 2: Explanation of the SEP scores .....	69
Appendix 3: Programme of the site visit.....	71
Appendix 4: Quantitative data.....	75



## Foreword by the committee chair

As chairperson of the review committee Human Geography and Planning, I am pleased to submit herewith the committee's report on research activities in the field of Human Geography and Planning at the University of Groningen, Utrecht University, and the University of Amsterdam.

The committee's findings are based on a study of the detailed self-assessment reports provided by these three institutions together with additional information given to the committee by QANU (Quality Assurance Netherlands Universities). In addition, the committee spent three days in the Netherlands in very intensive interviews with relevant administrators, academic staff, and students. At the time of its visit to the Netherlands, the committee members engaged in detailed face-to-face discussions with one another in an effort to coordinate their opinions and to find points of agreement, and this effort was underpinned by subsequent exchanges via e-mail. I am gratified to report that the committee was in fact able to arrive at a high degree of consensus, and, above all, that the committee members were all persuaded of the generally high level of performance observed at the three institutions visited.

The committee's work has benefited enormously from the guidance of Mariëlle Klerks of QANU who kept us consistently focused on the tasks to be accomplished and who very kindly, pleasantly, and efficiently offered helpful advice and support throughout our enquiries. Mariëlle also participated in the editing of this report, and we owe to her a debt of gratitude for her efforts in securing the coherence and focus of the final product.

For the rest, the committee enjoyed participating with QANU and the three universities in this review effort, and it hopes that this report will prove to be of positive value to all concerned.

Allen J. Scott  
Chair of the Committee



# 1. The review committee and the review procedures

## Scope of the assessment

The Human Geography and Planning Review Committee was asked to perform an assessment of the research in Human Geography and Planning at Utrecht University (UU), University of Groningen (RUG) and University of Amsterdam (UvA). This assessment covers the research conducted 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 institutes and the research programmes on the basis of the information provided by the institutes and interviews with the management and the research leaders, and to advise on how it might be improved.

## Composition of the committee

The composition of the Human Geography and Planning committee was as follows:

- Prof. A.J. (Allen) Scott (chair), Distinguished Research Professor of Geography and Public Policy at the University of California, Los Angeles, USA;
- Prof. A.J. (Anthony) Fielding, Professor Emeritus of Human Geography at the University of Sussex, Brighton, UK;
- Prof. A. (Anna) Geppert, Professor of Urban and Regional Planning at Paris-Sorbonne University, Paris, France;
- Prof. C. (Carole) Rakodi, Professor Emeritus in the International Development Department, School of Government and Society at the University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK;
- Prof. G. (Gill) Valentine, Pro-Vice-Chancellor for the Faculty of Social Sciences, Professor at the Department of Geography at the University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK;
- Prof. F.J.A. (Frank) Witlox, Professor of Economic Geography at Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium;

A short curriculum vitae of the committee members is included in Appendix 1.

Drs. G.M. (Mariëlle) Klerks 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 the programme under review were reported and discussed in the committee meeting. The committee concluded that there were no unacceptable relations or dependencies and that there was no specific risk in terms of bias or undue influence.

## Data provided to the committee

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

- Self-evaluation reports of the units under review, including all the information required by the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP), with appendices;
- Copies of the key publications per research programme, with a maximum of five articles/books;
- Publication lists of staff members 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 first reviewer was chosen on the basis of his or her expertise in the domain of the programme; the second reviewer was chosen to provide a more general, complementary perspective.

Before conducting interviews with representatives of the institutes and programmes under assessment, the committee was briefed by QANU about research assessment according to SEP and discussed the preliminary assessments. It also agreed upon procedural matters and related aspects of the assessment. For each university, the committee discussed the self-evaluation report, key publications and the preliminary findings of all research programmes and the institute before starting on the interviews. The first reviewers led the interviews, and then the second reviewers and the other committee members were given the opportunity to ask questions. After each interview the committee took some time to prepare a preliminary assessment. After concluding the interviews at each university, it discussed the scores and comments of the institute and programmes.

The interviews took place on 24, 25 and 26 March 2014 (cf. the schedule in Appendix 3) in Groningen, Utrecht and Amsterdam. The site visit consisted of interviews with the management of the research institutes and interviews with (1) the leaders and researchers of each of the research programmes and (2) a selection of PhD students.

At the end of its meeting in Amsterdam, the committee discussed the scores and comments of all 9 programmes and 3 institutes. The final assessments are based on the documentation provided by the institutes, the key publications, and the interviews. The texts for the committee report were finalised through email exchanges. The first assessor was responsible for writing the draft assessment and for sending it to the second assessor for amendment and/or approval. After it had been approved by both assessors and the committee chair, the assessment was inserted into the report. After receiving all assessments, the secretary compiled the report and returned it to the committee for a final approval. The approved version of the report was presented to the faculties for factual corrections and comments. The final report was presented to the Boards of the participating universities and was printed after their 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 2.

## 2. General remarks

The review committee has studied the copious documentation provided by the institutes and programmes and QANU, and spent three notably intensive days interviewing relevant administrators, staff and students in the field of Human Geography and Planning at the University of Groningen, Utrecht University, and the University of Amsterdam.

The committee was impressed with the three different institutes investigated. In all three cases the committee gives high marks in general for administrative competence, academic quality, societal relevance, and PhD student training. With exceptions as noted in the report, the individual research groups and programs that make up these institutes demonstrated high levels of intellectual seriousness and commitment to research, and while a small number of these units seem to be facing difficulties of one sort or another, in no case did the committee meet with anything but a very positive attitude to the prospects of change and improvement. The committee was also pleased to note the generally high standards of publication and the grant-getting ability that it met with in the majority of cases.

The committee members' interactions among themselves and with their various interlocutors raised a number of issues cutting across all of the particular organizations that they were asked to review. The committee brings to these issues a perspective that has the advantage of coming from a group of academics who are all employed in universities outside of the Netherlands but the disadvantage of being considerably less than fully acclimatized to the specific culture and organizational imperatives of Dutch universities. The committee presents its views, then, as offering tentative subjects for further discussion rather than as authoritative judgments.

The committee wants to make five main points.

1. The most obvious one is that direct funding for all of the organizations looked at has decreased greatly over the 2007-2012 period. This has put enormous strain on the academic staff, who are now forced to invest increasingly large amounts of time and energy in securing external money via grants and research contracts. This means, in turn, that less and less time is being devoted to fundamental research.
2. These pressures are compounded by the fact that incentives for staff to sacrifice quality of output in favor of quantity of output appear to be intensifying. The steadily widening resort to publication metrics – as in this report – as an aid to evaluation certainly makes this problem all the more acute.
3. In the same vein, in the institutions examined, the committee was struck by what appears to be a devaluation of books as indicators of academic performance and a bias towards papers in peer-reviewed journals. The committee most certainly does not wish to depreciate the value of specialized research papers in authoritative journals. Yet there is a very real sense in which books represent the heart and soul of all academic activity, and the committee's feeling is that their place in the repertoire of academic performance needs to be carefully conserved and rewarded.
4. These remarks are all of a piece with what the committee takes to be a possibly problematical trend to the streamlining of PhD work in the sense that this work is increasingly being focused on the production of a series of discrete scientific papers as the basic requirement for the degree. By the same token more and more students are dissuaded from following the traditional (and probably higher risk) course of action focused on the production of a monograph. In any case the committee has urged

*passim* in this report that the monograph option be kept firmly in place for those students who wish to pursue this mode of research and scholarly reflection.

5. Concomitantly, the committee would like to raise concerns about the increasingly common trend for PhD theses not only to take the form of discrete papers, but also for a number of these papers to be co-authored by the student's supervisor(s). Clearly, this arrangement is subject to potential abuse in that there will inevitably be questions in particular cases as to how much of the work is the student's and how much the supervisor's. The committee has no answers to this dilemma, but it has recommended in every case in this report that the matter be discussed with some deliberation by all relevant parties and appropriate policies implemented.

Furthermore, the committee would like to add that it sometimes found the Standard Evaluation Protocol itself a little difficult to work with, given the ambiguities and overlap between the different criteria it was asked to address. The committee felt that perhaps the Protocol might be more effective if the suggested criteria were broken down into a series of very much more focused prompts. For example, "quality," "productivity," and "vitality" issues overlap in many different ways and it would be helpful if they could be reduced to a larger number of mutually exclusive questions. The committee realises that the Protocol does provide some guidelines in this regard, but it feels that it would have been most helpful if, in the research review, it had been asked to structure its comments in the form of responses to more pointed questions. In addition, the Protocol is not very well adapted to the case of the University of Groningen where there is a great deal of ambiguity about where the "institution" ends and the "programme" begins. In this instance, the committee found it quite difficult to work with the standardised structure and scoring guide of the Protocol.

## Assessment at Institute and Programme level



### 3. Research review Urban and Regional Studies Institute (University of Groningen)

**Programme:** Towards Wellbeing, Innovation and Spatial Transformation

Programme director: Prof. Dr. I. Hutter

Research staff 2012: 8.48 FTE tenured, 60.0 total FTE

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

---

Since at the University of Groningen (RUG) all research in the field of Human Geography and Planning is conducted within an institute with one integrated research programme, the committee decided to integrate the assessment at the institute and programme level. Accordingly, the following assessment covers both levels.

#### 3.A.1. The institute

Research and graduate student training in human geography and planning, at the University of Groningen, are organised within the Urban and Regional Studies Institute (URSI), which in turn is part of the Faculty of Spatial Sciences (FRW).

FRW's research interests and teaching activities revolve around three main areas of concern, namely Geography, Spatial Planning, and Demography. In addition, FRW undertakes and disseminates world-leading and highly distinctive research focused on social transformations that encourage high levels of wellbeing and innovation. As such, it is a faculty with a high degree of overall scholarly coherence. The committee also notes that the FRW's research mission strongly connects to the university's *Healthy Ageing, Sustainable Society* and *Energy* research priorities.

URSI was established in 2003 and it has three main divisions, one being the Graduate School of Spatial Sciences (GSSS, cf. section 3.A.7.), which is responsible for graduate education of both masters' and PhD students, the second being the newly-formed tWIST (cf. section 4.A.1.B.), which now provides the programmatic framework for research in the Faculty, and the third the PhD Council, which represents the interests of the PhD researchers in the GSSS. URSI itself is complemented by a Research Advisory Group (RAG) which acts in an oversight capacity and was responsible for spearheading the building of the new tWIST programme (cf. 3.B.1.) in recent years. The director of URSI is the member of the Faculty Board who is responsible for research. Research coordination and policy are discussed by the URSI-GSSS Board.

The FRW and URSI are currently going through a number of important transformations, with major impacts on institutional performance and quality. The committee noted that, since the last review, there has been a significant increase in the total number of staff and in the total number of PhD students enrolled. The committee established that this, in turn, has been accompanied by a notable growth in terms of both the quantity and quality of the research activities and the published output of the Institute. Among the other changes currently going on in URSI is a re-thinking of the role of RAG, which is now opening up to younger

members of staff, and is seeking to re-organise the administrative infrastructures of URSI. The committee learned that this re-organisation includes the appointment of a Faculty funding officer responsible for coordinating grant and contract proposal applications and exploring new research funding opportunities.

Above all, the old arrangement of URSI's research activity, which was composed of four discrete sub-programmes, is being restructured into the much more flexible and yet clearly focused tWIST programme, with the objective of mobilising high levels of scholarly research activity. The committee learned from the interviews during the site visit that tWIST seeks to accomplish this objective principally by means of a significant intensification of collaborative research combined with a resolute focus on upgraded grant-getting capacity and the dissemination of research findings in major international peer-reviewed journals. The committee is of the opinion that tWIST provides a highly distinctive vision of future research activities in URSI.

All of these changes have required close attention in terms of managerial intervention and supervision at the level of both the FRW and URSI, and the committee is pleased to report that in the interviews during the site visit it found that these matters have been dealt with competently, smoothly, and creatively, while at the same time securing more or less full agreement on the part of the staff.

In short, the committee was impressed with the high-quality of management and leadership in both the FRW and URSI and with the energy and enthusiasm that are being invested in the important changes now going on, particularly in regard to mounting and implementing the ambitious tWIST programme. The committee was also made aware of the strong encouragement given by the university as a whole to FRW and its component units.

### **3.B.1. The programme**

In response to recommendations made in the 2007 review report, the tWIST programme (i.e. 'Towards Wellbeing, Innovation and Spatial Transformation') was initiated in 2009. Traditionally, within the FRW, there were four departments with four corresponding research programmes. The tWIST programme represents an effort to coordinate the research activities of URSI and integrate them into one faculty research programme. tWIST looks at some of the grand social and economic challenges of the contemporary world and seeks to tailor the resources of URSI in ways that most effectively addresses those challenges. The programme has a focus on *Wellbeing, Innovation and Spatial Transformation*. The self-assessment report explains that the links between 'wellbeing' and 'innovation' capture the relationships between the level of human development and the processes of change and improvement which bring about this development. tWIST examines and interprets these relationships in terms of processes of spatial transformation taking place in society. The programme aims at conducting world-leading, distinctive and policy-relevant research that aims to reveal these complex interrelationships. The committee is of the opinion that the programme's objectives accord well with the university's overall research priorities, which are directed to questions of healthy ageing, sustainable society and energy.

tWIST is subdivided into four distinct research clusters, which contribute different insights and aspects to the overall research theme 'towards wellbeing, innovation and spatial transformation':

1. *Place, Identity and Wellbeing*, which explores the relationships between people and place, and the social experience of transformations in rural and regional communities around the world.

2. *Population and Wellbeing in Context*, which focuses on population issues in a broad sense and on the consequences of these issues for wellbeing, against differing sociocultural and spatial backgrounds.
3. *Economy and Place*, which concentrates on the issues surrounding the performance and spatial transformation of and interactions between economic agents, institutions and factors of production within an explicitly spatial context.
4. *Institutional Innovation and Spatial Transformation*, which aims to understand ongoing transformations of space and place as co-evolving institutional, physical and social environments.

The review committee made special note of the energy and enthusiasm that are being dedicated to shaping tWIST into a first-class research organisation. Certainly, considering the overall period since the last review, there can be no questioning of the fact that URSI/tWIST has made many strides forward in the matter of overall scholarly quality and reputation, and, as will become increasingly clear in later sections of this report, all the usual criteria of scholarly performance (publication, citation rates, research funding) have evinced marked overall improvement since the last review. This improvement is partly based on a noteworthy increase in critical mass (from 9.46 to 20.58 FTE tenured and non-tenured staff over the review period), including a very large increase in non-tenured staff. The committee considers the increase of non-tenured staff to be a healthy sign of rising levels of new blood among the staff as a whole, but it feels that this should probably be balanced by one new senior appointment to offset the attrition that has occurred at this level since 2011-2012.

The committee stresses the point, however, that the operational expression of URSI's research concerns in tWIST is very much in an early stage of development. When detailed information about performance and accomplishments are laid out (see below), a number of lacunae appear and these call for remedial attention. For the moment, the committee simply comments on the possible tension that may occur between the declared objective of tWIST to provide a coherent and unified research programme while simultaneously maintaining an internal division of research interests revolving around four "clusters". This arrangement appears to have the broad assent of the staff, and was well received by the review committee, though there is always the potential problem that maintaining the clusters may stand in the way of the integrative ambitions of tWIST. This point is acknowledged in the self-assessment report, and the committee recommends that it continue to be a focus of institutional reflection.

As things now stand, the committee is happy to report on the improvement in the overall quality of URSI/tWIST and the rising international visibility of the staff at large. The committee has considerable faith that the younger scholars who have come to make up an increasingly large proportion of the total research staff will find in URSI/tWIST a nurturing atmosphere that will rapidly enable them to attain high standards of scholarly performance.

### **3.B.2. Quality and academic reputation**

The tWIST programme is a bold attempt to bring together four research themes. However, as already pointed out above, to some degree this programme is still a work in progress; while within the University it is clearly seen as having substance, status and effects, the impression was given that outside the University it has yet to become widely known or to have the power to attract researchers. Despite the boost to interdisciplinary research, which is one of the intended consequences of the establishment of tWIST, it is not possible to be sure at this stage that the quality of the research outputs has been improved by this initiative. What can be said is that, on the basis of the publications submitted to the committee, the quality of the

research is high, although, having said that, it was not judged to be outstanding across the board. In all, 11% of the peer-reviewed publications by staff members over the review years have appeared in the top 10% of academic journals and 30% have appeared in the top 25% of academic journals. The committee is of the opinion that this is a commendable level of accomplishment, especially given the intensity of international competition for publication in these journals.

The committee felt that the researchers in tWIST are competent and many seem to be poised to accomplish significant work in the future. A small core group of researchers have high reputations and their work is widely known and highly regarded in EU academic circles and beyond. In addition, there has been a threefold increase in ISI citations per annum and a fourfold increase in Scopus citations per annum between 2007 and 2012. The evidence of the citations and H-indices of the three key members of staff (Scopus H-indices 21, 18 and 17, citations 1281, 853 and 1386 respectively; ISI-web of science H-indices 19, 14, 13, citations 1227, 596, 1045 respectively) indicates that the impact and quality of their publications is both sound and generally up to international standards. The outputs of tWIST have been published in 165 different journals and 40 different ISI categories, which suggests a diffuse publication strategy which may reduce the impact of the group.

