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Preface

The Evaluation Committee was assigned the task of performing a midterm assessment of the research quality of CoRPS - Center of Research on Psychology in Somatic Diseases, an interdisciplinary research institute within Tilburg School of Social and Behavioural Sciences.

Researchers from the United States, Canada, and The Netherlands formed the committee to review the research program and management of CoRPS. We greatly appreciate the careful preparation and thorough documentation provided by the Institute, Director, Program Coordinators, and faculty and staff of the respective programs, all of whom made it possible to complete our task in an efficient and timely fashion. Our committee worked collaboratively, was receptive and respectful of various points of view, and achieved a consensus regarding our assessment of the CoRPS program. In preparation for our visit and in the development of this report, our Committee was aided by the secretary, Dr. Robert Braam, who was appointed to the committee by the board. We are grateful for his guidance and advice throughout the process. As chair of the Committee I want to take this opportunity to personally thank him and the members of the Committee for their invaluable contributions and cooperation during our deliberations.

Also, on behalf of our Committee, we wish to thank the University administration, leadership of the Institute, faculty, and staff who provided us with the detailed information necessary to complete our task. We also appreciate the warm reception that we received and we are grateful for everyone’s efforts to make us feel welcome during our visit.

We enjoyed meeting with the University administration as well as the leadership, faculty, staff, and students of CoRPS, and hope that our comments are useful to you.

Respectfully submitted,

Prof. dr. James A. Blumenthal
Chairman to the Committee
Structure of this report

The Evaluation Committee assessed the research and management quality of CoRPS - Center of Research on Psychology in Somatic Diseases, within the Tilburg School of Social and Behavioural Sciences of Tilburg University, as part of its midterm research review 2008 - 2010.

In Chapter 1, we provide a brief description of the Netherlands System of Research Quality Assessment along with a description of the composition of the evaluation Committee and the process by which the Committee functioned.

In Chapter 2, we present our assessment according to SEP (Strategic Evaluation Plan) of the quality of research management of CoRPS - Center of Research on Psychology in Somatic Diseases. The assessment first considers the Institute level and second addresses the level of CoRPS research program including its themes and target groups. The Committee also presents our view regarding specific evaluation criteria added by the institute for CoRPS, such as publication goals, along with additional supplementary material that was provided during our deliberations.

In the appendices, information is presented on aspects of the evaluation, on the members of the review committee, and on the visit to CoRPS at the Tilburg University campus site.
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1 Introduction

1.1 The Netherlands System of Quality Assessment of Publicly funded Research

This evaluation of research is part of the national evaluation system for publicly funded research in the Netherlands, and is performed according to the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015 for Public Research Organisations (SEP). This Standard Evaluation Protocol is the fourth protocol for evaluation of scientific research in the Netherlands, following the protocols of 1994, 1998 and 2003. Its aim is to provide common guidelines for the evaluation and improvement of research and research policy, based on expert assessments.

The SEP 2009-2015 aims at two objectives with regard to the evaluation of research (including PhD training) and research management:

- Improvement of research quality based on an external peer review, including scientific and societal relevance of research, research policy and research management.
- Accountability to the board of the research organisation, and towards funding agencies, government and society at large.

The structure of the SEP consists of a self-evaluation and an external review, including a site visit once every six years, and an internal mid-term review in between two external reviews. The evaluation committee will report its findings to the board of the research organisation. The evaluation report and the position of the board together constitute the results of the evaluation.

The external evaluation of scientific research applies at two levels: the research institute as a whole and its research programmes. Three main tasks of the research institute and its research programmes are to be assessed: the production of results relevant to the scientific community, the production of results relevant to society, and the training of PhD-students. Four main criteria are considered in the assessment: 1) quality, 2) productivity, 3) societal relevance, and 4) vitality and feasibility.

This protocol is primarily directed toward the evaluation of scientific research. The scope of the term ‘research’ is not limited to the research results. Research management, research policy, research facilities, PhD-training and the societal relevance of research are considered integral parts of the quality of work in an institute and its programmes. With these elements, the evaluation of research has a broad scope.

An institute may be defined as ‘a group of researchers with an articulated shared mission, operating within one or more research programmes under the same management’. Each ‘institute’ will have a director and/or research leader(s) with final responsibility. The board under whose jurisdiction a research institute falls is responsible for the organisation and proper procedures of the evaluation of that institute.

---

1.2 Evaluation of CoRPS

The Executive Board of Tilburg University commissioned this evaluation of the research programme of the Center of Research on Psychology in Somatic Diseases (CoRPS), at the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences. The period under review is 2008-2010.

The board appointed an external committee of international peers, assisted by a secretary to help the committee chair in preparing the institute visit and the committee evaluation report containing the findings, in accordance with requirements from the SEP-protocol (Appendix 1-3) and additional criteria from the institute (Appendix 4).