Further indicators of the academic reputation of the URSI research staff include the various prizes and awards received by the staff (e.g. 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Award for outstanding scholarship at the European Regional Sciences Association), the obtained research grants (e.g. NWO/VIDI, KNAW), the invitations to deliver keynote speeches and lectures, the participation in boards of scientific organisations (e.g. presidentship of the Association of European Schools of Planning (AESOP)), the various editorships or memberships of editorial boards (e.g. chief editorship of *Papers in Regional Science*), the participation in NWO and other review committees, co-appointments and/or important assignments (e.g. Special Adviser to the European Commissioner for Regional Policy, Director of the Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute (NIDI), etc.).

### **3.B.3. Resources**

The development of research staff numbers and total funding over the review period 2007-2012 is reflected in the tables presented in the self-assessment report (cf. Appendix 4). The tables provided much of the information that enabled the committee to make its judgements.

As already pointed out in section 3.A.1., staff numbers increased significantly over the review period. Total research staff (including tenured, non-tenured and employed and non-employed PhD candidates) numbers at URSI have increased from 59 persons (equal to 29.36 research FTE) in 2007 to 99 persons (equal to 59.98 research FTE) in 2012. All categories of staff were affected by this increase, although not all to the same extent. While the total PhD candidates FTE numbers more or less doubled over the review years from 19.9 FTE in 2007 to 39.4 FTE in 2012 (employed PhD candidates from 7.4 FTE in 2007 to 15.6 FTE in 2012, non-employed PhD candidates from 12.5 FTE in 2007 to 23.8 FTE in 2012), non-tenured staff numbers increased almost threefold from 3.49 FTE in 2007 to 12.10 FTE in 2012. Tenured staff demonstrated a more modest increase from 5.97 FTE in 2007 to 8.48 FTE in 2012. Also, the increase in research FTE occurred at all levels, i.e. the levels of full professor, associate professor, assistant professor, other researchers such as non-tenured post-doc researchers and PhD researchers.

As for the composition of the research staff, the committee learned from the self-assessment report that staff has been rejuvenated during the past years and that FRW/URSI aims at

building an age- and gender-balanced tenured research staff. In 2012, gender percentages were as follows: 18% of the full professors, 22% of the associate professors, 60% of the assistant professors, 57% of the postdoc researchers and 46% of the PhD candidates were female.

The increase in total research staff is paralleled by a significant increase in total funding from €1.105.350 in 2007 to €2.663.460 in 2012, an increase of 141%. Although the amount of direct funding has increased over the review years, the share of direct funding in the Institute's annual budget decreased. In 2007, direct funding amounted to €904.820 (supporting 12.60 FTE) and constituted 75% of the total annual budget, while in 2012 direct funding amounted to €1.679.890 (supporting 22.10 FTE) and constituted only 61% of the total annual budget.

While the share of direct university funding in the Institute's budget declined, the share of research grants and contract research went up. Research grant funding went from €28.400 in 2007 to €214.388 in 2012. Contract research grew from €172.130 in 2007 to €769.182 in 2012, which made second and third stream funding an increasingly substantial source of income. Together, research grant and contract money accounted for a total growth of 9.80 FTE between 2007 and 2012.

The committee is favourably impressed with the efforts by URSI to improve, in difficult circumstances, the resources available for the tWIST research programme. In particular, it noted that there has been significant support from the University in the form of funding for new posts, that there are now mechanisms for the identification and promotion of 'new talent', and that ability to attract research funds plays a part in the appointment of new staff. Still, the committee wishes to reiterate that consideration be given to adding a new senior tenured professor to the staff.

The committee also noted the emphasis on the development of long-term connections with key funding agencies (such as OECD) to develop positive relationships and a sustained pipeline of research contracts. A significant level of funding from NWO was noted, and the committee commends the intention to raise the group's profile with the ERC. Junior staff and PhD students commented favourably on the quality and relevance of research facilities, but some disquiet was voiced about the resourcing of PhD supervision.

### **3.B.4. Productivity**

The self-assessment report provided the necessary information on the number and type of output of URSI's researchers (cf. Appendix 4). The tables provided much of the information that enabled the committee to make its judgements.

The productivity of URSI has improved significantly over the evaluation period. Between 2007 and 2012, URSI research staff produced 987 publications in total (a yearly average of 4.2 per FTE total research staff). In 2007 the research staff were publishing significantly below international benchmarks for academic publications, with outputs dominated by professional articles. This reflected the traditional focus of the FRW on teaching and applied research. However, during the evaluation period, the FRW has become more research oriented and as a consequence changed its publication strategy to place a new emphasis on monographs, peer reviewed scientific articles, and book chapters. In addition, the 'normal' format of the PhD has evolved during the evaluation period from a monograph to a collection of articles (with the consequence that the average duration of the PhD has lengthened from an expectation of four years to 5 years and three months, cf. 3.B.7.). As a consequence of URSI's strategy, over

the review period the tWIST programme has produced 29 research monographs (a yearly average of 0.1 per FTE total research staff), which is a significant number. The output for total academic publications, at 463 (a yearly average of 2.0 per FTE total research staff) over the total evaluation period, is now appropriate for a research oriented programme, especially given the low productivity in the early years of the evaluation period. In particular, the number of scientific peer-reviewed articles has increased significantly from 25 in 2007 to 79 in 2012 which represents an impressive improvement in performance. The total of 321 refereed articles for the evaluation period, which equals an average of 1.4 refereed articles per FTE total research staff or 3.7 refereed articles per FTE tenured and non-tenured staff, represents an appropriate level of output for a research oriented department. Moreover, the committee noted that the yearly number of refereed articles per FTE tenured and non-tenured staff increased over the review period from 2.6 in 2007 to 3.8 in 2012. tWIST published 113 book chapters (a yearly average of 0.5 per FTE total research staff), which the committee considers to be a significantly high number and ratio, and 489 professional publications (a yearly average of 2.1 per FTE total research staff) over the total evaluation period despite the change in its publication strategy during this time which saw a significant reduction in these outputs during the latter period of the evaluation.

The number of PhD theses produced each year varies from 1 to 11, which the committee considers reasonable, though a little on the low side given the overall size of URSI/tWIST. Over the review years, a total of 39 PhD theses were produced. This means that there were a yearly average of 0.8 PhD theses per FTE tenured staff.

The committee learned from the self-assessment report and the interviews during the site visit that URSI, at the moment, does not yet have a clear publication policy. The committee was pleased to learn from the strategic vision that URSI plans to develop such a policy in the coming years.

### **3.B.5. Societal relevance**

Societal relevance is anchored in FRW's vision and research mission and URSI is strongly committed to undertaking research that addresses the policy and intervention needs and interests of society. The committee assesses the societal relevance of tWIST research as very good indeed. The group has established strong links with national and regional institutions, such as the Netherlands Institute for City Innovation Studies (Platform 31), the Ministry for Infrastructure and Environment, the Wadden academy (Jouke van Dijk being its Director). In addition to a very proactive attitude in terms of dissemination of research results, participatory research projects have been carried through (e.g. Zorg Zonder Regels). These interactions have resulted in strong partnerships (e.g. the Mansholt chair financed by the Ministry of Agriculture).

The research is also relevant at the international level, where burning topics have been addressed, such as population decline, smart specialisation, wellbeing in place or post-earthquake resilience, all in partnership with the OECD, or the reproductive careers of women with HIV in Maharashtra, India with the WHO.

The personal implication of some tWIST researchers in expertise for various national and international organisations appears outstanding. A good example is the European Union. Philip McCann is special adviser of the EU Commissioner for Regional Policy. As members of the EU International expert group, Philip McCann and Franck Vanclay have contributed to the elaboration of the EU guidelines on regional development programme implementation.

In the future, tWIST could build further on these outstanding individual achievements to develop a “world-leading” position as a research centre, by developing the visibility of the programme as tWIST and attracting permanent institutional partnerships. Today, the list of topics which have been performed in partnership with international organisations is broad, but also somewhat dispersed, with widely varying levels of practical and policy significance. For the future, the committee suggests that tWIST could define targets for which it intends to reach this world-leading position: for which topics does tWIST want to be world-leading?

### **3.B.6. Strategy for the future**

The self-assessment report provides a SWOT-analysis, which identifies URSI’s strong and weak features, and the threats and opportunities it faces. One important factor contributing to the viability of URSI/tWIST is considered to be the tWIST programme itself. tWIST unites and integrates research and research clusters and addresses important societal issues at the local, national and international level. For instance, there are clear links between HORIZON 2020 and tWIST. Moreover, tWIST is well-embedded in the University of Groningen, as it relates well to the university’s research foci. Other strengths of URSI comprise e.g. the large number of young staff, which creates a dynamic environment, and the large number of non-tenured staff, which contributes to the Institute’s flexibility. Furthermore, the increase in research and contract funding in particular is considered to be a strength, especially considering the threats of the various (inter)national budget cuts, the increasing competition for funding and in publishing and the fact that funding emphasis is on the natural rather than social sciences.

Even so, the self-assessment report – to its credit -- identifies some weaknesses as well. Among these is the fact that tWIST is not always sufficiently evident on the ground yet. Also, there is not yet sufficient innovative research across the boundaries of research clusters and the tWIST profile, reportedly, is not yet sufficiently visible externally. This could result in missing out on participation in consortia. Further weaknesses relate to the staff. Although having a large number of younger staff has its positive sides, the downside is that young staff are relatively inexperienced in research-related activities. In this respect, however, the university support for talent development is identified as an opportunity. Also, the large number of non-tenured staff, although contributing to the institute’s flexibility, may also be a threat to continuity. The SWOT-analysis furthermore states that there is an imbalance between the research staff and PhD candidates. The committee does not fully share this latter view, considering the student/staff ratio at URSI at a very sustainable level and, indeed, rather lower than the ratio at comparable institutions. Another weakness concerns the fact that the roles of and the differences between URSI-GSSS and the RAG are unclear, although the committee was informed that there is now an effort to find ways of bringing the RAG and the URSI-GSSS into one operating unit. Also, RAG is now taking steps to incorporate younger staff into its structure. A final weak feature identified in the SWOT-analysis is the long PhD completion time. The committee concurs that this problem needs close attention and was pleased to learn from the self-assessment report and the interviews during the site visit that FRW/URSI intends to intensify monitoring of PhD progress and to professionalise the PhD trajectory in order to shorten the time PhD candidates need to finish their PhDs.

The committee considers the SWOT-analysis to be very honest and open in its treatment of the strengths and weaknesses of URSI and is of the opinion that this indicates a clarity of institutional vision that bodes well for the future. The committee endorses the strategic vision that is appended to the self-assessment report. It learned that the central focus in this vision is on further embedding tWIST in all aspects of faculty life. Mobility of staff between clusters is and will continue to be encouraged, with each staff member supposed to belong to at least

two clusters. However, the committee strongly feels that, given the continued existence of clusters within the Institute, future monitoring will be necessary in order to ensure that their boundaries are porous and the projected level of internal flexibility in tWIST will be secured and maintained.

Diversity of staff in regard to age, gender and national origins has evidently been a problem at URSI in the past, but the committee established that this problem is now being addressed, with concomitantly positive effects on the general vitality of the Institute. The age structure is also being rebalanced. The gender inequalities are receiving attention, and this concern is partly addressed, as well, by the resources made available by the Rosalind Franklin Fellowship programme. The committee notes, however, that the degree of gender balance in URSI decreases markedly when moving from junior to senior staff. The international complexion of the Institute (both staff and students) is now clearly evident.

Finally, the committee notes with approval the heavy emphasis that is given in the strategic vision to improving levels of academic quality and visibility.

In summary, the committee is convinced that URSI is well poised in terms of its institutional fabric and its academic resources to move forward in very positive ways, and to maintain the momentum that has been initiated with the formalisation of tWIST.

### **3.B.7. PhD-training and supervision**

URSI's Graduate School of Spatial Sciences (GSSS) consists of the PhD programme in Spatial Sciences and the Research Master's in Regional Studies. All PhD candidates are enrolled in the GSSS and are subject to its rules and regulations, which are summarised in the PhD manual. At the time of the review, the GSSS is undergoing a process of professionalisation, particularly concerning the entrance criteria, the monitoring of progress, the evaluation at the end of the first year of the PhD trajectory and the preparation of the PhD defence. The interests of all PhD candidates in the GSSS are represented by the PhD Council, which is also part of URSI.

As things now stand, the committee considers the student/staff ratio at URSI to be at a very sustainable level. Each PhD student has a first (senior) promoter and a second (junior) promoter, which suggests that general student supervision is well attended to. A small number of students have co-supervisors from different clusters, and the committee learned that this practice will continue to develop further.

The self-assessment report provides information on PhD enrolment and success rates (cf. Appendix 4). Out of the 17 standard (employed) PhD candidates who enrolled between 2004 and 2008, 12% had graduated within four years. Another 18% had graduated within four to five years. 29% have not yet finished their projects, while 12% of the total of 17 standard PhD students dropped out. As for contract (non-employed) PhD candidates, success rates are higher. Out of the 19 contract PhD candidates who enrolled between 2004 and 2008, 16% had graduated within four years, while within four to five years another 47% had graduated. 11% have not yet finished their projects and 16% of the total of 19 contract PhD candidates had discontinued. The average time to degree is five years and three months, which is quite a bit higher than the norm of four years. In addition, there is considerable variance around the average, with 53% of all students taking more than five years to graduate. The committee is of the opinion that the average time needed to complete the PhD is too long and agrees with the Institute that this issue needs close attention (cf. 3.B.6.).

PhD students take courses within the frameworks of RUG, FRW and NETHUR. The latter provides education in the spheres of theory, methodology, and professional preparation. The self-assessment report states that students are “encouraged” to take courses. Students with four-year contracts or fellowships are expected to take 30 EC, while PhD candidates with three-year contracts/fellowships must obtain EC in proportion to the duration of their project. The committee feels that the language about these issues in the self-assessment report is rather vague. It is not clear to the committee in substantive terms what URSI’s specific requirements for the various types of PhD students are here, and the interviews suggested that there is quite a bit of variation in the course-load demands put on students, depending on their research interests. The committee recognises that there is a PhD manual (which is not included in the appendices to the self evaluation) that guides students and presumes that course requirements are further specified there. Although the committee recognises that the Dutch system leaves room for PhD trajectories without training in the form of courses, and that institutes cannot actually require taking courses from students who are not employed by the university, it wishes to emphasise the importance of a solid training. Therefore, the committee wants to recommend to URSI that adequate training in theory and methodology be ensured for all students.

By far the greater part of the committee’s time in examining issues of PhD training and supervision was devoted to questions focused on the thesis. It noted that the former requirement of a monograph has now virtually entirely been replaced by a requirement for a series of scientific articles written by the student and partly co-authored with the supervisors. The committee was divided in its opinions on this issue, though it fully recognises that the system appears to have the almost entire support of the staff and the students. All committee members were agreed that this is a system that has a number of potential weaknesses in regard to intellectual quality and breadth of view, and the committee feels that the option of doing a monograph should be kept open for those students who wish to pursue a more traditional, extended and synthetically integrated plan of research inquiry. The committee is also concerned about the potential for abuse of the system, in particular, cases where supervisors unduly take the lead in initiating, framing, and writing research results. It believes that a careful system of monitoring should be installed in order to ensure that students pursuing the paper option are indeed being challenged to capitalize on and demonstrate their own research capabilities.

Finally, there appears to be a very good spirit of *esprit de corps* among the students, and they are clearly well integrated into the daily life of URSI via different forums of discussion and open presentations of work. To judge by the information given in one of the appendices of the self-assessment report, there is a significant degree of success in placing post-PhD students in high-quality academic positions.

### **3.B.8. Conclusion**

From all of the above, it is evident that URSI has made considerable progress since the last review. Therefore, the committee is delighted to give a very positive overall evaluation of its current status and future prospects. The committee has noted, in particular, that the tWIST programme appears to be evolving in very good ways, and that it has the virtually unreserved support of the staff and the students. Specific recommendations that emerge out of this report can be briefly enumerated as follows (in no particular order of priority):

1. Even though the committee realises that URSI is already strongly focused on the future of tWIST, it wants to reiterate the need for continued careful oversight of the programme as it evolves so as to ensure that the goals of flexibility, collaborative work, high productivity and scholarly excellence are fully met.

2. There may be some tension between the objectives of tWIST and the continued existence of internal clusters. This possibility calls for some deliberation on the part of the staff.
3. Consideration should be given to adding a senior tenured professor to the staff.
4. A clear policy regarding staff publication requirements should be worked out.
5. Careful consideration of PhD student course requirements or expectations (in the case of non-employed PhD students) is advisable to ensure that all students – irrespective of research focus – attain a high level of expertise in basic theoretical and methodological issues.
6. The option of completing the PhD by means of a monograph should be retained.
7. Explicit policy guidelines should be developed in order to ensure that the scientific papers option for the PhD genuinely reflects the student's ability and accomplishments.
8. Some increase in the number of PhD enrolments per staff member seems feasible if appropriate funding can be secured.