In accordance with the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP 2009 -2015), and looking at the requests from the board, the tasks of the appointed evaluation committee were:

• To assess the quality of research and research management of the institute on the basis of the information provided by the institute and through interviews;
• To assess, in addition, the realisation of more specific criteria and deliverables from the institute (see appendix);
• To advise how this quality might be improved, with special attention to the international standing of the research group engaged in the program.

The committee held interviews with members of the board of Tilburg University, the Tilburg School of Social and Behavioural Sciences, the management of CoRPS - Research Institute, programme leaders, researchers and PhD students of the research program, during a visit at the campus of Tilburg University on May 26th and 27th 2011 (Appendix 6). Before the visit the committee received the CoRPS Mid-Term Self-Evaluation Report 2008-2010, together with Appendices on specific information, a link to a website with a complete list of all CoRPS publications, and a copy of the CoRPUS Magazine.

1.3 The Review Committee

The composition of the Review Committee, appointed by the Board of the Tilburg University, was as follows:

Chair:
• Prof. James Blumenthal (Duke University Medical Center, Durham, USA)

Members:
• Prof. Wolfgang Linden (University of British Columbia, Vancouver BC, Canada)
• Prof. Aartjan Beekman (VU-Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands)

Secretary:
• Dr. Robert Braam (Utrecht) was appointed secretary to the Committee.

Abbreviated curriculum vitae of the Committee members are included in Appendix 5.

Independence
All members of the Committee signed a statement of independence during the visit in Tilburg, which confirmed that the Committee assessed the quality of the CoRPS Institute and its research program in careful, objective, and independent way. The committee as a whole
decided, and agreed upon, the assessment of the Institute and its research program (including research themes) described in this document.

1.4 Scope of the Assessment

In order to monitor the progress of CoRPS a mid-term evaluation is held after three years of operation and a final evaluation after five years. For the current mid-term review 2008-2010, CoRPS prepared a self-evaluation report, containing all the information useful and necessary to make the assessment. The main general criteria to be used in the evaluation follow from the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP criteria) for academic research. Besides, the committee is asked to evaluate additional, more specific, criteria,

1.5 Data provided to the Committee

The Committee has received a self-evaluation report of CoRPS from the Institute board, on the CoRPS institute and its research program:

- Mid-Term Self-Evaluation Appendices 2008-2010: CoRPS - Center of Research on Psychology in Somatic Diseases Tilburg University, School of Social and Behavioural Sciences, April 2011.
- Supplemental material specifically addressing the issue of ‘social relevance’ provided by the CoRPs leadership.

Furthermore, the Committee was provided with additional information, including a list of publications of CoRPS, on a dedicated website: http://www.tilburguniversity.edu/qualityassessment/corps/; the Committee also received issues of the CoRPUS Magazine (June 2010) published by the Institute.

The Committee requested, and received, additional detailed information from the CoRPS-management on societal relevance and community outreach of the CoRPS research activities. This material was considered in the Committee’s final ratings.

The documentation, together with the additional material received, included all the information required by the SEP 2009-2015 protocol.

1.6 Procedures followed by the Committee

The Committee proceeded according to the SEP-Protocol (SEP 2009-2015). The assessments are based on the documentation provided by the institutes, on the institute, the research program, the list of publications of the programme, including its themes and target groups, as well as the additional reference material, and the interviews and discussions between the committee and members of the faculty board, Institute management, programme leaders,
researchers and PhD students. The committee held a preparatory meeting on May 26th, interviews and discussions of the site visit took place at May 27th, 2011 (Appendix 6).

The Committee members read the self-evaluation report with the appendices, carefully examined the list of publications of the program faculty, and reviewed its themes and target groups. The Committee made a preliminary assessment of the program using the SEP-checklist for internal committee use (see Appendix 1-3 of the SEP). This preliminary assessment was discussed within the committee at a preparatory meeting the evening prior to the site visit and again during a breakfast meeting the day of the official visit. The Committee discussed the process by which the interviews would be conducted during the visit and arrived at a preliminary evaluation during its preparatory meeting on May 26th, 2011.

The Committee had the opportunity to meet with the Dean of the Faculty and the Vice-Dean for Research at a committee dinner on May 26th, 2010. The following day, May 27th, the Committee was welcomed by the Rector of Tilburg University, and after this the committee had a meeting with the board of the Tilburg School of Social and Behavioural Sciences.

On the same day, May 27th, the Committee held meetings and interviews with the academic leader and program coordinators of CoRPS, with researchers and PhD students of the research program, in consecutive meetings throughout the day. At the end of the day, after internal deliberations, the committee informally presented its first impressions and findings.