## 4. Research review Urban and Regional Research Centre Utrecht (Utrecht University)

### 4A. The institute

---

#### 4.A.1. The institute

Research in the field of Human Geography and Planning at Utrecht University is embedded in the Urban and Regional Research Centre Utrecht (URU), which is the research institute of the Department of Human Geography and Planning of the Faculty of Geosciences. URU's mission is described in the self-assessment report as 'to play an internationally inspiring role in research and academic discovery of sustainable social and economic development, and governance of cities and regions'. URU specifically aims to address society-driven transitions from place-based dynamics to people- and firm-based dynamics, by determining the leading role of cities, regions and (localised) networks in shaping these dynamics. The mission and aim are pursued by research on economic, social and planning aspects of sustainable development, analysed from a geographical perspective.

The research is subdivided into four research programmes:

1. Economic Geography (UU1);
2. International Development Studies (UU2);
3. Spatial Planning (UU3);
4. Urban Geography (UU4).

Each programme is led by an individual member of staff and concentrates on its own specific aspects within the overarching URU theme of *Sustainable Cities and Regions*. The programme composition has changed since the previous review. Following the suggestions of the previous assessment committee, the former *Urban Geography and Planning* programme has been split into two separate programmes - *Urban Geography* and *Spatial Planning* -, so as to represent the clearly distinct disciplines and communities, while the former programme of *Geography, Development and Representation* has been transformed into the new *International Development Studies* programme. As the research and student capacity of the former *History and Cartography* programme decreased steadily over the years, this programme has been discontinued.

While the four programmes represent different kinds of research sensibilities, the committee established that there is a considerable degree of general intellectual consistency in URU, and hence numerous opportunities for crossover collaborative projects. The programmes also dovetail well with the two research areas, namely *Sustainability* and *Institutions*, that the university as a whole has identified as major priorities for scholarly enquiry.

During the site visit, the review committee engaged with the management in a very frank and open discussion. The committee was impressed with the quality of the overall leadership and with the strong strategic vision in regard to URU that was shared among these administrators. There was a clear collective sense of the importance of URU in the wider research community and an obvious commitment to maintain its reputation for excellence.

The newly-established Expert Centre for Urban Development and Sustainability (ESD<sup>2</sup>), with its focus on raising research funds, adds important capacity to the institutional infrastructure of URU.

With these points in mind, the committee is impressed with URU's vision, mission, and objectives, which appear to be soundly grounded in a very encouraging administrative structure while being, at the same time, coherent, focused and societally relevant.

#### **4.A.2. Quality and academic reputation**

URU as a whole has enjoyed strong international visibility for some time. Several of its staff members have excellent reputations in academic and policy circles and are well known as leaders in their different fields of research. It is evident, too, that the international visibility of URU has increased over the last six years and there is tangible improvement in many of the Centre's metrics of academic performance.

Areas of research for which URU is especially well-known include (a) the evolutionary development of cities and regions (indeed URU is a world-leader in this particular field), (b) space-time geography and life course questions, (c) governance issues in regard to sustainable spatial development, and (d) network dynamics in local and global contexts. The Centre is perhaps best known for its analytical work, with a strong focus on empirically-based research. In addition, URU has recently attracted a major GIS researcher, whose work cuts across virtually all of these fields and who must be seen as making a major contribution to the broad research capacity of the Centre as a whole.

Since the last review, publication strategy on the part of staff members has considerably de-emphasized professional publication in favor of publication in more prestigious peer-reviewed international journals. In all, 10% of the peer-reviewed publications by staff members over the last six years have appeared in the top 10% of academic journals, and 37% have appeared in the top 25% of academic journals. The committee considers this a commendable level of accomplishment, and all the more so given the intensity of international competition for publication in these journals. However, the record of publication in terms of both quantity and quality appears to be rather uneven from one individual staff member to another, and in testimony to this point only five staff members (out of total of 20 tenured and 17 non-tenured staff in 2012) have a Scopus H-index over 10, though three high-performers have an H-index exceeding 20.

The committee established that there has been an increase in the amount of research grant money earned by the Centre and that much of this money has come from highly competitive and prestigious national and international external funders such as the European Union's FP-7 initiative, NWO (VIDI and VENI grants), and the Netherlands Institute for City Innovation Studies. In all, a remarkable 107 projects with funding of over €10,000 each were awarded from external sources between 2007-2012.

The high quality and reputation of URU is further maintained by the influential conferences and workshops hosted by the Centre, the significant number of URU scholars who are prominent as editors of international journals and as keynote speakers at international conferences, and the distinguished international scholars who are sufficiently attracted by the Centre's work to stay for extended visits.

URU itself is now working intensively on further improving its overall academic quality, and the committee notes that there is evidence in the self-assessment report – backed up in the interviews during the site visit – that determined efforts are being made to enhance overall research collaboration and, in its recruitment activities, to attract additional highly accomplished scholars.

#### 4.A.3. Resources

The development of research staff numbers and total funding over the review period 2007-2012 is reflected in the tables presented in the self-assessment report (cf. Appendix 4). The tables provided much of the information that enabled the committee to make its judgements.

The resources of URU have increased quite tangibly since the last review. Over the review period, total research staff numbers at URU (including tenured, non-tenured and employed and non-employed PhD candidates) have increased from 79 persons (equal to 34.30 research FTE) in 2007 to 93 persons (equal to 49.50 research FTE) in 2012. However, this broad observation needs to be broken down into a number of different component trends. Thus tenured staff declined from 8.70 FTE in 2007 to 7.20 FTE in 2012. Non-tenured staff grew very rapidly indeed over the same period of time, from 1.60 FTE in 2007 to 11.30 FTE in 2012. The total number of PhD students enrolled increased from 24.00 FTE in 2007 to 31.10 FTE in 2012, due to an increase in the number of non-employed students from 7.60 FTE in 2007 to 18.30 FTE in 2012. The number of employed students, on the other hand, declined from 16.40 FTE in 2007 to 12.80 FTE in 2012. These different shifts over the six-year review period work out in terms of student-staff ratios at a fairly constant figure of about 1.5 per annum, which is a little on the low side. The committee understood from information gleaned in the interviews that four new tenured positions will be opened up in the near future, and if the right individuals can be recruited, this will obviously be an important boost to the teaching and research capacity of the Centre. The committee learned that it is URU policy to look for people who can cross over with relative ease from one research group to another, thus enhancing collaboration. An increase in the number of staff will make it possible to increase the graduate student enrollment numbers quite significantly.

The increase in total research staff was paralleled by an increase in total funding. Total funding was €1.971.000 in 2007 and €2.709.000 in 2012, an increase of 37.4%. Although the amount of direct funding increased over the review years, the share of direct funding in the Institute's annual budget decreased. Concomitantly, in 2007 direct funding amounted to €906.660 (supporting 19.20 FTE) and constituted 46% of the total annual budget, while in 2012 direct funding amounted to €1.110.690 (supporting only 13.70 FTE) and constituted only 41% of the total annual budget. By contrast, there was a notable increase in research grant and contract money over the same period. Research grant funding went from €335.070 in 2007 to €948.150 in 2012. Contract research grew from €729.270 to €1.322.110 in 2010, but declined thereafter due to governmental cuts in the budgets of government agencies which are the main source of contract funds. Research grant and contract money has lubricated much of the expansion of URU in recent years, accounting for a total growth of 20.89 FTE between 2007 and 2012.

One of the significant innovations, and consequent major institutional assets of URU is the Expert Centre for Urban Development and Sustainability (ESD<sup>2</sup>), established in 2012, and administered part-time by two staff members. The goals of ESD<sup>2</sup> are to mediate between the research staff of the Centre and interlocutors such as governmental agencies, firms, and policy makers with a view to the further promotion of contractual research in the Centre. In its first year of operation ESD<sup>2</sup> achieved a turnover of €261.000 spread over eight different projects, and all the signs are that it will continue to follow a very successful trajectory in the future.

The committee's overall diagnosis is that the Centre's resources are adequate for a continued high level of operation. That said, the committee noted a real imbalance in the distribution of

resources across the four main research groups, and it recommends that close attention be paid to this issue, perhaps by some re-structuring of the groups themselves.

#### **4.A.4. Productivity**

The self-assessment report provided the necessary information on the number and type of output of URU's researchers (cf. Appendix 4). The tables provided much of the information that enabled the committee to make its judgements.

The committee considers the productivity of URU as a whole to be entirely commendable. During the review period, URU research staff produced 1101 publications in total (a yearly average of 4.3 per FTE total research staff), 619 of which were academic publications (a yearly average of 2.4 per FTE total research staff). A total of 437 professional publications were produced (a yearly average of 1.7 per FTE total research staff). There has been a shift in emphasis in the publication strategy with increased focus on publishing in high quality peer reviewed academic journals rather than on producing professional publications. The number of peer-reviewed articles published grew from 52 in 2007 to 81 in 2012. Over the review period a total of 444 refereed articles were produced, which equals a yearly average of 1.7 refereed articles per FTE total research staff or 4.9 refereed articles per FTE tenured and non-tenured staff. The committee noted that the yearly number of refereed articles per FTE tenured and non-tenured staff slightly decreased over the review period from 5.0 in 2007 to 4.4 in 2012. According to the committee, however, this minor decrease in the rate of publication in peer-reviewed journals can no doubt be accounted for by the declining number of senior, tenured staff. Again, however, the committee points to discrepancies in publication performance among individual staff members and among research programs (cf. the programme sections of the report).

Besides 154 book chapters (a yearly average of 0.6 per FTE total research staff), URU staff produced 21 books (a yearly average of 0.08 per FTE total research staff) over the review period, an average of about three a year. The committee considers this to be a rather low number, and it is the committee's understanding that the publication of book-length texts is not especially highly-prized in URU. If the committee's perception here is correct, it would recommend that some thought be given to raising expectations about book publishing, for, after all, (good) books often represent critical catalysts in initiating, promoting, and re-configuring major research issues.

The number of PhD theses produced each year varies from 6 to 11, which the committee deems reasonable, though a little on the low side given the overall size of URU. Over the six-year review period, a total of 45 PhDs were defended (a yearly average of 0.9 PhDs per FTE tenured staff).

#### **4.A.5. Societal relevance**

The committee learned from the self-assessment report that it is URU's strategy to increasingly acknowledge and invest in products and networks related to societal relevance (e.g. social media, professionalisation of external research via ESD<sup>2</sup>, stimulation of professional publications, further cooperation with policy makers and firms in research, etc.). To that end, URU recently (2014) developed a 'Guideline Valorisation', in which criteria for societally relevant research and dissemination are presented, along with its valuation in individual researchers (i.e. assessments) by education and (basic) research activities.

The committee is of the opinion that the work of URU is fairly consistently directed to issues with high societal relevance. Among the individual topics of research investigated by URU

staff are sustainable development, regional economic development, regional competitiveness, innovation policy, health, social inclusion, migration, climate change, mobility, and resource planning, among many others. This is an impressive commitment to real world research by any standards. In addition, much work is carried out in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, especially, of course, by the international development studies group.

At the same time, much of the research of URU is funded by bodies such as NGOs, ministries, governmental agencies, and international organizations, and the committee feels that URU has been extremely responsive to the demands of these organisations in its contractual research work.

The committee is convinced that the societal relevance of URU will be further intensified as ESD<sup>2</sup> continues to develop its outreach capabilities. This facet of the Centre's operations will certainly be enhanced by its focus on developing long-term relationships with different stakeholders and policy makers.

#### **4.A.6. Strategy for the future**

The self-assessment report provides a SWOT-analysis, which identifies URU's strong and weak features, its threats and opportunities. Among the strong features, there are the complementarities and variety in views in the *Sustainable Cities and Regions* research portfolio. The research portfolio also corresponds well to the theme of sustainability, which prevails at Utrecht University and the Faculty of Geosciences. Other strengths of URU identified in the SWOT-analysis are e.g. the Institute's high research productivity in peer-reviewed articles in high-impact journals, its strong international network of cooperation with institutes outside Utrecht University and the academic value and strong focus on policy and governance of URU research results in policy-relevant research in externally funded projects. In addition, URU profits from the high visibility of some of its profiled professors with international reputations.

On the other hand, the SWOT-analysis identifies some threats to the Institute's viability as well. One of the threats concerns the relatively limited number of crossovers between the research programmes and their themes, the unevenly spread earning capacity among researchers and the PhD candidates who do not finish their PhD research in time. Also, the limited number of talented students who enter the research master programme and subsequently take up PhD positions is considered to be a weakness. Further threats to the institute's viability are considered to be : (a) the increased workload of the diminished tenured staff, (b) the perceived stress on the number of publications and its impact on the balance between short-term research grants and contract research versus fundamental research, (c) the risk that the career opportunities for PhDs and research masters students may be hampered by the financial crisis, and (d) the financial sourcing, which is subject to increased competition. In this latter respect, further development of ESD<sup>2</sup> as a facilitating network organisation for externally funded research is considered as an opportunity, as it can act as a catalyst for increasing earning capacity. Also, teaming of talented scholars from the various research programmes within URU in joint proposals is identified as an opportunity, as collaboration may enhance the chances of success in interdisciplinary research calls.

Based on this analysis, URU has formulated a strategy for the future, consisting of three main goals:

1. To develop interaction between URU programmes on the theme of Sustainable Cities and Regions, exploit untapped potential and consolidate international visibility and leadership;

2. To increase talent spotting and talent development (including better monitoring and guidance systems for PhD students);
3. To stimulate research collaborations domestically and internationally and to further boost funding through large grants and contract research.

The committee concurs with these three strategic goals and is confident that URU is well positioned to carry forward into the future its successes of the past. The staff is highly motivated. There is a strong commitment to collaboration and cooperation, and a managerial emphasis on team building is in evidence. Diversity in terms of gender and age structure is also shifting in the right directions.

The committee is also favorably struck by the “talent-spotting” concerns of URU. This strategy has already paid dividends in the recruitment of a leading international scholar, and the committee is convinced that it will be further mobilised as the search for the four new appointments to be made in the near future moves forward. This strategy is all the more to be commended in view of the anticipated retirement of senior staff over the next five to seven years.

The committee is of the opinion that the overarching *Sustainable Cities and Regions* theme provides a broad, meaningful direction for URU as a whole, and is an important point of reference for all four of its internal research programmes. The committee would reiterate, however, its sense that some rebalancing of these programmes should be given high priority.

#### **4.A.7. PhD-training and supervision**

PhD students appear to be well looked after in terms of general advice and support, and in the interview with the student body as a whole the committee noted the high level of satisfaction expressed in regard to these matters. One sign of this satisfaction is the low rate of attrition among PhD students. Students are also encouraged to present papers at professional conferences, and monetary subsidies are available for this purpose.

The self-assessment report provides information on PhD enrolment and success rates (cf. Appendix 4). Out of the 24 standard PhD candidates who enrolled between 2004 and 2008, 8% had graduated within four years. Another 42% had graduated between four to five years. 17% have not yet finished their projects and another 17% of the total of 24 standard PhD students dropped out. The record is better for contract PhD candidates. Out of the 30 contract PhD candidates who enrolled between 2004 and 2008, 53% had graduated within four years, while within four to five years another 10% had graduated. 20% have not yet finished their projects and 13% of the total of 30 contract PhD candidates discontinued. There is obviously much variation in time-to-degree and it was evident also from the interviews that students usually take much more than the norm of four years to complete their theses. 43% of all students take more than five years to graduate. The committee noted that the SWOT-analysis also refers to this problem and was informed that some remedial action is already being planned.

Two questions more than any others prompted debate among the members of the committee. One of these concerns the general intellectual preparation of the graduate students. The committee realises that students are embedded in the Netherlands Graduate School of Urban and Regional Research (NETHUR) and the Graduate School of Geosciences, and that they are able to take courses within these frameworks. However, the committee was unable to discern any consistent or coherent policy in regard to course work, and more than anything else it felt a degree of concern that the overall theoretical/conceptual

preparation of students for research and academic life generally was perhaps not quite as clear and well-defined as it might be. Although the committee recognises that the Dutch system leaves room for PhD trajectories without training in the form of courses, and that institutes cannot actually require taking courses from students who are not employed by the university, it wishes to emphasise the importance of a solid training. Therefore, the committee recommends that URU initiate a thorough review of this issue.

The other question refers to the turn towards individual research papers as the basic requirement for the PhD degree. The committee was mixed in its views on this issue, but it felt that it was important that the monograph be maintained as an option for those students who wish to pursue a more extensive, synthetic and conceptually thorough course of investigation for the PhD. The committee was also concerned about the potential moral hazard built into a system where papers for the PhD are co-produced with members of staff, leading to possible situations where it is quite unclear how much of the final product is actually the student's work. There also appears to be some discrepancy in the requirements about the number of papers to be written between the different research programmes.

The committee's overall recommendation in respect of these two questions is that URU subject its PhD training and supervision programme to scrutiny, and that a set of clear Institute-wide policy statements about requirements and expectations in regard to both staff and students should be crafted.

#### **4.A.8. Conclusion**

In addition to the specific comments made regarding URU's accomplishments and areas of weakness, the committee wishes to stress the importance of the three major strategic goals that URU has set for itself in its self-assessment report. These concern its commitment to internal collaboration, its focus on talent-spotting, and its emphasis on winning significant levels of highly prestigious and competitive external funding. If these goals are consistently striven for, the committee has no doubt that the continued excellence of the institution and its component programmes will be secured. The committee believes that its recommendations will help to sustain movement in the same directions. In no specific order of priority these recommendations can be summarised as follows:

1. Continue to enhance research collaboration.
2. Deal with imbalances between the resources and achievements of different research groups.
3. Ensure faster time to degree of PhD students.
4. Maintain the monograph option in the PhD programme.
5. Ensure thorough grounding of PhD students in theory and methodology.



## 4B. Programme level

---

The committee comes to the following overall programme scores for quality (Q), productivity (P), relevance (R), and vitality/feasibility (V) for the three programmes of the Urban and Regional Research Centre Utrecht of Utrecht University:

Code	Programme name	Q	P	R	V
UU1	Economic Geography	5	5	4	5
UU2	International Development Studies	3	3	4	3
UU3	Spatial Planning	3	3	4	2
UU4	Urban Geography	5	5	4	5

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



## Programme UU1: Economic Geography

Programme leaders: Prof. Dr. F.G. van Oort  
Research staff: 2.60 FTE tenured, 9.50 total FTE

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

### *Brief description*

The Economic Geography (EG) research group at Utrecht University can be considered one of the leading international research centres in evolutionary economic geography (EEG). By taking an explicit dynamic perspective, EEG complements neoclassical and institutional modes of analysis in economic geography. The approach explains the dynamics and spatial evolution of firms, industries, networks, cities, and regions based on the elementary processes of the entry, growth, exit, and (re-)location of firms. The main theoretical resources are evolutionary economics, small business economics, and social network theory. The EG research programme has established, promoted and further developed EEG theoretically, methodologically and empirically. Core research is focused on the locational behavior of firms, the spatial evolution of industries and networks, and the evolution of urban and regional economics.

### **Quality**

The ambition with regard to quality is very high, as shown by abundant publications in forums such as *Journal of Economic Geography*, *Economic Geography*, *Regional Studies*, and *Journal of Regional Science*. By all measures, the quality of the programme is first-rate. The key staff members are internationally renowned scholars, who collaborate with other leading scholars from around the world. The research is well-integrated and articulate. Much of it is frequently cited in international outlets, leading to high H-indices of the key staff members (Scopus H-index 25 and 1818 citations; Scopus H-index 13 and 523 citations, and Scopus H-index 8 and 151 citations respectively). The group's international network and academic reputation is outstanding, and can be considered as being among the best in the world. Evidence of the programme's outstanding reputation is also found in the participation of its staff members (tenured and non-tenured) as keynote speakers at international conferences (e.g. AAG), editorial board memberships, foreign research affiliations, and visiting professorships. One of the key staff members was awarded an Honorary Doctorate degree from the University of Marburg. Before, during, and following the review period, the programme has engaged in front-line research. In terms of bibliographic outcomes, the programme scores at the excellent level, including many highly cited publications (journal articles, but also handbooks, and chapters in handbooks). The programme was very successful in attracting external research funds (research grants and contract research), with funding from the EU FP7, NWO, NICIS, and NWO/VIDI.

### **Productivity**

Considering all measures of productivity along with the productivity strategy, this programme is judged as outstanding. Over the review period, a total of 325 publications were produced (a yearly average of 4.5 per FTE total research staff), 189 of which were academic publications (a yearly average of 2.6 per FTE total research staff). The number of refereed articles in journals is 119 (a yearly average of 1.66 per FTE total research staff, or 3.1 per FTE tenured and non-tenured staff). There is a clear focus and strategy to publish in international journals.

The number of professional publications is also high (125, a yearly average of 1.7 per FTE total research staff). Over the review period, a total of 6 books were published (a yearly average of 0.1 per FTE total research staff) and 183 book chapters (a yearly average of 0.9 per FTE total research staff). 14 theses were defended over the last six years. This amounts to 0.81 theses per FTE tenured staff. Some of these theses have received prestigious national and international academic prizes.

### **Relevance**

The research themes are socially and policy relevant, with impacts at the national and international level. The research results have been disseminated to both the public sector, to the private sector and the wider community. Key staff members have been consulted by cities, regional development agencies, ports, airports, and other societal stakeholders in and outside the Netherlands. In this respect the ESD<sup>2</sup> initiative (Expertisecentrum Stedelijke Dynamiek en Duurzaamheid) has proven to be a great facilitator for the valorisation and dissemination of the research results in the Netherlands. Senior staff is engaged in national and international academic and professional networks. In sum, the body of scholarly work has an impact nationally and internationally, which goes beyond academia, but the main impact of the EG research group is primarily in setting the international research agenda with respect to EEG.

### **Viability**

The programme's viability is considered to be excellent because of its internationally leading role, its involvement in cutting-edge research ideas, its flexibility in adjusting as new ideas and expertise emerge, and its competent leadership. As with all the other research programmes, cuts in direct funding and increased reliance on external funding have increased its vulnerability and the time and effort that needs to be devoted to applying for funds. Recent and new appointments at different levels mean that the group expects to build on existing areas of work on migration and mobility of knowledge workers, globalisation of innovation and development, sustainability and resilience of urban and regional systems, and institutional variety and emergence of industries at the regional and national levels. Here, again, the link with ESD<sup>2</sup> can be very valuable. The programme's impact has increased during the review period, and given the strategies in place, there are good reasons to expect that it will continue to do so.

### **Conclusion**

The programme is judged to be excellent with respect to the quality of the research conducted, the quantity of output, and its viability. It is judged to be very good with respect to its relevance to society. The key staff members are international leaders in the field who have made highly significant contributions to a number of areas of research.

## Programme UU2: International Development Studies

Programme leaders: Prof. Dr. A. Zoomers  
Research staff: 1.30 FTE tenured, 12.30 total FTE

Assessments:	Quality:	3
	Productivity:	3
	Relevance:	4
	Viability:	3

### *Brief description*

The International Development Studies (IDS) programme is the result of the transformation of the former programme of *Geography, Development and Representation*. Its mission is described as to better understand global processes of transformation, focusing in particular on the appearance of ‘new flows and circulations’ and analysing the consequences for inclusive and sustainable development in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Its research starts from the assumption that ‘local’ development is only to a limited extent place-based, as it is increasingly determined by external forces (such as investments and remittances by migrants). External links and exchanges of resources are vital to people’s ability to benefit from globalisation. As a result, globalisation is resulting in ‘translocal’ development. IDS’ basic research questions are:

1. What are the characteristics of current flows/circulations and how do these flows materialise?
2. Who are the drivers/agents of change (new actors)?
3. What consequences do these changes have for the livelihoods of people, i.e., the capabilities, assets and initiatives required for making a living?
4. What are the implications in terms of enhancing a *sustainable* future for *cities and regions*?

The programme’s research is empirically based, actor-oriented and grounded in a tradition of fieldwork. It has a preference for multilocational and trans-scalar research, paying attention to the inter-relations among micro-level, meso-level and macro-level processes. A *translocal* approach is developed by conducting multi-site field research, focusing on flows currently present in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Taking globalisation as a starting point, the programme thematically focuses on new mobilities, land and urban governance, climate change and responsible business.

### **Quality**

The programme has made some distinctive contributions to conceptual development and empirical knowledge in the fields of translocal development, development corridors and development chains, and the implications for development of flows of people (migration) and investment (particularly international investment in land), although its intellectual contribution is not very well articulated and its outputs had limited academic impact, as revealed by the citation data of the key staff members (Scopus H-index 6 and 191 citations, Scopus H-index 2 and 4 citations and Scopus H-index 2 and 3 citations respectively). In addition, the group has produced good quality professionally oriented work on city-to-city cooperation, and geographical mobility and social capital accumulation amongst Chinese academic geographers. The programme has become somewhat more coherent over the period, and some promising avenues for continued research have been developed, but apart from the work on land, its agenda does not yet have a strong and distinctive thematic focus. The outputs are of good quality, particularly the special issue on translocal development, but they depend heavily on the work of the group leader and the proportion of articles published

in professional outlets is still rather high. Data in the appendix to the self-assessment show that about 11% of articles were published in journals in the top 10% and 22% in the top 25%. The programme faces the dilemma common to development studies researchers internationally that the journals with wide circulation are not necessarily those that have the highest ranking, but acknowledges that the progress already made towards a higher proportion of publications in top-ranking academic journals needs to be consolidated in the years to come. The programme's international reputation is heavily dependent on its single full professor, although it can be expected to increase in future as the outputs from its funded research and networking related to land come to fruition.

### **Productivity**

Since 2007, the group has seen a decrease in the number of tenured staff from 7 to 4 (1.6 to 1.3 FTE) and a rapid increase in non-tenured staff from 0 to 4 (0 to 1.7 FTE) and PhDs (9 to 14, or 3.5 to 9.5 FTE). Funding has grown, including a growth in research grant and contract research funding, indicating good effort and some success in attracting research funding. 9 PhDs (a yearly average of 0.9 per FTE tenured staff) were completed and 14 new projects initiated, which is commendable given the low numbers of senior staff.

Over the whole evaluation period, the group produced a total of 237 publications (a yearly average of 4.6 per FTE total research staff), which is a reasonably good record. It should be noted that both overall productivity and trends can be affected by the completion dates of major research projects. The overall figure can be broken down into categories – 110 academic publications (2.1/FTE total research staff), 71 refereed articles (1.4/FTE total research staff or 4.6 per FTE tenured and non-tenured staff), 5 books (0.1/FTE total research staff), 34 book chapters (0.7/FTE total research staff) and 118 professional publications (2.3/FTE total research staff). Both this indicator and the categories are crude, but they indicate an adequate level of productivity with respect to academic and especially professional publications. Increasingly, PhD students produce articles during their period of study, and submit a thesis in the form of a package of these papers with an introduction and conclusion rather than a monograph, a trend which, as discussed elsewhere, has both advantages and risks. In addition to a good overall level of productivity, the trend has been upward from a very low base of academic outputs (from 17 publications in total (3.3 per FTE total research staff) and 3 refereed articles (1.9 per FTE tenured and non-tenured staff) in 2007 to 57 (4.6 per FTE total research staff) and 21 (7 per FTE tenured and non-tenured staff) in 2012 respectively).

### **Relevance**

The programme's research is highly relevant to development. It has recently developed research, advisory and academic links with international development organisations (such as the World Bank, CIFOR, and the EU) and Dutch agencies. In particular, its work on land grabs has led to the development of a funded programme network (LANDac – the academy, forum and linked research projects), international links (for example with the World Bank) and media exposure. Examples of direct influence on Dutch international development policy are given in the self-assessment report.

### **Viability**

This programme has made good progress since its establishment in 2007, increasing the quality and quantity of its academic outputs, on the basis of a number of relatively small research grants. It has started to develop a more coherent research agenda, win funding, and develop an increasing international reputation. It appears from the appendix to the institutional assessment to have funded research under way on topics related to land and

natural resources management (Ministry of Foreign Affairs), as well as rural-urban interactions (FP7), the implications of climate change and Chinese links with developing countries (NWO). However, in 2012 it had only one grant exceeding Euros 500,000 (LANDac) obtained by the programme's director, and two grants exceeding Euros 350,000, one of which was obtained by the director as well. In the committee's opinion, this makes the programme highly dependent on the work and profile of the director. To realise its potential, become fully viable and continue its upward trajectory, a further senior permanent appointment should be recruited to contribute towards the group's leadership and further development.

### **Conclusion**

This programme has made good progress since its establishment in 2007, improving from a low base with respect to the key indicators (quality of output, productivity, developing an international profile, attracting research funding, staff and postgraduate students). Its research is highly societally relevant. However, its improved performance relies too heavily on the work and reputation of its current director, and for it to continue its upward trajectory and fulfil its potential additional a more coherent research agenda, further large research grants, and additional senior staff resources will be vital.



## Programme UU3: Spatial Planning

Programme leaders: Dr. S. Geertman  
Research staff: 0.70 FTE tenured, 8.80 total FTE

Assessments:	Quality:	3
	Productivity:	3
	Relevance:	4
	Viability:	2

### *Brief description*

The Spatial Planning (SP) programme originates from the former *Urban Geography and Planning* programme, which has been split up into two separate and distinct entities. After becoming independent, the programme transformed its research focus during the years of 2007-2012, moving from short-term contract research related to Dutch spatial planning to scientific, internationally oriented research, with a focus on long-term acquisition and performance of PhD and post-doctoral research.

The programme aims to become an internationally recognised research centre in socio-spatial research on *Governance for Sustainable Spatial Development*. The concept of 'governance' is defined as the interaction between public and/or private organisations in their aim to realise collective goods. The programme formulates its research focus as follows: "To what extent and under which conditions do different modes of governance enable sustainable spatial development?". This research focus closely connects to URU's focus on *Sustainable Cities and Regions*, which in turn is in line with the University's scientific policy. The research is performed with a socio-spatial empirical-analytical approach: multidisciplinary settings bridge spatial, political and social aspects and incorporate diverse theoretical insights, a range of methodological approaches and various empirical case studies.

### **Quality**

Under the broad umbrella of *Governance for Sustainable Spatial Development*, various topics have been addressed. One orientation investigates planning support systems (Geertman). Another analyses stakeholder strategies in project areas (Spit). A new orientation has emerged, linking water management, planning law and spatial planning (Hartmann). There appears to be little interaction between these orientations.

The programme has increased the proportion of its publications in refereed academic rather than professional journals, inside and outside the planning discipline, and intends to continue this re-orientation in the future. However, tangible measures would be welcome to support this strategy. The programme is characterised by very dynamic participation in international networks, where staff members hold responsibilities (Geertmann in CUPUM, Hartmann in AESOP). The programme has (co-)organised some major international conferences, which is a success, especially given its modest size.

International academic standing and visibility, as revealed by citations, varies for whom citation scores are given and are very low (Scopus H-index 2 and 19 citations, Scopus H-index 8 and 187 citations and Scopus H-index 1 and 2 citations for the three key staff members respectively) low.

## **Productivity**

The total output of the SP programme in relation to the number of research staff is the highest of all the programmes assessed by the committee. Over the research period, a total of 158 publications were produced, a yearly average of 5.15 publications per FTE total research staff. However, this impressive result is to a large extent due to a large number (53% of the total) of professional publications (84, a yearly average of 2.7 per FTE total research staff), which is typical for spatial planning, a discipline strongly related to practice. Publication of refereed articles is also very good (41 during the review period, a yearly average of 1.3 per FTE total research staff or 4.8 per FTE tenured and non-tenured staff) and some articles have been published in top international journals. Over the review period, the programme produced 67 academic publications (a yearly average of 2.2 per FTE total research staff), 5 of which were books (a yearly average of 0.2 per FTE total research staff) and 21 of which were book chapters (a yearly average of 0.7 per FTE total research staff).

The number of publications tripled between 2007 and 2012. A significant proportion of this increase can be attributed to the recruitment of numerous PhD candidates (0.60 FTE in 2007 to 6.00 FTE in 2012), who usually prepare their PhD in the form of a series of papers. Over the last six years, 7 theses were defended. This amounts to 1.6 theses per FTE tenured staff.

## **Relevance**

The SP programme is highly relevant to its social environment and interacts actively with various organisations, Dutch as well as international (e.g. in China). Activities range from knowledge dissemination (public lectures, publications) to the provision of expertise. Staff play roles on the advisory boards of planning professional organisations (NIROV, STAD2), of public entities (e.g. Port of Rotterdam, Provinces of Utrecht and Brabant), and in the private sector (Vicrea, Omniplan).

These activities have grounded long-lasting partnerships with major planning institutions. For instance, the Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment has financed a part-time appointment in the programme (Luc Boolens, 2007-2013). This high social relevance has permitted a dynamic increase of contract research funding (from 0.60 to 5.00 FTE).

## **Viability**

The viability of the programme is threatened by the lack of critical size of the group. Tenured staff has gone down from 3 persons (0.90 FTE) in 2007 to 2 persons (0.70 FTE) in 2012. Even complemented by non-tenured positions, this is not sufficient to sustain the strategic tasks of managing the programme and directing the numerous PhD candidates. Possible retirements of tenured staff create additional uncertainty for the near future. The recent promotion of Thomas Hartmann to assistant professor is a positive signal, but the group remains fragile.

## **Conclusion**

Albeit well embedded in the university's research policy efforts, and productive, the SP programme is threatened by its lack of critical size. Ongoing changes in the field of research, growing pressure to develop earning capacity, and the increasing number of PhD candidates pose challenges which require consistent teams. Unless supported by the appointment of further tenured staff, the viability of the SP programme remains uncertain.