The Committee, assisted by the Committee secretary, prepared an initial draft report of the evaluation outcomes for the CoRPS Institute and the research program, which was distributed electronically within 24 hours of the completion of the site visit. The final draft version of the report was sent to the Institute Board for factual corrections and comments, which were received in good order and handled by the committee, in order to produce the final report and send it to the Faculty Board’s vice Dean of research.

1.7 Assessment Aspects and Assessment Scale

The Standard Evaluation Protocol requires the Review Committee to assess the research on the following four main aspects:

- Quality (policy and management, international recognition and innovative potential)
- Productivity (productivity policy, scientific output)
- Societal Relevance (societal orientation, societal impact, valorisation)
- Vitality and feasibility (orientation, flexibility, management)

The assessment at the institute level primarily focuses on strategy and organisation, whereas the programme level assessment primarily focuses on performance and activities of researchers and the results of their work (output and outcome). At the institute level, explicit attention is paid to the (policy regarding) education and training of PhD students.

**At the Institute level** the four criteria are used with a focus on policy and strategy, preferably in a qualitative manner, identifying the main issues of praise and criticism and putting forward recommendations for improvement. The accent here is on looking forward.
At the research group or Program level the four criteria are used with a focus on performance, both in terms of scientific achievements and of societal relevance. The group evaluation ends with a summary in which the four main criteria are translated into a five-point scale. The committee applied the full range of the five-point scale according to the SEP 2009-2015 descriptions: Excellent (5); Very good (4); Good (3); Satisfactory (2); Unsatisfactory (1). A description of the five-point scale as used is included in Appendix 3.

Using the above research quality criteria and the listed managerial aspects, the committee acquired a comprehensive picture of the performance of the research institute and the research programme (including its themes and target groups).

2 The Center of Research on Psychology in Somatic Diseases CoRPS

Management:
- Prof. dr. J. Denollet, academic director
- Ms. K. Boermans, managing director

Information on CoRPS

A brief overview about the structure and function of CoRPS, derived from the self-evaluation report, is provided below to inform the reader of this report on the Institute.

The Center of Research on Psychology in Somatic Diseases CoRPS is an interdisciplinary research institute in the School of Social and Behavioural Sciences of Tilburg University. CoRPS is an initiative of the School of Social and Behavioural Sciences and the executive board of Tilburg University, in collaboration with partner organisations in the medical field (two hospitals, a Cancer Registry Center, and a primary care organization in its surrounding area in the Netherlands. Researchers from Medical Psychology, Cognitive Neuroscience and from Methodology and Statistics, join forces with professionals at these medical institutions.

The research activities of CoRPS, as all fundamental research activities of the School of Social and Behavioural Sciences, are housed in the Oldendorff Research Institute, founded in 2001, that also houses the (local) graduate school. The objective of the Tilburg School of Social and Behavioural Sciences’ research policy has been to improve the quality of research while retaining a high level of productivity. The research staff of the School has grown from 66 fte in 2003 to 130 fte (full-time equivalent) in 2010; and a doubling of PhD students to 100.

According to the mission of CoRPS - Center of Research on Psychology in Somatic diseases ‘optimal health care for patients with chronic conditions should identify patients at risk, monitor health outcomes that are immediately relevant for patients, and intervene with programs of care that enhance patients’ quality of life and self-management of their condition’. Therefore, the mission of CoRPS is: ‘To further uncover the complex nature of the interface between human mind and body’. The institute has the ambition of becoming a leading research institute in Europe in the area of psychology and somatic disease.

2 The information in this chapter is taken from the CoRPS Self-Evaluation Report, April 2010, pp. 1-11.
The CoRPS research program investigates under which conditions psychological factors may interact with the clinical course of chronic diseases, to better understand these interactions, and to influence these interactions for the benefit of the patient. The review period concerns the initial phase (2008-2010) of the research center, involving initiating research projects, acquiring funding and reporting findings that address its research agenda. Besides interdisciplinary research within CoRPS, researchers collaborate with colleagues from other academic centers in the Netherlands, Europe and the US, and with medical specialists, biologists and experts in bio-medically oriented disciplines.

According to the self-evaluation report, the research program focuses on four groups of patients with chronic medical conditions including:
1) Cardiovascular disorders;  
2) Diabetes and hypertension;  
3) Cancer & cancer survivorship;  
4) Neurological disorders.

An additional Miscellaneous program includes cognitive neuroscience, health psychology, and biostatistics.

The self-evaluation report states that the research program covers four areas of research fields: 
1) Risk stratification and outcome assessment;  
2) Mediating mechanisms;  
3) Clinical care and behavioural interventions;  
4) Methodology and medical statistics.

CoRPS has a board of directors – an academic and managing director – appointed by the Dean of the Tilburg School of Social and Behavioural Sciences. The board of directors of CoRPS has appointed program coordinators, who serve informally as key-advisors across the various research domains. These program coordinators supervise the researchers and the PhD students, and contribute to the scientific vision and research agenda of CoRPS.

The research staff of CoRPS grew from 29 fte in 2008 to 45 fte in 2010. Of these 8 – 9 held tenured positions (full professors, associated professors and assistant professors). Non-tenured staff included around 7 assistant professors and researchers, and an increasing number of PhD students (from 21 in 2008 to 36 in 2010).

The CoRPS research program is carried out in collaboration with partner organisations:
1. Department of Medical Psychology of Tilburg University;  
2. St. Elisabeth Hospital, Tilburg;  
3. TweeSteden Hospital, Tilburg;  
4. Cancer Registry South, Tilburg;  
5. Practitioners organisation POZOB, South-East Brabant area;  
6. Catharina Hospital, Eindhoven;  
7. Amphia Hospital, Breda.
**Funding** of CoRPS comes from within Tilburg University, the Medical Department, the Tilburg School of Social and Behavioural Sciences, and the Oldendorff Research Institute, from partner organisation, the two hospitals and POZOB contribute financially to the CoRPS program, and from research grants and contract research. In the first three years, funding of CoRPS has grown from 0.65 M€ in 2008 to 2.0 M€ in 2010, with a stable budget of 0.6 internal funding and increasing external funding (from 3% to 69% in 2010).

The CoRPS international position is specified in the self-evaluation report, and appendices. CoRPS contributes to the interdisciplinary field of medical psychology and neuropsychology and developed international collaborations, including joint publication and exchange of PhD students and post-doctoral fellows. Collaborations on research projects include national and international collaboration with researchers of various disciplines and affiliation (appendices). The institute has international visiting scholars and co-sponsors a national lecture series.

The self-evaluation report provides results of **SWOT analysis**: Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT). Advantages mentioned of CoRPS include: quality of the academic staff, collaborations, impact of scientific work, new areas of cutting-edge research, inclusion of a 2-year Master program in Medical Psychology.

When a program grows as quickly as CoRPS did, there is a considerable risk that not all building blocks, policies and visions also grow in a parallel, integrated fashion. Much time had to be invested by CoRPS researchers in developing new relationships with groups outside the university. Potential threats to growth include future reduction in the university budget, reduced likelihood of successfully obtaining extramural funding, absence of an academic medical center in the geographic area, and difficulties in the hiring and retention of junior faculty.

CoRPS produced a total **research output** of 420 items, including 324 refereed articles (ISI), 35 other refereed articles, 2 books, 21 book chapters, 23 PhD theses and 15 professional publications. For each of the thematic areas, a list of 10 prototypical publications are included in the self-evaluation report document:

1) Publications on risk stratification and outcome assessment  
2) Publications on mediating mechanisms  
3) Publications on clinical care and behavioural interventions  
4) Publications on methodology and medical statistics.

The institute also lists examples of published meta-analytical studies, review papers and invited editorial comments. Furthermore, in the appendices, the institute lists scientific lectures, oral presentations and media appearances, given by its staff.

The CoRPS institute contributes to **research training** in two ways. The research of CoRPS is linked to the education of students at Tilburg School of Social and Behavioural Sciences, in particular the Master of Medical Psychology, and the enrolment of PhD candidates within CoRPS. In the period 2008-2010 CoRPS has 29 new PhD students, in addition to 5 PhD’s who started in 2005-2007 in projects related to the CoRPS institute. The two-year master’s program includes a thesis in English embedded in ongoing CoRPS research projects.
The self-evaluation reports on the **Strategy** of CoRPS, stating that CoRPS has been highly productive in PhD projects, publications, in invited lectures and in acquiring extramural funding. Opportunities for research are seen in *brain body medicine*, and in *patient self-management*. The mission of CoRPS is to further conduct excellent research that promotes better understanding of the complex interaction of bio-behavioural factors in patients with chronic conditions, and to publish these finding in premier medical and psychological journals. The ultimate goal is to improve long-term health of patients’ life-threatening and disabling conditions. The self-evaluation report specifies seven **goals** to be met for CoRPS:

1) Acquired status of Center of Excellence at Tilburg University:
2) Improved internal organization
3) Secured grant funding
4) International alliances include a teaching component
5) Relevance for society: promoted practical applications
6) Retained productive research alliances
7) Continue to strive for the best research at the interface of mind and body.