Given its small size, and the fragmentation of research interests inside the programme, the objective of SP appears to be very ambitious. For the future, this means that to achieve this

ambition, the team would need a further senior academic appointment, especially as the age structure shows that retirements will come soon. A strong focus on a more restrained, highly distinctive topic would make the most of the programme's potential. Water management and spatial planning might be such a topic, both integrative for the team and distinctive in the landscape of Dutch planning programmes. At a broader scale, the dynamic collaborative strategy developed towards other research centres in spatial planning, in the Netherlands and abroad, is a good move.



## Programme UU4: Urban Geography

Programme leaders: Prof. Dr. M. Dijst  
Research staff: 2.70 FTE tenured, 19.00 total FTE

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

### *Brief description*

The Urban Geography (UG) programme originates from the former *Urban Geography and Planning* programme, which has been split up into two separate and distinct programmes. After becoming independent, the programme formulated its own mission, which is described as ‘to strengthen the group’s position as an internationally recognised and inspiring research group in *Social Sustainable Cities* by developing advanced theoretical and methodological knowledge and disseminating this knowledge to other academics, policy makers, teaching programmes and the public at large.’ The programme’s research objectives during the recent years have become more focussed on socio-spatial issues relevant for socially sustainable development of cities. They correspond to the general URU focus on *Sustainable Cities and Regions* and are formulated as follows:

1. To understand the factors that influence the social and spatio-temporal distribution of resources to allow an equal and fair distribution of opportunities for employment, housing, education, health and safety and provide attractive residential and public environments.
2. To understand the factors that influence social connectivity in urban residential and public areas and inspire a sense of community identity and the experience of belonging, respect and engagement with other people.

### **Quality**

The committee, on the basis of submitted publications, information supplied through the self-assessment report, and responses to questions posed during the site visit, judged the quality of research in this programme to be very high. More specifically, the UG programme contributed greatly to research on the relations between individuals (and households) and their spatio-temporal environments at the scale of neighbourhoods, cities and regions, as expressed, for example, through their migration and mobility behaviours. The Committee also noted with approval the new interdisciplinary initiative on Healthy Urban Living. This programme, which is financially supported by Utrecht University and has a strong focal point within the social sustainability field, is a collaboration between researchers from the geosciences, social sciences and medical sciences of Utrecht University and (regional) organisations and is led by two UG professors. The initiative aims at profiling the Utrecht region as a national and international knowledge centre for urban health.

Reflecting the high quality of the programme, research grant income has risen significantly since the last assessment period including a number of European-level awards, and the staff have been able to strengthen their international professional standing. The research impact as measured by citations of the three principle researchers is very significant, as they have enviable citations records (Scopus H-index 21 and 911 citations, Scopus H-index 17, and 520 citations and Scopus H-index 28 and 1710 citations respectively).

### **Productivity**

Productivity is also very high. Over the review period, the programme produced a total of 425 publications (a yearly average of 4.1 per FTE total research staff), 274 of which were academic publications (a yearly average of 2.6 per FTE total research staff). The production of peer-reviewed articles over the review period was especially high. The programme produced 228 refereed articles, a yearly average of 2.2 per FTE total research staff or 7.9 per FTE tenured and non-tenured staff. This is higher by quite a margin than the average (1.7 per FTE total research staff and 4.9 per FTE tenured and non-tenured staff) for the Urban and Regional Research Centre at Utrecht as a whole. Besides 41 book chapters (a yearly average of 0.4 per FTE total research staff), the programme produced 5 books (a yearly average of 0.05 per FTE total research staff). The number of professional publications produced during the review period amounted to 131 (a yearly average of 1.3 per FTE total research staff).

These data show that the research outputs in the Urban Geography Programme at the University of Utrecht are roughly equivalent to those of the other high scoring programme at Utrecht (Economic Geography) and to the best performing programmes in other institutions.

The PhD success rate and PhD completion times were judged, however, to be rather disappointing. A total of 20 theses were defended over the last 6 years, an average of 1.1 theses per FTE tenured staff per annum.

### **Relevance**

It was clear to the committee that UG attracted significant funds from state, para-state, and private sector organisations for professional research on urban and transport policy related issues. The programme's other 'non-applied' research also has many implications for urban planning and for healthy urban living. We noted, however, that the proportion of funding from professional sources and the proportion of research outputs consisting of professional publications were decreasing over time, so a social relevance score of 4 was judged to be appropriate. The innovative ESD<sup>2</sup> initiative to increase contract research and impact was noted with approval.

### **Viability**

The committee was impressed by the vitality of the UG programme. There is a strong forward looking strategy that aligns with the University's focus on sustainability. In particular, the new programme focus around social sustainability and health is enabling the group to evolve the tradition of the work they do in a theoretically sophisticated way, and is likely to give the programme a strong competitive edge internationally. The programme has a coherent strategy to build capacity around particular strengths including through the recruitment of prominent research leaders, the development of post doctoral and early career researchers (including aligning individuals with external funding opportunities) and the innovative use of international expert groups. The group recognises however the need to foster the coherence of the group and collaboration with the other programmes (e.g. Economic Geography and Spatial Planning).

### **Conclusion**

To summarise, since the last assessment, the UG programme has become more successful in terms of income and outputs, its international visibility has improved, its leadership is strong, its strategy for future development is strong, and its overall performance has been excellent.

## 5. Research review Amsterdam Institute for Social Science Research (University of Amsterdam)

### 5A. The institute

---

#### 5.A.1. The institute

Research in the field of Human Geography and Planning at the University of Amsterdam (UvA) focuses on the relationship between social, economic, political and cultural processes on the one hand, and the spatial contexts at different levels of scale on the other. The core themes are urban issues, globalisation and sustainability. The research is subdivided into four research programmes or groups:

1. Governance and Inclusive Development (UvA1);
2. Geographies of Globalizations (UvA2);
3. Urban Geography (UvA3);
4. Urban Planning (UvA4).

The four research groups are based in the Department of Geography, Planning and International Development Studies (GPIO), which is part of the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences (FMG). As of January 2010, the groups fall under the responsibility of the Amsterdam Institute for Social Science Research (AISSR), which is the research institute of the Social Sciences within the FMG. The core mission of the AISSR is described in the self-assessment report as 'to create an academic environment that enables researchers to conduct cutting edge and socially relevant research'. In addition to the four GPIO research groups, the AISSR comprises eight other research programmes covering much of the spectrum of the social sciences. In fact, AISSR is now one of the largest institutes of its kind in Europe. The Institute thus offers a highly stimulating multidisciplinary environment, both through its internal dynamics of cooperation and collaboration and through its numerous external national and international connections.

As for the division of responsibilities, the director of the AISSR, together with the director of the College of Social Sciences, the director of the Graduate School of Social Sciences and the Chairs of the Departments of Political Sciences, Sociology and Anthropology, and Geography, Planning and International Development Studies, form the Board of Social Sciences. The Board of Social Sciences constitutes the decision making body for financial, formation (e.g. opening of a vacancy for tenured staff) and organisational issues (e.g. creation of a new research programme group), as well as the main issues relating to research and education. The GPIO department is responsible for human resources management (recruitment and selection of new academic staff, assessment, dismissal, promotion of staff, etc.) and a balanced development of the discipline. The academic staff of the research programmes under review is housed in the GPIO department. The AISSR is allocated financial resources by the Board of Social Sciences. The AISSR is responsible for research policies and initiating academic activities. Therefore, it is responsible for the allocation of direct research funding, the overall cohesion of the research activities across the research programmes, management of support staff and infrastructure, organisation and policy of PhD training and supervision, monitoring and evaluation of research programmes and leadership and stimulating of grant application and innovative research initiatives.

Each AISSR research programme group is led by a programme director, who is responsible for research management and programme development. All programme directors are members of the AISSR Programme Council, which meets six times a year to discuss policies and initiate academic activities.

Cooperation across the programme groups is institutionalised in five multidisciplinary research centres, which stimulate interdisciplinary research and collaboration between programme groups within departments and across departments and faculties. The research centres are allocated special funding. One of these research centres, i.e. *Urban Studies (CUS)*, was initiated and coordinated by the GPIO department. CUS stimulates comparative urban research in various key themes (e.g. diversity and integration, planning and design, etc.). CUS closely relates to one of the university-wide research priority areas, i.e. Urban Studies.

In general, the committee's interviews with representatives of GPIO, FMG and AISSR were very positive. The committee was persuaded of the high quality of the leadership and was struck by the evidently smooth relations between the top managers. The system appears to be working very well indeed, even though it represents a complex management structure with, as the SWOT analysis itself reports, "high transactions costs." This judgement implies, too, that at least some of the lines of authority within the system are less than clear. Despite the latter demurrals, the committee was impressed with the energy and vision of the overall leadership, and these qualities are obviously now starting to pay off in terms of academic dynamism.

#### **5.A.2. Quality and academic reputation**

The committee is convinced that the academic quality of the four GPIO research groups is robust overall, despite some unevenness in performance levels from one group to another. The majority of senior staff members have strong international reputations, and several of them have played important roles in major international debates in urban and economic geography, development studies, and planning.

These remarks are underpinned by the achievements of the staff in terms of publication (cf. 5.A.4.), grant-getting capacity (as reflected in prestigious grants from ERC, NWO, EU FP-7, NICIS, as well as from diverse governmental programmes and NGOs), and the presence of many staff members on the editorial boards of high-quality international academic journals.

The committee was pleased to note that many of the individuals interviewed, both staff and students, placed considerable stress on quality of output rather than quantity, notwithstanding the pressure to publish at frequent intervals. The committee was informed, as well, that FMG is putting into place a policy in regard to "strategic professors" which makes it possible to identify and hire talented younger academics who are then put on a fast-track to promotion to a senior post. This policy will clearly make an important contribution to overall academic quality.

Further confirmation of the committee's high opinion of the quality of the institution and its staff comes from the fact that the GPIO was placed 18<sup>th</sup> in the Times Higher Education Rankings in 2013-2014. This rank is the highest for any university geography department in continental Europe. At the same time, the AISSR was identified in the same evaluation system as the most important social science research centre in continental Europe.

### 5.A.3. Resources

The development of research staff numbers and total funding over the review period 2007-2012 is reflected in the tables presented in the self-assessment report (cf. Appendix 4). The tables provided much of the information that enabled the committee to make its judgements.

One of the more remarkable aspects of the GPIO programme groups has been their great stability over the period from 2007 to 2012 - a period that was marked by unusual financial turbulence - which in itself would appear to be testimony to a high degree of managerial good judgement and decision-making. Over the review period, total GPIO research staff numbers (including tenured, non-tenured and employed and non-employed PhD candidates) oscillated around 100 persons, with 100 persons in 2007 and 97 in 2012. In FTE terms, total research staff decreased from 61.40 research FTE in 2007 to 51.20 research FTE in 2012. This decline is to a large extent the result of a decrease in employed PhD candidates. Other categories of staff showed only a slight decrease or remained more or less stable. Tenured and non-tenured staff declined only slightly from 15.10 and 7.60 FTE in 2007 to 13.90 and 6.60 FTE in 2012 respectively, a decrease due to direct funding cuts. The number of PhD candidates decreased from 38.70 FTE in 2007 to 30.70 FTE in 2012 due to the significant decrease of employed PhD candidates from 33.10 FTE in 2007 to only 17.20 FTE in 2012. FTE numbers for non-employed PhD candidates, on the other hand, increased from 5.6 FTE in 2007 to 13.5 FTE in 2012. Currently, then, there is a student-staff ratio of less than unity, suggesting that there is quite a bit of room for the enrollment of more students.

Total funding decreased from €3.531.573 in 2007 to €2.810.835 in 2012, a decrease of 20%. This decrease can be ascribed to a reduction in direct funding from €1.659.839 (supporting 28.80 FTE) in 2007, when it constituted 47% of the total annual budget, to €927.575 (supporting 17.00 FTE) in 2012, when it constituted only 33% of the total annual budget. By contrast, the share of research grants and contract research in the Institute's budget increased over the six-year review period. Research grant funding amounted to €670.998, supporting only 19% of the total personnel costs in 2007, and rose to €815.142, supporting 29% of the total personnel costs in 2012. Although funding from contract research declined from €1.200.734 in 2007 to €1.068.117 in 2012, the share of contract funding in the Institute's total annual budget still increased from supporting 34% of the total personnel costs in 2007 to supporting 38% of these costs in 2012. In 2012, research and contract money together supported 1.60 FTE more research staff than in 2007.

The committee commends the GPIO programmes for their success in raising funds over the difficult years of 2007-2012, and for maintaining overall programme stability. It is evident, of course, that intensified efforts in the matter of external fund raising will need to be forthcoming in the years ahead given the probable continued decline of direct funding.

### 5.A.4. Productivity

The self-assessment report provided the necessary information on the number and type of output of GPIO researchers (cf. Appendix 4). The tables provided much of the information that enabled the committee to make its judgements.

During the review period, GPIO research staff produced 1404 publications in total (a yearly average of 4.2 per FTE total research staff), 748 of which were academic publications (a yearly average of 2.2 per FTE total research staff). A total of 600 professional publications were produced (a yearly average of 1.8 per FTE total research staff). The number of professional publications produced has declined markedly, but the committee feels that this is more than offset by increases in other publication formats. Most importantly, the number of

articles published in peer-reviewed journals grew from 51 in 2007 to 87 in 2012, a very substantial increase. Over the review period a total of 412 refereed articles were produced, which equals a yearly average of 1.2 refereed articles per FTE total research staff or 3.2 refereed articles per FTE tenured and non-tenured staff. The committee noted that the yearly number of refereed articles per tenured and non-tenured staff increased over the review period from 2.3 in 2007 to 4.2 in 2012. It should be remarked, however, that in terms of publication per staff member the number of articles in peer-reviewed journals was just 0.9 in 2007 and 1.5 in 2012 (though the figures look rather better, of course, in FTE terms). The committee recognises that there are mitigating circumstances due to the taking on of new junior staff over the review period, while, at the same time, GPIO does relatively well in terms of books produced per staff member. Even so, these numbers are on the low side, and there is assuredly room for improvement in overall rates of publication without in any way sacrificing current high levels of quality. That being said, the self assessment report suggests that the publication rate for tenured staff is much higher than these average figures seem to indicate and that the rate is increasing.

In the committee's view, a very positive aspect of staff productivity is the number of books produced. Over the review period, GPIO staff published 44 books, an average of about 7 a year (and a yearly average of 0.1 per FTE total research staff). Many of these books are published by highly reputed international publishers. Besides books, 247 book chapters were produced (a yearly average of 0.7 per FTE total research staff).

AISSR appears to make a major contribution in regard to stimulating research activity and publication. For instance, the committee noted that AISSR actively supports and coordinates high-quality research proposal writing. The committee was particularly impressed with the obvious dynamism and commitment of the current director. It also would appear that AISSR now encourages staff and students to engage in open access publication, and from an academic perspective the committee finds this to be a very constructive step.

The number of PhD theses produced each year varies from 5 to 14, which the committee considers reasonable, though a little on the low side given GPIO's staff size. Over the review period, a total of 56 PhDs were defended (a yearly average of 0.6 PhDs per FTE tenured staff).

A useful incentive to productivity has been put in place by AISSR which now awards a monetary premium to departments for each successful PhD produced.

#### **5.A.5. Societal relevance**

The research of the four GPIO programmes is generally of high academic quality, and also has numerous direct and indirect policy implications in fields such as urban planning, development studies, and governance. The professional publications by staff members represent a notably direct connection to policy-making bodies in the Netherlands and elsewhere. In addition, over the review period, five special chairs have been funded for varying periods of time by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Amsterdam School of Real Estate, Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency, Oxfam-Novib, and Statistics Netherlands. These represent important vehicles of information exchange between GPIO and the funding/policy bodies concerned.

A further major contribution to the relevance of the GPIO's work comes from the Centre for Urban Studies (CUS), which is not only concerned with many different kinds of applied

research in urban areas, but is also strategically situated so as to contribute to and take advantage of the university's declared research priority focused on urban studies.

Public sharing of knowledge takes place through media appearances, contributions to printed and social media, participation in panels, workshops, training sessions and public lectures.

#### **5.A.6. Strategy for the future**

The self-assessment report provides a SWOT-analysis, which identifies AISSR's strong and weak features, its threats and opportunities for the GPIO programme groups. Among the strong features, there are e.g. the scientifically and societally relevant research programmes of the groups, the high productivity in high ranking journals and books published by international academic publishers and the increasing success in the acquisition of external funding. Also, the decentralised management structure of the AISSR is identified as a strength, although the downside of this structure is that it is rather complex and continuously changing, which generates high transaction costs and identification problems for researchers.

On the other hand, the SWOT-analysis identifies some weaknesses and threats to the Institute's viability as well. One of the threats concerns the programme groups' increasing dependence on external funding to maintain their strength. Also the overhead of externally funded projects is very high. Another threat are the limited funding opportunities for social sciences in the Netherlands. In this respect, though, the expertise of the GPIO programme groups matches the main current global societal issues, which is considered to be an opportunity. In addition, budget cuts in education increase teaching loads and fragmentation of research time and the large number of non-tenured staff in combination with a decrease in tenured staff demands repeated efforts concerning planning, management and cohesion. Also, there is a high turnover rate. The committee, however, was informed that additional resources in the form of two new chairs (in Financial Geography and Environment, Development and the Global South) are expected to be made available, and that plans are also under way to deal with projected future retirements. In addition, the foundation of the interdisciplinary research centres, in particular CUS, provide the opportunity to attract new research staff. A further weakness identified in relation to the staff is the unbalanced age structure. The committee established, however, that diversity in terms of age and gender is improving, as indicated by decreasing average age and the fact that half of all assistant and associate professors are now female (though only 22% of the complement of full professors is female). Plans for continued revitalization in terms of diversity are clearly in evidence.