The **Appendices** to the self-evaluation report provide the committee with information on:

1) Evaluation criteria and deliverables
3) External funding
4) Acquired grants for participating centers
5) Completed PhD projects
6) Current PhD projects
7) Organization chart
8) H-Index & Citation score
9) Affiliates
10) Organization of Academic meetings
11) Visibility: Keynotes, invited lectures and presentations
12) Media appearances
13) Academic reputation and senior staff
14) CoRPUS Magazine

In a separate document, the Committee received information on **societal relevance and community outreach** of CoRPS research, including examples of activities in the following areas:

1. Dissemination of knowledge for the general public;
2. Dissemination to specific patient groups and health care professionals;
3. Enhancing training of health care professionals;
4. Application of new diagnostic and therapeutic tools that can be readily integrated in clinical practice;
5. Cooperation with industry to improve patient-friendliness of medical devices;
6. Advising policy makers (national and international) to improve health care.
2.1 Assessment of the institute

The Committee was very impressed with the Institute and recognized the important scientific and societal contributions that it has made in the three short years of its existence. The Institute has grown extremely quickly over this brief time and has clearly established itself as a leader in the field-- both nationally and internationally.

Characterisation of the Institute

The Center of Research on Psychology in Somatic Diseases CoRPS is an interdisciplinary research institute in the School of Social and Behavioural Sciences of Tilburg University. CoRPS is an initiative of the School of Social and Behavioural Sciences and the executive board of Tilburg University, in collaboration with partner organisations in the medical field (two hospitals, a Cancer Registry Center, and a primary care organization in its surrounding area in the Netherlands). Researchers from Medical Psychology, Cognitive Neuroscience and from Methodology and Statistics, collaborate with professionals at these medical institutions.

The research activities of CoRPS, as all fundamental research activities of the School of Social and Behavioural Sciences, are housed in the Oldendorff Research Institute, founded in 2001, that also houses the (local) graduate school. The objective of the Tilburg School of Social and Behavioural Sciences’ research policy has been to improve the quality of research while retaining a high level of productivity.

Performance of the Institute

The Institute started very modestly but has grown exponentially over the past 3 years. The program structure, with a focus on four chronic health conditions—heart disease, diabetes/hypertension, cancer, and neurological disorders, is a reasonable organizational framework that has served the Institute well, enabling faculty to achieve considerable success in attracting funding and growing several programs at a rapid rate. The Institute is clearly “on the map” with an international reputation for outstanding research. The addition of Dr. Wijo Kop is considered to be a major coup for the Institute and his recent appointment as editor-and-chief of the prestigious journal *Psychosomatic Medicine* will only enhance the visibility, and credibility, of the Institute.

The fact that the Institute is housed in an academic institution rather than in a medical center is somewhat unique and could pose difficulties for the program. However, the faculty have developed an impressive network of hospitals and medical practices that provide excellent access to patients and medical expertise. The development of the ICD registry is one such example of how this arrangement can work successfully. Liaisons with hospitals such as St. Elisabeth and TweeSteden represent superb opportunities for collaborative research without the typical barriers for patient recruitment that often impede progress in university medical centers (such as competition for research subjects). Primary care organization (POZOB) also represents an exciting research opportunity with great potential. The ability to attract medical collaborators in these diverse settings represents another challenge that faces the Institute. In several areas, this arrangement has worked
extremely well. For example, the Cancer program, directed by a surgical oncologist, is a model for how a physician can provide a critically important leadership role in the examination of psychological issues in cancer patients. The Cancer Registry South is potentially a tremendous resource for Institute investigators interested in cancer research.

A conscious decision was made early on to focus on several key medical conditions. While other important areas of investigation, particularly prevention, paediatrics, and pain, would be desirable, it is understandable that CoRPS needed not to try to do too much and to be overly inclusive, but rather to excel in a few areas.

The organizational structure of Tilburg University was unfamiliar to the Committee and proved difficult to fully grasp. Inclusion of a more complete organizational chart would help to clarify the interrelationships among the various departments and programs within the University. Research at Tilburg is organized in 5 schools, including the School of Social and Behavioural Sciences. Bachelor and Master’s programs are offered in 5 areas, including Psychology and Sociology and there are 12 research programs including Medical Psychology (of which Professor Denollet is the director), Cognitive Neuroscience, Developmental Psychology, Social Psychology, and Latent Variable Models. CoRPS represents collaboration between Medical Psychology, Cognitive Neuroscience and Methodology. There also is training in clinical psychology, but apparently the training is done at the Master’s level and, unlike North America, appears independent of doctoral training. It is not clear how clinical training in medical settings, such as those integral to CoRPS is being supervised. It would appear that efforts to integrate clinical training into these settings would be useful to inform research questions and potentially provide additional revenue streams into the Program.

Although there are currently 3.88 tenured full professors, 2.05 associate professors, and 2.75 assistant professors (total tenured 8.68 fte), there are 36.25 non tenured staff, the majority of which (29.00) being PhD students. We noted that PhD students are in many ways counted as staff because they have paid research positions. However, the number of faculty who actually have some fte effort could not be determined.

The Institute generally has adequate funding to support many of its investigators. In particular, senior investigators have received considerable grant function to support their research activities and have been the recipients of VENI, VICI, VIDI grants as well as funding from the EU. There also are a large number of graduate students and post docs who bring a great deal of energy and enthusiasm to the Program. However, it was noted the “next generation” of leaders, the so-called “mid-level” faculty represent a talented, yet vulnerable, group of young researchers. This is a relatively small group of recent graduates who are striving to establish themselves in a competitive academic environment. It is not clear what opportunities might be available to these individuals, either at Tilburg or other academic institutions throughout the Netherlands when they approach the stage where they would be granted tenure with promotion to Associate Professor in many North-American academic institutions. It was noted that several promising investigators were unable to secure faculty positions and recently had to leave the University, and possibly the field. We were pleasantly surprised that this occurrence did not appear to have an overtly negative impact on the morale of the junior faculty; however, the Committee considers this
situation to be a critical phase in the lives of young researchers, which could have important implications for the long term health and well-being of the program. There need to be creative ways of attracting and retaining these young investigators to sustain the Institute over time. Funds to “seed” pilot projects with a high likelihood for eventually obtaining external research support also would be desirable. We considered strong support for this part of the faculty to be necessary to build a critical mass of young investigators who will ultimately succeed the current leaders and ‘stars’ of the CoRPS group.

Internal support for the program (e.g., from Department of Medical Psychology and Neuropsychology, School of Social and Behavioural Sciences, Tilburg University) has remained stable for the past 3 years, while external support has essentially tripled, due in large part to successfully obtaining research grants from NWO and ZonMw. Because these funds are time limited, it is not clear if the Program can continue to grow, or even sustain their current funding given the current economic realities. Support from such organizations as the Dutch Cancer Society and EFSD provide excellent sources of research support, but new revenue streams should be developed to backstop existing sources of support.

Future of the Institute

The Committee is convinced that the Institute is well-positioned to expand and thrive with a more solid funding base and greater attention to ways to retain its junior faculty. The kind of stability and recognition provided by a Center of Excellence designation would undoubtedly help the Institute “get to the next level” and establish itself as an international leader in the field.

Remarks concerning the assessment:

This assessment is a mid-term review of CoRPS research, and concerns the initial phase (2008-2010) of the research center, involving initiating research projects, acquiring funding and publishing findings that address its research agenda in the scientific literature.
2.2 Assessment of the research programme

Programme CoRPS: Psychology in Somatic Diseases

Programme director: Prof. dr. J. Denollet
Academic staff in 2010: 44.93 fte (2008: 29.16 fte)
Assessment:
- Quality: 4-5
- Productivity: 4-5
- Relevance: 4
- Vitality and feasibility: 4-5

Title of programme
Psychology in Somatic Diseases

Management

The committee believes that the Program is very well-managed, although its administration is somewhat underfunded. The director is highly regarded internationally and among his peers locally. He clearly has the respect of the faculty and students at Tilburg. He is trusted and well-regarded as a scientist and administrator. He also has assembled an excellent group of investigators, many of whom are leaders in their respective fields. Because the program has grown so rapidly, however, the infrastructure support has not been able to keep pace with the increased faculty and funding levels. For example, it was noted that the administrative support is somewhat limited—in particular, the administrative director has a part-time, temporary position. The Committee considered this situation as problematic, which could destabilize the Program. The Committee recommended that a permanent position be established for a full time administrator.

While the Program has grown substantially since 2008, the Committee noted that there did not appear to be a clear vision for the long range growth of the Program nor a well-articulated strategy for its further development. Some programs are quite large and well-established (i.e., Cardiovascular disorders), while others tend to be smaller, (i.e., Diabetes and Hypertension and Neurological disorders). It was not clear if the goal of the program was to achieve a balance across the 4 programs, if new programs could emerge depending on opportunities (e.g., in the areas of paediatrics or pain), if resources would be diverted to build programs that are as yet underdeveloped, or if the particularly strong programs would be encouraged to continue to expand. The extent to which opportunities to develop collaborations across programs is encouraged could not be determined. The role of cognitive neuroscience also was not clear, as this program could be integrated into the program on Neurological disorders. The Committee did not have a recommendation about how the programs should grow, but encourage the Institute to discuss this issue. To this end, the Institute is encouraged to proceed with the establishment of an internal Advisory Board or Executive committee for strategic planning to help provide guidance as to the optimal strategies to secure or grow existing programs should be considered. Formally appointing each of the 4-5 program coordinators to serve in this capacity would be a logical next step. Also, it might be desirable to involve some
of the younger faculty in this effort so as to enable them to feel more invested in the program and to eventually grow into leadership positions. An external Advisory Board, constituted by researchers outside of Tilburg but familiar with multidisciplinary collaborations in behavioural medicine/health psychology, could also prove useful to the Institute.