Based on this analysis, the AISSR has formulated a strategy for the future. The committee learned from the self-assessment report that for the next six years the AISSR aims at consolidating the research strengths of the GPIO programme groups, strengthening the focus on urban issues, globalisation and sustainability and linking the GPIO research programmes through an institutional and interdisciplinary approach. Furthermore, the methodological expertise in analyzing large data sets and handling 'big data' will be reinforced by using new GIS applications and the CUS centre for innovative research in urban issues will be further developed in order to become an important resource for interdisciplinary research. AISSR will continue targeting research grants from NWO and ERC, as well as research funding from societal stakeholders, to create PhD positions and post-doctoral fellowships and secure additional research finances for tenured staff. To stimulate grant acquisition, new instruments are being adopted, such as short-term fellowships and seed money to support young scholars in designing grant applications. As in UvA, the policy with respect to direct research funding is mainly dependent on achievements in the educational programmes, AISSR will integrate research and teaching.

The committee endorses the strategic vision and is convinced that the stability of the GPIO research programmes in recent years provides a sound basis for moving forward in the future. This optimistic assessment is reinforced by the obvious improvement in the four programmes' capacities to earn external funds and thus to expand their research portfolios.

In the interview stage, the committee found a high degree of enthusiasm and commitment among both the staff and students, and the overall atmosphere appeared to be one of genuine collegiality.

Both the GPIO and AISSR put a high premium in their future plans on stimulating innovative research and on securing high-prestige grant money. AISSR reinforces this policy with its emphasis on facilitating career development for younger scholars and internationalisation of the staff. The self-assessment report states that "the good international reputation and research performance, the embedding in a broad social science environment, and the stimulating academic and social atmosphere make the programme groups in the GPIO department 'the place to be' for young talented scholars from around the world." The committee fully endorses this statement.

#### **5.A.7. PhD-training and supervision**

The self-assessment report provides information on PhD enrolment and success rates (cf. Appendix 4). Out of the total of 51 standard and contract PhD students enrolled over the review period, less than half (i.e 47.0%) graduated in five years or fewer. More specifically, of the 41 standard PhD candidates who enrolled between 2004 and 2008, 10% had graduated within four years. Another 41% had graduated within five years. 17% have not yet finished their projects, while 5% of the total of 41 standard PhD students dropped out. The record for contract PhD candidates is somewhat better. Out of the 10 contract PhD candidates who enrolled between 2004 and 2008, 10% had graduated within four years, while another 20% had graduated in five years. 10% have not yet finished their projects and none of the total of 10 contract PhD candidates discontinued. The committee recommends that some tightening up of the time-to-degree for PhD students be instituted.

PhD-training at the AISSR is tailor-made in the sense that PhD candidates follow their own individual educational programme. This consists of courses provided by AISSR and the Graduate School of Social Sciences and specialised courses provided by the Netherlands Graduate School of Urban and Regional Research (NETHUR) or CERES (research school for resource studies for development). Each student is expected to take 12 EC in social science theory and 12 EC in methodology, together with additional short intensive courses. However, there appears to be much variability in the way these requirements are actually applied, and the PhD Student Guide given in the annexes of the self-assessment report, states that "Ultimately ... it is up to the supervisor and student to decide which courses to take." The committee feels that this is a rather ambiguous statement, and the question is whether there is not some possibility of slippage here. Although the committee recognises that the Dutch system leaves room for PhD trajectories without training in the form of courses, and that institutes cannot actually require taking courses from students who are not employed by the university, it wishes to emphasise the importance of a solid training. In passing, the committee considers the PhD Student Guide as a whole to be an extremely informative, helpful and important reference document for the student.

PhD students work with a supervisor and a co-supervisor, and must produce either a monograph or four scientific papers (with a final defense) in order to earn their degree. The review committee felt that it was important that the monograph option be retained for

students who want to pursue this mode of scholarly enquiry, though it was also made aware of the fact that the four papers option is now by far the most widely followed alternative. Here, a number of concerns were raised among the committee members about the possibilities of conflating the student's and the supervisor's work, possibly to the degree where the student's contribution is submerged in that of the supervisor. This problem seems all the more evident given that the student manual states only that "*at least one* of these papers should be written by the student as sole author" (the committee's emphasis). The committee would therefore urge programme directors and other responsible parties to review this matter with a view to ensuring that the potential moral hazard built into this system is rigorously identified and dealt with.

In spite of these qualifications, the committee was very favorably impressed with the evident maturity and intellectual vitality of the PhD students interviewed during the site visit.

### **5.A.8. Conclusion**

In summary, it is evident that GPIO and AISSR merit high marks for the general excellence of their programmes and for overall clarity of vision about future threats and promises. The committee would simply like to underline five main points where it feels that continued vigilance and intra-institutional discussion need to be maintained:

1. Effort should be devoted to encouraging higher rates of publication among the younger staff.
2. The committee feels that the monograph option should be maintained as a requirement for the PhD degree.
3. Some sort of oversight should be established to ensure that supervisors' contributions to students' PhD papers do not become intrusive or dominant.
4. Steps might be taken to ensure some degree of consistency of PhD requirements or expectations (in the case of non-employed PhD students) across different research programmes.
5. Average time-to-degree needs to be reduced.



## 5B. Programme level

---

The committee comes to the following overall programme scores for quality (Q), productivity (P), relevance (R), and vitality/feasibility (V) for the three Geography, Planning and International Development Studies programmes of the Amsterdam Institute for Social Science Research of the University of Amsterdam:

Code	Programme name	Q	P	R	V
UvA1	Governance and Inclusive Development	4	4	5	4
UvA2	Geographies of Globalisations	5	5	4	4
UvA3	Urban Geographies	5	5	4	4
UvA4	Urban Planning	4	5	5	4

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



## Programme UvA1: Governance and Inclusive Development

Programme leaders: Prof. Dr. I. Baud  
Research staff: 3.40 FTE tenured, 11.20 total FTE

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

### *Brief description*

The self-assessment report describes the Governance and Inclusive Development (GID) group's mission as 'to promote interdisciplinary research on hybrid forms of governance and inclusive development in strategic areas of concern', by developing a better understanding of how governing processes deal with socio-economic inequalities and exclusion, and issues of political representation and mobilisation at different scales. Hybrid governance arrangements are defined as complex multi-actor networks and interactions which rescale between local and regional levels and are characterised by legal pluralism. They are influenced by policy mobility and informality in local arrangements, with actors working in conflicting as well as cooperative ways. The objective of the programme group's research is to gain a deeper insight into patterns of social and political transformation and economic development emanating in the global South. The concern is how increasingly hybrid governance arrangements influence economic, social, political and environmental development trajectories at local through to national scales. The dynamics of such trajectories are analysed in terms of socio-economic and environmental justice. The work is also motivated by a strong sense of responsibility to participate in wider societal debates and to collaborate with organizations of practice. The programme's research focuses on three thematic areas:

- urban governance – how urban governance (including knowledge management), mobilization and citizenship are linked within trajectories of inclusive and resilient development;
- natural resources management and human wellbeing, with a focus on fisheries, land, water and forest management at various scales, from local to global;
- the governance of education and social justice: the role of education in conflict-affected situations and in peacebuilding.

The committee learned that, following the recommendations of the previous assessment committee, the programme group has reduced its focus from five to the above-mentioned three research areas, and followed up the suggestion that 'education and development' should become a focus area. In addition, it aims to link an understanding of the epistemological perspectives of actors in the global South to international theoretical debates and to develop methodological innovations, especially in the use of GIS in cities of the South.

### **Quality**

The programme has made a distinctive contribution on the subject of resilient urban development and the governance of natural resources and wellbeing, while its newer research on the governance of education is beginning to make a significant contribution on the role of education in peace building and conflict-affected environments. The themes are linked by a focus on governance, theoretical perspectives that utilise a strategic relational approach and the concept of hybridity. Assisted by strong leadership, the programme has both set its own research agenda and responded to opportunities, enabling it to use its limited resources to

make important contributions to international development, especially issues related to urban governance, which is a relatively neglected aspect of the field of study. The links it has drawn between theoretical, methodological and practical aspects of urban change, urban space and governance are noteworthy. The group re-oriented its publications away from professional outlets and towards refereed journal articles, but faced the dilemma that several suitable reputable journals (including some that reach significant audiences in the Global South) are not highly ranked, with the result that a relatively small proportion of its refereed articles were published in the top ranked journals (3% in the top 10% and 20% in the top 25%). The group has a total of 0.73 FTE of professorial level research time. The impact of the group's output as measured by citations of its lead members ranges from very good to adequate, depending largely on seniority (Scopus H-index 13 and 576 citations, Scopus H-index 4 and 40 citations and Scopus H-index 1 and 12 citations respectively).

### **Productivity**

Constrained by the 2-year wait for a chair appointment (taken up in 2013), this relatively small group (5.7 FTE tenured and non-tenured staff in 2007, 5.1 FTE in 2012) has multiplied its resources by the development of research partnerships, recruitment of talented mid-career staff and PhD candidates (13.5 FTE employed and non-employed PhD candidates in 2007, 6.1 FTE in 2012, of whom half are from the South), and links with masters students, who are encouraged to undertake relevant fieldwork for their dissertations. The group has diverse sources of research funding, including the ERC. An extremely high proportion of the PhD students under the group's supervision successfully completed, although they took an average of 5 years to do so. While this is relatively long, it is partly explained by the necessity for long periods of fieldwork in developing countries.

The productivity of the group increased over the period, and shifted towards academic journal articles (19% of publications in 2007, 43% in 2012). The group produced a total of 329 publications over the review period (a yearly average of 3.5 publications per FTE total research staff). This is a good record, although less impressive than some other research groups. However, it should be noted that both overall productivity and trends can be affected by the completion dates of major research projects. The overall figure over the review period can be broken down into categories - 199 academic publications (2.1/FTE total research staff), 99 refereed articles (1.1/FTE total research staff or 3.1/FTE tenured and non tenured staff), 20 books (0.2/FTE total research staff) and 74 book chapters (0.8/FTE total research staff), 25 PhD theses (1.1/FTE tenured staff) and 106 professional publications (1.1/FTE total research staff). Increasingly, PhD students produce articles during their period of study, and submit a thesis in the form of a package of these papers with an introduction and conclusion rather than a monograph, a trend which, as discussed elsewhere, has both advantages and risks. In addition to a good overall level of productivity, the broad trend has been upward, increasing from 0.5 refereed articles per FTE total research staff or 1.8 per FTE tenured and non-tenured staff in 2007 to 1.9 or 4.3 in 2012 respectively, and from 2.8 total publications per FTE total research staff in 2007 to 5.5 in 2012.

### **Relevance**

The group's research is societally highly relevant and has been put into the public domain through a number of channels other than academic outlets. Members have developed extensive international and national networks with research and governance agencies (e.g. UNICEF), and its senior staff have held positions as coordinators of these networks and policy advisers.

**Viability**

Over the period, the decline in direct funding has been compensated by continued contract research and increased success in obtaining research grants. A new chair appointment will yield dividends in the field of global environmental governance in the years to come, while the intention to appoint a successor to the current director before her retirement is to be commended. If this position is filled, the programme will continue to have excellent leadership, backed up by the recruitment of talented younger staff members who have already obtained significant research funding for work on urban conflict and security, fisheries governance, urban security and development. The programme's research strategy has been adapted to accommodate major new research funding already won, the imminent end of major projects and these new grants.

**Conclusion**

Under the strong leadership of the current director, and despite delays in a recent chair appointment, this group has strengthened its performance during the assessment period. Providing that the director's position is filled at professorial level, the prospects for sustained funding, further progress in improving the number and quality of academic publications, and increased impact on policy and practice appear to be very good.



## Programme UvA2: Geographies of Globalisations

Programme leaders: Prof. Dr. R. Kloosterman, Prof. Dr. E. Engelen  
Research staff: 2.30 FTE tenured, 14.20 total FTE

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

### *Brief description*

The Geographies of Globalisations (GoG) programme originated from two former programme groups that were evaluated separately in the previous evaluation (i.e. Economy and Space and Territories, Identities and Representations) and merged following the recommendations of the previous assessment committee.

The GoG programme contributes to the development of geographical approaches to processes of globalisation by integrating historical-sociological and political-institutional concepts by means of an array of methodological perspectives to understand and explain the key drivers and impacts of globalisation at the urban level. The programme has a coherent mission, focusing on four specific research themes that form the core of the programme: (i) local responses to globalisation in emerging economies, (ii) comparative financial geography, (iii) geographies of work in urban economies, and (iv) multilingualism as a cultural feature of Europeanisation and globalisation. The binding factor is the exploration of the impacts of and responses to structural economic changes, and how these changes intertwine with local conditions and relate to policies at multiple spatial scales.

### **Quality**

By all measures, the quality of the programme is outstanding. The key staff members are internationally renowned scholars, who collaborate with other leading scholars from around the world. The research is well-integrated and coherent. Much of it is frequently cited and published in excellent international outlets (e.g., *Journal of Economic Geography*, *Environment and Planning A*). Generally, the programme is regarded as being among the best in the world. Evidence of the programme's outstanding reputation is also found in the participation of its staff members (tenured and non-tenured) as keynote speakers at international conferences, members of the editorial boards of international journals, and visiting professorships. Before, during, and following the review period, the programme has engaged in cutting-edge research. In terms of bibliographic outcomes, the programme scores at the excellent level, including many highly cited publications (citation scores of the programme's lead members: Scopus H-index 11 and 357 citations, Scopus H-index 9 and 251 citations and Scopus H-index 15 and 777 citations respectively). The programme was very successful in attracting external research funds (research grants and contract research), with funding from e.g. the NWO, NICIS and an ERC Starting Grant. Estimated funding during the review period amounted to €2,250,000.

### **Productivity**

Considering all measures of productivity along with the productivity strategy, this programme is judged as excellent. The total number of publications produced during the review period was 376 (a yearly average of 4.4 per FTE total research staff), 187 of which were academic publications (a yearly average of 2.2 per FTE total research staff). The number of refereed articles in journals is 90 (a yearly average of 1.0 per FTE total research staff, or 2.8 per FTE

tenured and non-tenured staff). The number of professional publications is also high (181, a yearly average of 2.1 per FTE total research staff). Although the absolute number of journal papers does not excel (even compared to the other programmes at UvA), what is important is that papers are being published in high-impact journals (i.e., the best journals in their field) and are being widely cited. This is demonstrated by the relatively high H-indices of the key staff members (cf. the section “Quality” above). The research group recognises that productivity is important, but does not pursue a ‘productivist’ strategy solely aimed at increasing output. In other words, ‘less is more’. The group has suffered from a reduction in the numbers and research capacity of tenured staff due to retirements, unforeseen departures, staff turnover and budget cuts. During the review period, 8 theses were defended. This amounts to 0.4 theses per FTE tenured staff. There were fewer thesis completions than desirable, but this issue is now being addressed. The appointment of younger staff, new research projects and progress with PhD research are expected to lead to more outputs soon.

### **Relevance**

The programme has a strong relevance to society nationally and internationally. The research themes are all socially and policy relevant, with their geographical focus influencing the nature of links (e.g., cultural industries and economic activities in residential neighborhoods have a largely Dutch focus, while studies of economic and financial change are international, and neighborhood economic development is investigated in both Dutch and overseas cases). Thus, the body of scholarly work has an impact nationally and internationally which goes well beyond academia. Senior staff members are extensively engaged in national and international academic and professional networks, with one of the scholars in particular becoming an important opinion leader in the Netherlands.

### **Viability**

The programme’s viability is considered very good because of its internationally leading role, its involvement in cutting-edge research ideas, its flexibility in adjusting as new ideas and expertise emerge, and its competent leadership. As with all the other research programmes, cuts in direct funding and increased reliance on external funding have increased its vulnerability and the time and effort that needs to be devoted to applying for funds. Recent and new appointments at different levels mean that the group expects to build on existing areas of work on the locational patterns of economic activity and identity formation in multicultural urban settings and to develop new areas of work related to financial geography and processes of globalisation and outsourcing in Asia. The group is developing a strategy for applying for more external funds and further improving its staff profile (taking into account the current gender imbalance). The programme intends to focus much of its future effort on book publishing, but a viable balance between books and journal articles in the group’s publication plans should be ensured. The programme’s impact has increased during the study period, and given the strategies in place, there are good reasons to expect that it will continue to do so. Also, by hiring new staff, the continuation of the current successful research lines will be guaranteed.

### **Conclusion**

The programme is judged to be excellent with respect to the quality of the research conducted, and the quantity of output, and very good with respect to the relevance to society, and its viability. The programme directors are international leaders in the field who make highly significant contributions to a number of areas of research.