Quality (4-5 = very good to excellent)

The Committee considered the quality of the research to be outstanding. Professor Denollet has assembled a superb team of investigators who have injected great energy and enthusiasm into the program. Generally the work is important and innovative. Examination of potential mechanisms underlying the association of risk factors and outcomes is considered especially important. While the Program has a modest record for intervention research, there appear to be potential opportunities through the connections at various clinical sites throughout the region and possibly expanded throughout the Netherlands to in order to position itself to attract large scale, multi-center clinical trials in the future. The use of the Internet to deliver web-based treatments is considered innovative and potentially important. The respective group leaders together represent a strong group of investigators who provide excellent role models for their students. The morale of students is considered excellent.

Productivity (4-5 = very good to excellent)

This has been an exceptionally productive research group with over 300 peer-reviewed publications, many of which in the top scientific journals in the world. Indeed, CoRPS investigators achieved great success in publishing 102 articles in targeted journals from 2008-2010. In addition to publication in high quality journals with high impact factors, a number of investigators have clearly impacted the field as reflected in their high ‘h’ scores. It was noted that 7 investigators achieved an ‘h index’ >20; the cardiovascular area was a particular strength of the program. Although the cardiovascular program is clearly the strength of the center, it is reasonable to expect that other programs, such as cancer, will increase their productivity in the near future.

Relevance (4 = very good)

The CoRPS research and institute is highly relevant to the mission of the University. The focus of the research group is on chronic illnesses that have a serious impact on society including heart disease, diabetes, and cancer. Efforts to understand psychological and behavioural factors that affect these diseases are extremely important and greatly affect the health and welfare of citizens of Tilburg, the Netherlands, and the society as a whole. In addition the Program has reached out to the community to increase public awareness about these conditions and have provided a number of public service programs, although efforts tended to be highly focused and not necessarily relevant to larger segments of society. For example, a course for health care professionals was offered to increase awareness of the psychological consequences of living with an implantable cardiac defibrillator (ICD). It was noted that the Program could take a more active leadership role in the community by serving on local boards or by having a greater presence in local professional organizations and by having greater visibility in Dutch journals.
Vitality and feasibility (4-5 = very good to excellent)

The Committee was impressed with the level of external funding obtained by CoRPS investigators, with several faculty successfully obtaining VENI, VICI, VIDI grant awards. External support for research has grown exponentially from 19,000 in 2008 to 528,000 in 2009 to 1372,000 in 2010. Although funding is likely to be more challenging over this next 3 years, there is no reason why the program should not be successful in the future. As previously noted, it will be important to maximize the success of younger faculty who represent the long term future of the program. Because it can be anticipated that funding levels may remain constant or even decline, it will be important to identify alternative funding sources and develop novel strategies for funding research programs in the future.

Overall remarks

The panel members unanimously agreed that the CoRPS program has performed exceptionally well and that the worldwide recognition that it has achieved is well-deserved. Because much of the Program relies on external funding, their remains some uncertainty about the future of the Program. While internal funding for the program has been stable since the inception of the program, external funding has more than tripled in the past 3 years. Despite the increasingly competitive funding environment, the Program has done very well in attracting talented investigators who have potential for obtaining grant funding. The Committee recognized that that the CoRPS has met all of the targets it proposed initially including successfully obtaining external funding, scholarly productivity, education, and professional networking. The Committee unanimously agreed that the Program exceeded its ambitious goals after 3 years and that a Center of Excellence designation would be appropriate recognition for their achievements and would help to solidify the position of CoRPS as a leader in the field.

2.3 Assessment of additional evaluation criteria of CoRPS

In this chapter the committee presents its view regarding specific evaluation criteria added by the institute for CoRPS. The committee was impressed by the fact that the Institute proposed a list of additional evaluation criteria and deliverables for its performance after three and five years (see appendix 4). These additional criteria serve as aspirational goals that help to guide research efforts and facilitate the realization of the high standards established by the CoRPS investigators. This strategy also is a reflection of the strength of the leadership, effectiveness of the approach, and commitment of the faculty.
3 Appendices: Aspects of the Assessment

According to the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP 2009-2015) the following checklists and five-point scale for ratings of research quality have been used. The committee has applied the checklists for internal use only.

3.1 Appendix 1: Preliminary assessment Institute

(Only for internal use by the committee)

Reviewer ..........................