## Programme UvA3: Urban Geographies

Programme leaders: Prof. Dr. S. Musterd  
Research staff: 4.60 FTE tenured, 13.10 total FTE

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

### *Brief description*

The Urban Geographies (UG) programme group's mission is described in the self-assessment report as 'to play a leading role in social science debates on urban spaces and places'. The programme aims to contribute to the debate through theory driven, socially relevant and empirically grounded research, mostly in international comparative settings, using various methods and focusing on variable levels of analysis (the city, city region, state, neighbourhood, local stakeholders and individuals).

UG's objective is described as 'to gain a better understanding of the mutual relations between the development of urban spaces and places and social processes, individual behaviours, perceptions, life experiences and life chances'. During the review period, UG has focused mainly on three interrelated fields of research, i.e.:

1. New urban dynamics and intra-urban transformations;
2. Everyday urban geographies: consuming and producing places;
3. Socio-spatial inequalities: segregation and neighbourhood effects.

Besides doing research on these three themes, UG has further widened the scope of its research, by including more cities in Europe, and particularly in North America and Asia. At the same time it has strengthened its comparative focus. Furthermore, it has strengthened the connection between population research and sub-programmes in UG, and has placed a stronger emphasis on the housing dimension in urban research.

### **Quality**

The UG programme has a clear mission and focus which aligns with the University's strategic priorities. The research programme has an outstanding international reputation - despite a significant reduction in direct funding and a significant turnover in staff. This is reflected in the impressive international standing and esteem accorded to senior staff in the group, as well as the strong international relationships formed with other institutions and the participation of staff members in international research associations. The staff of the programme have organised 25 international conferences and workshops. During the evaluation period the group has held €10.6M in research grants from European (including a prestigious ERC award) as well as national sources (including major awards from NWO and NICIS). This work has produced high quality outputs that have had an impact on academic debates in the field of urban studies. The Scopus H-index scores and sample outputs provided for three staff members are somewhat variable (Scopus H-index 22 and 1369 citations, Scopus H-index 11 and 304 citations and Scopus H-index 9 and 262 citations respectively), suggesting some unevenness in quality across the programme notwithstanding career stage.

### **Productivity**

The productivity of this programme has increased by a third from an already impressive starting point despite a reduction in the number of directly funded staff. The total number of

publications produced during the review period amounts to 392 (a yearly average of 4.4 per FTE total research staff), with a total number of academic publications of 207 (a yearly average of 2.3 per FTE total research staff) and a total number of professional publications of 172 (a yearly average of 1.9 per FTE total research staff). The number of refereed journal articles per FTE has increased significantly since the last evaluation, in line with both national and international trends in productivity. As such, the programme produced a total of 134 refereed journal articles over the last six years (a yearly average of 1.5 per FTE total research staff and 3.4 per FTE tenured and non-tenured staff) and 62 book chapters (a yearly average of 0.7 per FTE total research staff). This represents a strong but not exceptional rate of productivity. In addition, the programme has increased the number of books published to 11 (this represents 0.1 per FTE total research staff) over the evaluation period. The programme has produced a good pipeline of talent from the masters' programme which has contributed to an increase in the number of PhD students and has established an international PhD exchange with two other universities. Of the 12 students enrolled between 2004 and 2008, 10 completed their PhDs of which 90% within 5 years (despite the shift in the model of a PhD away from a monograph towards publications) and all secured employment.

### **Relevance**

In line with national trends, the number of professional publications has declined over the evaluation period. Staff have contributed to a range of public debates through publications in newspapers, appearances in the media and the development of websites. In particular, the work of the programme has had significant coverage in national newspapers - although evidence of international dissemination is less clear. The funded research projects and programmes held by staff have led to engagement with policy makers/stakeholders. While it is clear that significant dissemination and activities have taken place the self-evaluation document is less effective at demonstrating what impact or outcomes such dialogue has produced.

### **Viability**

This is a very strong programme. It has an outstanding international reputation and a clear future strategy for how to develop its three subthemes as well as plans to develop and strengthen work in the housing field in line with recent European funding success. However, the programme saw a significant staff turnover during the evaluation period. Although the number of tenured staff increased, the number of direct appointments was reduced from 7.50 FTE to 6.30 FTE; and the total number of research staff decreased by 3.70 FTE over the evaluation period. The number of PhD students also declined (from 9.30 FTE to 6.80 FTE) in line with a reduction in direct funding for PhD candidates. Although the programme has made some very strong new appointments, which have opened up new opportunities for the development of its research agenda (and it has a good gender and age balance), if these opportunities are to be realised it is important that the programme receives strong support from the Institution in the forthcoming evaluation period.

### **Conclusion**

This programme was judged to be excellent in terms of the quality of its research, its effectiveness in securing prestigious and highly competitive international funding and its leadership of, and impact on the field despite suffering reductions in direct funding. The programme is strongly led and has a clear and ambitious strategy. However, if its further potential is to be realised in full it needs to receive strong institutional support and investment in future.

## **Programme UvA4: Urban Planning**

Programme leaders: Prof. Dr. W. Salet

Research staff: 3.60 FTE tenured, 12.60 total FTE

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

### *Brief description*

The Urban Planning (UP) programme aims ‘to investigate how strategies of spatial intervention matter in complex urban societies’. This requires insight into actual trends in urban spaces, and into the relative impacts of various strategies. The central objective of this research is on the “how questions” of organising effective and legitimate collective action in complex and difficult to govern urban regions.

It is UP’s mission to sustain a distinctive position at the top of the international planning studies community. Its research focus is on the potential of collective action strategies vis-à-vis the radical transformation of advanced urban societies. In particular, the group analyses collective action arrangements that successfully address the social-spatial problems associated with the new “urban core and periphery” constellations of mega cities in advanced urban societies. The perspective of “institutions in action”, combining the action philosophy of pragmatism with a critical approach directed at institutional innovation, underlies the whole research programme. UP’s central research themes are:

1. Spatial Planning and Urban Governance;
2. Sustainability and Mobility in Urban Regions.

### **Quality**

The quality of the research performed in UP is high. The research addresses timely issues, present in the international debate. The research programmes are original and sharply defined. Much of the research is undertaken with international partners. The programme appears very coherent. Its structure is clear: two complementary themes are organised around two internationally recognised professors and share some common research activities.

UP’s publication strategy targets international highly-ranked planning journals, and indeed one third of its academic papers were published in journals in the first quartile. Nevertheless, diversity is preserved and professional publications are also present, which is important in the planning discipline. Also, the committee appreciates that staff are encouraged to publish books, and there is scope for presenting PhD theses in the form of monographs.

UP has consolidated and developed further its international academic reputation. Several staff members have had important positions in international networks (e.g. president of AESOP). This international recognition is confirmed by the capacity of UP to attract research grants from prestigious bodies, such as ERC. The high impact of the group’s output can be measured by the citation data of its lead members: Scopus H-index 6 and 88 citations, Scopus H-index 11 and 325 citations and Scopus H-index 18 and 1237 citations respectively.

### **Productivity**

Over the review period, the programme has reached an excellent track record with a total of 306 publications (a yearly average of 4.6 per FTE total research staff). Scientific production

has accomplished a major shift, from a model where professional publications had an important share towards academic publications. This growth in the number of academic publications has been accomplished while keeping the number of professional publications at a stable level. In total, 142 professional publications were produced (a yearly average of 2.1 per FTE total research staff).

The development of academic publications has been realised by an additional output. Over the last six years, the programme produced 156 academic publications (a yearly average of 2.4 per FTE total research staff). The output went up from 29 academic publications in 2007 (2.8 per FTE total research staff) to 40 in 2012 (3.2 per FTE total research staff). Within the category of academic publications, the programme produced 90 refereed articles (a yearly average of 1.4 per FTE total research staff or 3.8 per FTE tenured and non-tenured staff), often in top-ranking international planning journals. This excellent output is completed by 6 books (a yearly average of 0.1 per FTE total research staff) and 38 book chapters (a yearly average of 0.6 per FTE total research staff).

### **Relevance**

The relevance for society is excellent. Close interactions with end-users have been established not only for dissemination, but also from the beginning of research programmes. This engagement has not only permitted the group to attract research contracts, but also to establish permanent relations with policy and practice organisations, demonstrated for instance by a Leerhuis chair.

In addition to these original elements, UP's expertise is recognised nationally (KiM, Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment) and internationally (OECD). Finally, UP is committed to publishing in professional journals (*Rooilijn, Agora*).

### **Viability**

Several elements give UP good viability. The team is viable in terms of size. It has rejuvenated itself, and has today a good demographic structure (three senior researchers, a mid-career group, and a solid group of young researchers). Remarkably, the number of tenured positions has increased.

UP has demonstrated a good capacity to attract external funding, both contract research (50% of the total funding in 2012) and research grants (25% of total funding in 2012). The latter have developed significantly during the period, from supporting 0.70 FTE in 2007 to 3.20 FTE in 2012. Moreover, this has been achieved in the context of economic crisis, which has been managed successfully, demonstrating the group's capacity to adapt to change.

### **Conclusion**

Summing up, UP has successfully managed several transitions. Its composition is now rejuvenated and solid. Its research focus is now very well-tuned, with a complementarity between fundamental and applied research. It receives significant international recognition. It interacts with other disciplines (political science, urban studies) within the framework of the institutionalist approach.

Clearly, the group has all the assets needed to implement the strategy presented for the next period. The principal matter of concern is the decrease in direct funding (from supporting 4.50 FTE in 2007 to 3.10 FTE in 2012), which generates stressful conditions for research, and a limited professorial capacity in housing policy, which would usefully complete the team.

## Appendices



## Appendix 1: Curricula vitae of the committee members

---

**Allen Scott** is Distinguished Research Professor in the Departments of Geography and Public Policy at the University of California, Los Angeles. He received his BA degree from Oxford University in 1961 and his PhD degree from Northwestern University in 1965. His research interests focus on issues of the urban economy, regional development, and globalisation. His latest book is *World in Emergence* published by Elgar in 2013. He was awarded the Prix Vautrin Lud in 2003, the Anders Retzius Gold Medal of the Swedish Society for Anthropology and Geography in 2009, and the Sir Peter Hall Prize of the Regional Studies Association in 2013.

**Tony Fielding** is Research Professor in Human Geography in the School of Global Studies at the University of Sussex. He graduated from the London School of Economics in 1962 and received his PhD from there in 1965. He had in the meantime joined the new University of Sussex where he remained in full time employment until 2006. During this period he took unpaid leave to accept a temporary appointment at the University of Illinois in the US, and four temporary appointments at Ritsumeikan and Kyoto Universities in Japan. His research interests focus on the links between social and geographical mobility, and more generally on explaining internal and international migration flows in Western Europe and East Asia.

**Anna Geppert** holds a PhD in Geography and Planning (1996) and a Habilitation in Spatial Planning (2008). She worked as Associate Professor at the University of Reims (1996-2009), France. Since 2009, Anna Geppert is Professor of Urban and Regional Planning at the University of Paris-Sorbonne, where she is Head of Studies for the Master in Urban and Regional Planning. She also teaches in Paris-Sorbonne Abu Dhabi and has been visiting professor in several European universities. Her research interests are strategic spatial planning, comparative planning systems, European spatial planning. Anna Geppert has been Secretary General of the Association of European Schools of Planning (2007-2011). She acts as expert for the French agency of evaluation for higher education and research (AERES) and for the national council of universities (CNU). She serves on the editorial board of planning journals such as *European Spatial Research and Policy*, *Territoires en mouvement*, *Raumforschung und Raumordnung*, and on the scientific committee of various international conferences. Her work is published in French, English, Polish, Slovak, German, Finnish.

**Carole Rakodi** is a social scientist and urban planner who has worked as a professional planner, researcher and consultant for many years in a range of developing countries, especially in Sub-Saharan Africa. She worked for substantial periods in Zambia and Kenya, and has carried out research, with colleagues, in Zimbabwe, Tanzania, Ghana, Nigeria, India, the Philippines and Pakistan. From 1978 to 2001, she taught urban planning to international students in the Department of City and Regional Planning, Cardiff University, and from 2002 to 2011, research methods and social analysis for development in the International Development Department, University of Birmingham. Her main research interests are in urban planning and management, poverty and livelihoods, and land and she has published widely in these areas. From 2006 to 2011, she was Director of a multi-country research programme on Religions and Development. She has undertaken research and consultancy work for a variety of organisations, including the World Bank, the UK Department for International Development, UN-Habitat and the United Nations University. She was chair of the advisory group for the ESRC-funded Wellbeing and Development Research Programme at the University of Bath, and in 2011 was an academic mentor in the African Centre for Cities at the University of Cape Town.

**Gill Valentine** is Professor of Human Geography and Pro Vice Chancellor for the Faculty of Social Science at the University of Sheffield, UK. She holds a BA (Hons) in Geography from the University of Durham, and a PhD from the University of Reading, both UK. She began her academic career at the University of Manchester where she was lecturer from 1992-1994. From 1994 to 2004 she was a lecturer and then professor of Geography at the University of Sheffield where she taught social and cultural geography and qualitative research methods. From 2004 to 2012 she was a Professor of Geography at the University of Leeds where she also served as the Director of the Leeds Social Science Institute and as Head of the School of Geography. Gill's research is focused in three interconnected areas: *social identities and belonging*; *childhood and family life*; and *urban cultures and consumption*. Her research has been supported by the award of 14 research grants (value of >£5 million) from European Research Council, Economic and Social Research Council, Arts and Humanities Research Council, Joseph Rowntree Foundation and The Leverhulme Trust, as well as applied research contracts from UK Government Departments and NGOs. Gill has (co)authored/edited 15 books and over 100 refereed journal articles. She was a co-founding editor of *Social and Cultural Geography* and also served as an editor of *Gender, Place and Culture* and has served on the editorial board of several other journals as well as co-editing two book series for Taylor Francis. Her research has been recognised by the award of Philip Leverhulme Prize and a Royal Geographical Society/Institute of British Geographers Gill Memorial Award for contributions to Geography and gender.

**Frank Witlox** holds a PhD in Urban Planning (Eindhoven University of Technology, the Netherlands), a Master's Degree in Applied Economics and a Master's Degree in Maritime Sciences (both University of Antwerp, Belgium). Currently, he is Professor of Economic Geography at the Department of Geography of Ghent University, Belgium. He teaches among others Transport Geography; Economic Geography; Geography of the Enterprise; Transport, Logistics and Space; Spatial Modelling Techniques; Current Issues in Social and Economic Geography. He is also a visiting professor at ITMMA (Institute of Transport and Maritime Management Antwerp), where he teaches Warehouse and Hinterland Distribution Management and Transport Economics and Policy, and an Associate Director of GaWC (Globalization and World Cities, Loughborough University). He serves on the editorial boards of *Journal of Transport Geography*, *Journal of Urban Technology*, *Transport Reviews*, and *European Journal of Transport and Infrastructure Research*. Since 2010 he is the Director of the Doctoral School of Natural Sciences (Ghent University). Frank Witlox has held part-time teaching positions at the Hasselt University (Belgium), University of Antwerp (Belgium), and University of Leuven-Campus Kortrijk (Belgium), and is a guest lecturer at Lund University-Campus Helsingborg (Sweden), University of Tartu (Estonia), and Chongqing University (P.R. China). Since August 2013 he has been appointed an honorary professor in the School of Geography at The University of Nottingham.

## 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

### RESEARCH ASSESMENT HUMAN GEOGRAPHY AND PLANNING

DAY 0		MARCH	23	GRONINGEN	
18.30				Introduction / Preparatory committee meeting I	Comittee and Secretary, Inge Hutter (Dean RUG)
20.00				working dinner	
DAY 1		MARCH	24	GRONINGEN, URSI, Faculty of Spatial Sciences, Landleven 1, room 3.34	
8.30	11.15			Introduction / Preparatory committee meeting II	
11.15	12.00			preparation RUG	
12.00	12.45			lunch	
12.45	13.15	RUG		institute management RUG: Faculty Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inge Hutter (Dean Research)</li> <li>Peter Groote (Vice-Dean Education)</li> <li>Gerda Groen (HRM and Finances)</li> </ul>
13.15	13.45			institute management RUG: Research Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inge Hutter (Director URSI)</li> <li>Philip McCann (Endowed Chair FRW, development tWIST)</li> <li>Lonneke Opsteegh (Research Policy Advisor / PhD coordinator)</li> <li>Alida Meerburg (Office Manager URSI-Graduate School)</li> </ul>
13.45	14.45			programme RUG 1: tWIST' senior research staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leo van Wissen (Vice-dean Research, at start of tWIST)</li> <li>Philip McCann (Endowed Chair FRW, development tWIST)</li> <li>Frank Vanclay (Leader RC1 Place, Identity, Well-being)</li> <li>Clara Mulder (Leader RC2 Population, Well-being in Context)</li> <li>Jouke van Dijk (Leader RC3 Economy and Place)</li> <li>Johan Woltjer (Leader RC4 Institutional Innovation and Spatial Transformation)</li> </ul>
14.45	15.45			programme RUG 1: tWIST' junior research staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hinke Haisma (Rosalind Franklin Fellow, Adjunct Professor, RC2)</li> <li>Constanza Parra (Rosalind Franklin Fellow, Assistant Professor, RC4)</li> <li>Victor Venhorst (Post-doc researcher, RC3)</li> <li>Ajay Bailey (Assistant Professor, RC2)</li> <li>Tialda Haartsen (Assistant Professor, RC1)</li> <li>Chris Zuidema (Assistant Professor, RC4)</li> </ul>
15.45	16.00			break	

16.00	17.00		PhD students RUG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jianjun Tang (PhD researcher, year 4, RC3)</li> <li>• Linden Douma (PhD researcher, year 3, RC2)</li> <li>• Koen Salemink (PhD researcher/EU, year 3, RC1)</li> <li>• Ori Rubin (PhD researcher/N.W.O, starting year 3, RC2)</li> <li>• Gintare Morkute (PhD researcher, year 1, RC3)</li> </ul>
17.00	17.45		committee meeting	
17.45	19.45		transfer to Utrecht	
20.00			working dinner	
<b>DAY 2</b>	<b>MARCH</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>UTRECHT, Uithof, Van Unnikgebouw, room 10.15a</b>	
9.00	9.45		preparation UU	
9.45	10.45	UU	institute management UU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frank van Oort (URU)</li> <li>• Ronald van Kempen (dean)</li> <li>• Martin Dijst (head department)</li> <li>• Chris Huijgen (treasurer/secrerial URU)</li> <li>• Oedzge Atzema (ESD2)</li> <li>• Andrea Morrison</li> <li>• Frank van Oort (coordinator)</li> <li>• Pierre-Alexandre Baland</li> </ul>
10.45	11.30		programme UU1: Economic Geography	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annelies Zoomers (coordinator)</li> <li>• Guus van Westen</li> <li>• Maggi Leung</li> </ul>
11.30	12.15		programme UU2: International Development Studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annelies Zoomers (coordinator)</li> <li>• Guus van Westen</li> <li>• Maggi Leung</li> </ul>
12.15	13.15		lunch	
13.15	14.00		programme UU3: Urban Geography	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Martin Dijst (coordinator)</li> <li>• Ronald van Kempen</li> <li>• Dick Ettema</li> </ul>
14.00	14.45		programme UU4: Spatial Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tejo Spit</li> <li>• Thomas Hartmann</li> <li>• Stan Geertman (coordinator)</li> </ul>
14.45	15.45		PhD students UU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maté Hartog (EG)</li> <li>• Nicola Cortinovis (EG)</li> <li>• Patrick Witte (SP)</li> <li>• Hu Hong (SP)</li> <li>• Lars Bocker (UG)</li> <li>• Marijke Jansen</li> <li>• Ari Susanti (IDS)</li> <li>• Michelle Nuijen (IDS)</li> </ul>
15.45	17.30		committee meeting / preparation UvA	
18.00			working dinner	
20.30			transfer to Amsterdam	

DAY 3		MARCH	26	AMSTERDAM, Plantage Muidersgracht 14 1018 TV Amsterdam, Room 2.40	
8.30	9.30	UvA	institute management UvA		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Edward de Haan (Dean Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences)</li> <li>Anita Hardon (Director Amsterdam Institute of Social Science Research)</li> <li>Joos Droogleeve Fortuijn (Chair Department of Geography, Planning and International Development Studies)</li> </ul>
9.30	10.15		programme UvA1: Governance and Inclusive Development		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Isa Baud (full professor International Development Studies, programme director)</li> <li>Rivke Jaffe (associate professor)</li> <li>Mieke Lopes Cardozo (assistant professor)</li> </ul>
10.15	10.30		break		
10.30	11.15		programme UvA2: Geographies of Globalizations		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Robert Kloosterman (full professor Economic Geography, programme director)</li> <li>Ewald Engelen (full professor Financial Geography)</li> <li>Barbara Heebels (postdoctoral researcher)</li> </ul>
11.15	12.00		programme UvA3: Urban Geographies		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sako Musterd (full professor Human Geography, in particular Urban Geography, programme director)</li> <li>Jan Nijman (full professor Urban Studies, Director Centre for Urban Studies)</li> <li>Wouter van Gent (assistant professor)</li> </ul>
12.00	12.45		lunch		
12.45	13.30		programme UvA4: Urban Planning		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Willem Salet (full professor Urban and Regional Planning, programme director)</li> <li>Luca Bertolini (full professor, Urban and Regional Planning, in particular Transport and Infrastructure)</li> <li>Federico Savini (assistant professor)</li> </ul>
13.30	14.30		PhD students UvA		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rowan Arundel (standard PhD candidate Urban Geographies, 2nd year)</li> <li>Zaya Enkhbold (standard PhD candidate Geographies of Globalizations, 4th year)</li> <li>Myrte Hoekstra (standard PhD candidate Urban Geographies, 1st year)</li> <li>Thijs Koolmees (standard/external PhD candidate Urban Planning, 1st year (1 day a week employed by UvA, 4 days by Municipality of Amsterdam))</li> <li>Tara Saharan (contract PhD candidate Governance and Inclusive Development, 2nd/3rd year)</li> <li>Joeri Scholtens (lecturer/standard PhD candidate Governance and Inclusive Development, 4th year (formerly contract PhD candidate))</li> </ul>
14.30	19.00		committee meeting		
19.00			end of site visit		



## Appendix 4: Quantitative data

### Urban and Regional Studies Institute (University of Groningen)

#### Resources

##### Research staff, PhD researchers and support staff: total number of staff and research FTE's

	2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013	
	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE
Tenured staff <sup>1</sup>	24	5.97	27	6.5	29	7.76	29	8.82	31	9.16	29	8.48
Non-tenured staff <sup>2</sup>	10	3.49	9	3.9	13	5.32	16	8.07	16	7.03	18	12.1
<b>Total research staff</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>9.46</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>10.4</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>13.08</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>16.89</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>16.19</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>20.58</b>
PhD candidates (employed)	12	7.4	14	12.4	14	12.6	16	12.7	19	13.3	19	15.6
PhD candidates (non employed)	13	12.5	13	8.3	11	8.2	15	10.3	22	12.7	33	23.8
<b>Total PhDs</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>19.9</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>20.7</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>20.8</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>23.0</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>26.0</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>39.4</b>
Support staff	2	0.7	3	1.1	3	1.1	3	1.33	3	1.6	3	2

<sup>1</sup> tenured = in permanent position, including special and honorary professors

<sup>2</sup> non-tenured = in temporary position

##### Personnel costs of URSI research 2007-2012: staff & employed PhDs

2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		2012	
Euro	FTE	Euro	FTE	Euro	FTE	Euro	FTE	Euro	FTE	Euro	FTE
Direct funding											
904.820	12,6	998.140	14,8	1.193.650	15,8	1.456.400	18,4	1.295.340	17,4	1.679.890	22,1
	75%		65%		62%		62%		59%		61%
Research funding											
28.400	0,8	30.240	0,8	33.520	0,8	100.320	1,3	77.200	0,8	214.388	2,9
	5%		4%		3%		4%		3%		8%
Contract Funding											
172.130	3,5	389.860	7,2	553.130	9,1	656.590	9,9	765.320	11,3	769.182	11,2
	20%		31%		35%		34%		38%		31%
Total research funding: staff & PhDs											
1.105.350	16,9	1.418.240	22,8	1.780.300	25,7	2.213.310	29,6	2.137.860	29,5	2.663.460	36,2

## Output

### Total output

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Total
Scientific articles, peer-reviewed	25	41	50	62	64	79	321
Scientific book chapters, peer-reviewed	9	27	26	11	23	17	113
Scientific monographs, peer-reviewed		6	4	4	7	8	29
PhD theses	1	4	8	11	8	7	39
total scientific publications	<b>35</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>502</b>
Professional publications	100	85	96	77	75	56	489
total publications	<b>135</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>987</b>

### PhD enrolment and success rates

#### Employed PhD candidates

Starting year	Enrolment		Total	Success Rates				Total		
	Enrolment (M/F)			Graduated After ≤ 4 years	Graduated After ≤ 5 years	Graduated After ≤ 6 years	Graduated After ≤ 7 years	Total graduate	Not yet finished	Discontinued
2004	2	-	2	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
2005	-	2	2	-	-	1	1	2	-	-
2006	2	1	3	1	1	-	-	1	2	-
2007	3	4	7	1	1	2	1	5	1	1
2008	2	1	3	-	1	-	-	1	2	-
2009	2	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	3	-

#### Other PhD candidates (not employed)

Starting year	Enrolment		Total	Success Rates				Total		
	Enrolment (M/F)			Graduated After ≤ 4 years	Graduated After ≤ 5 years	Graduated After ≤ 6 years	Graduated After ≤ 7 years	Total graduate	Not yet finished	Discontinued
2004	2	2	4	-	2	-	1	3	-	1
2005	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	0	-	-
2006	3	-	3	1	1	-	-	2	-	1
2007	2	3	5	2	3	-	-	5	-	-
2008	3	4	7	-	3	1	-	4	2	1
2009	1	2	3	-	-	-	-	-	3	-

## Urban and Regional Research Centre Utrecht

### Resources

#### Research staff at the institutional (URU) level (in research-FTE)

	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		2011	
	#	fte										
Institutional level (URU)												
Tenured staff	27	8.7	28	9.8	26	8.8	23	8.4	21	7.8	20	7.2
Non-tenured staff	4	1.6	6	4.1	9	5.7	16	8.6	16	9.4	17	11.3
PhD candidates (employed)	25	16.4	25	17.6	24	11.8	19	12.3	22	14.2	20	12.8
PhD candidates (not employed)	23	7.6	25	10.0	30	12.3	37	15.8	37	17.4	36	18.3
<b>Total research staff</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>34.3</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>41.4</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>38.6</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>45.0</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>48.8</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>49.5</b>
Support staff	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total staff</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>34.3</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>41.4</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>38.6</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>45.0</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>48.8</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>49.5</b>

#### Funding at the institutional (URU) level\*

	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		2011	
	fte	%										
<i>Funding</i>												
Direct funding	19.2	46	20.5	50	16.1	40	18.0	31	17.3	38	13.7	41
Research grants	7.1	17	11.7	16	13.4	22	14.6	22	17.2	29	20.8	35
Contract research	8.0	37	9.2	33	9.1	37	12.5	47	14.3	33	15.1	24
<b>Total funding</b>	<b>34.3</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>41.4</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>38.6</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>45.0</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>48.8</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>49.5</b>	<b>100</b>
<i>Expenditure</i>	€	%	€	%	€	%	€	%	€	%	€	%
Personnel costs	1,579	80	1,802	85	1,597	74	1,997	71	2,317	79	1,863	69
Other costs	392	20	316	15	547	26	815	29	616	21	846	31
<b>Total expenditure</b>	<b>1,971</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2,118</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2,144</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2,813</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2,934</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2,709</b>	<b>100</b>

\*: € x 1,000

### Output

#### Main categories of research output at the institute (URU) level

	2000-2006*	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2007-2012
Institutional level (URU)		#	#	#	#	#	#	∑#
Refereed articles	42	52	63	93	64	91	81	444
Books	5	3	4	3	2	5	3	21
Book chapters	17	21	34	29	10	27	33	154
PhD theses	8	6	7	12	7	2	11	45
Professional publications	150	82	88	72	49	65	81	437
<b>Total publications</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>1,101</b>

\*Average per year

## *PhD enrolment and success rates*

### Standard PhD candidates

Enrolment			Success rates								Total						
Starting year	Enrolment (male/female)		Total (male + female)	Graduated After								Total graduated		Not yet finished		Dis-continued	
	(<) 4 years	(<) 5 years		(<) 6 years	(<) 7 years												
	# male	# female	#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2004	3	0	3	0	0%	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%
2005	4	4	8	1	13%	4	50%	0	0%	0	0%	7	88%	0	0%	1	13%
2006	1	2	3	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%	1	33%	1	33%
2007	5	2	7	0	0%	2	29%	2	29%	0	0%	4	57%	1	14%	2	29%
2008	1	2	3	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%	2	67%	0	0%
2009	1	2	3	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	67%	1	33%

### Contract PhD candidates

Enrolment			Success rates								Total						
Starting year	Enrolment (male/female)		Total (male + female)	Graduated After								Total graduated		Not yet finished		Dis-continued	
	(<) 4 years	(<) 5 years		(<) 6 years	(<) 7 years												
	# male	# female	#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2004	3	0	3	1	33%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	2	67%	1	33%	0	0%
2005	0	2	2	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%
2006	6	4	10	8	80%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	8	80%	1	10%	1	10%
2007	5	2	7	3	43%	1	14%	1	14%	0	0%	5	71%	0	0%	2	29%
2008	5	3	8	3	38%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	38%	4	50%	1	13%
2009	7	3	10	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	20%	8	80%	0	0%

# Amsterdam Institute for Social Science Research

## Resources

### Research staff at institute level / composition of the research Group GPIO

Table GPIO1 (SEP Table 5.4) Research staff at institute level													
Composition of the research group: GPIO Total													
Research staff	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		2012		
	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	
Tenured staff	15,1	45	14,2	43	14,3	44	16,2	48	14,2	44	13,9	46	
Non-tenured staff	7,6	12	6,7	11	6,9	11	5,2	10	6,1	10	6,6	13	
PhD-candidates (employed)	33,1	37	32,7	37	28,9	41	26,6	35	21,3	28	17,2	24	
PhD-candidates (not employed)	5,6	6	4,8	7	5,0	6	8,2	11	10,8	15	13,5	14	
<b>Total research staff</b>	<b>61,4</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>58,4</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>55,2</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>56,3</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>52,4</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>51,2</b>	<b>97</b>	
Support staff	0,6	1	0,6	1	0,8	2	4,0	14	1,1	7	0,0	0	
<b>Total staff</b>	<b>62,0</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>59,0</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>56,0</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>60,3</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>53,4</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>51,2</b>	<b>97</b>	

### Overview of the various sources of financing / funding and earning capacity GPIO

Table GPIO2 (SEP-Table 5.4) Overview of the various sources of financing													
Funding and earning capacity: GPIO Total													
Funding in FTE	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		2012		
	FTE	%											
Direct funding	28,8	47%	24,6	42%	23,9	43%	19,4	35%	19,1	36%	17,0	33%	
Research grants	11,6	19%	13,4	23%	12,5	23%	10,7	19%	10,4	20%	14,9	29%	
Contract research	21,0	34%	20,4	35%	18,7	34%	26,1	46%	22,9	44%	19,3	38%	
<b>Total funding FTE</b>	<b>61,4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>58,4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>55,2</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>56,3</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>52,4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>51,2</b>	<b>100%</b>	
Expenditure €													
	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		2012		
Personnel costs	€ 3.531.573		€ 3.349.170		€ 3.209.485		€ 3.237.010		€ 2.923.989		€ 2.810.835		

## Output

### Main categories of research output of GPIO

Table GPIO3 (SEP Table 5.3) Main categories of research output*							
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Total
<b>Department of Geography, Planning and International Development Studies UvA</b>							
Refereed articles	51,25	74,24	66,33	75,5	58,49	86,5	412
Non-refereed articles	7	3	10	4,5	13	7,5	45
Books	6	5,5	5	9	11	7	44
Book chapters	33	34	48	45	37,33	50	247
<b>Total academic publications</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>748</b>
PhD-theses	7	5	11	14	10	9	56
Professional publications	123,83	93	126,33	90,5	80	86	600
<b>Total publications</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>267</b>	<b>239</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>1404</b>

\* All totals are rounded off

## PhD enrolment and success rates

### Standard PhD candidates

Table GPIO4a (SEP table 5.5) - Standard PhD candidates													
Enrollment GPIO Total				Success rates				Total					
Starting year	Enrolment m/f		Total (m+f)	Graduated After (≤) 3 years	Graduated After (≤) 4 years	Graduated After (≤) 5 years	Graduated After (≤) 6 years	Graduated After > 7 years	Graduated After (>) 5 years	Total graduated	Completion rate	Not yet finished	Discontinued
2004	2	4	6		2	2			2	4	66,67%	1	1
2005	8	4	12	1	4	2		3	5	10	83,33%	2	0
2006	3	9	12	2	5	2	1		3	10	83,33%	1	1
2007	2	6	8		5	1			1	6	75,00%	2	0
2008	2	1	3	1	1				0	2	66,67%	1	0

### Contract PhD candidates

Table GPIO4b(SEP table 5.5) - Contract PhD candidates														
Starting year	Enrolment m/f		Total (m+f)	Success rates					Total					
				Graduated After (≤) years	Graduated After > 7 years	Graduated After (>) 5 years	Total graduated	Completion rate	Not yet finished	Discontinued				
2004	3	2	5	1		2	1	1	1	4	5	100,00%	0	0
2005	1	0	1			1				1	1	100,00%	0	0
2006	2	0	2		1	1					2	100,00%	0	0
2007	0	1	1								0	0,00%	1	0
2008	0	1	1			1					1	100,00%	0	0