Institute name:

5 = Excellent, 4 = Very good, 3 = Good, 2 = Satisfactory, 1 = Unsatisfactory.
See Appendix 1b, for a full explanation of scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How do you evaluate the institute with respect to:</th>
<th>Institute level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 Quality and scientific relevance of the research</td>
<td>(Assess only at program level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Academic reputation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Organisation (not included in Table 3.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5 Resources (A4 in Table 3.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 PhD training (A5 in Table 3.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall assessment of institute quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Productivity** | |
| B1 Productivity strategy | |
| B2 Productivity | |
| Overall assessment of institute productivity | |

| **Relevance** | |
| C1 Societal relevance: policy measures aimed at: | |
| • C1.1 enhancing societal relevance of the research, and/or: | |
| • C1.2 enhancing societal orientation of researchers, and/or: | |
| • C1.3 knowledge transfer to other than academic users. | |
| Overall assessment of institute societal relevance | |

| **Vitality and Feasibility** | |
| D1 Strategy | |
| D2 SWOT analysis | |
| D3 Robustness and stability | |
| Overall assessment of institute vitality and feasibility | |
### 3.2 Appendix 2: Preliminary assessment Program

(Only for internal use by the committee)

Programme title (short):

5 = Excellent, 4 = Very good, 3 = Good, 2 = Satisfactory, 1 = Unsatisfactory. See Appendix 1b, for a full explanation of scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How do you evaluate research group or programme with respect to:</th>
<th>Research group or Programme level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 Quality and scientific relevance of the research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Academic reputation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Organisation <em>(note: not included in Table 3.1)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5 Resources <em>(note: A4 in Table 3.1)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 PhD training <em>(note: A5 in Table 3.1)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall assessment of quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Productivity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Productivity strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Productivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall assessment of productivity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Societal relevance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• C1.1 Societal quality: interaction with stakeholders, and/or:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• C1.2 Societal impact: how research affects stakeholders, and/or:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• C1.3 Valorisation: application, availability, usage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall assessment of societal relevance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vitality and Feasibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 SWOT analysis <em>(Assess only at institute level)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 Robustness and stability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall assessment of vitality and feasibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.3 Appendix 3: The Five-Point Scale

*The Five-Point Scale*

The five-point scale used in the assessment is described in the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 Excellent</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Very good</strong></td>
<td>Research is nationally leading. Research is internationally competitive and makes a significant contribution to the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Good</strong></td>
<td>Research is internationally visible. Work is competitive at the national level and makes a valuable contribution in the international field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Satisfactory</strong></td>
<td>Research is nationally visible. Work adds to our understanding and is solid, but not exciting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Unsatisfactory</strong></td>
<td>Work is neither solid nor exciting, flawed in the scientific and or technical approach, repetitions of other work, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 Appendix 4: CoRPS – Evaluation criteria and deliverables

CoRPS – Evaluation criteria and deliverables

*Academic Research*

i. The main general criteria to be used in the evaluation follow from the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP criteria).

Other, more specific, criteria are:

ii. There will be a steady stream of high quality papers published in English language journals. At the end of year five, a sufficient number of articles should be published, or should have been accepted for publication, in the leading journals in the field. A motivated list of these journals is presented at the end of this appendix.

iii. CoRPS researchers will be regularly invited to present keynote speeches at international conferences.

iv. The interdisciplinary approach of the Institute and its research program will be based on the combination of the disciplines involved (psychology and medicine).

v. The Institute should be continued if the output after the first three years is considered to be very good and excellent after five years.

*Outside Money (NWO, EU and the market)*

vi. After five years, the institute should have demonstrated to be able to receive sufficient funding from NWO and other organizations that support health care research in order to live up to the financial agreement as stated in the CoRPS regulations. After three years, there should be clear indications that these targets will be met.

*PhD Education*

vii. CoRPS will start up four new PhD projects in the first two years and three per year in the last three years.

viii. At the end of the period of the contract of the PhD, 80% of the PhD manuscripts should have been approved.

ix. All PhD proposals are submitted to the regular procedures of the Oldendorff Research Institute in order to safeguard the academic quality of the research proposals.

x. The PhD educational program is based at the programs of the Graduate Schools of the Oldendorff Research Institute.

xi. CoRPS will enable PhD’s to follow courses outside the university when these courses are not offered within the curricula of Tilburg University.

*Networking*

xii. After three years, Tilburg University will be viewed as the place in the Netherlands for research on the cutting edge of psychology and medicine.

xiii. After three years, the institute will be part of a formal international network.

xiv. After three years, the institute will be recognized as a leading institute in the world, in particular in Europe and North America.

*Validation*
Research seminars, workshops and/or conferences bringing together researchers from various disciplines as well as practitioners in order to exchange ideas and benefit from different types of knowledge.

The research activities and output of CoRPS will be recognized as very relevant for disease care management by stakeholders in the field of health care and health care policy.

**Target Journals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medical Psychology</th>
<th>Medicine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychology</strong></td>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Psychosomatic Medicine</td>
<td>- The Lancet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Psychological Medicine</td>
<td>- Journal of the American Medical Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Brain, Behavior &amp; Immunity</td>
<td>- Annals of Internal Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Psychotherapy &amp; Psychosomatics</td>
<td>- Archives of Internal Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Health Psychology</td>
<td>- Journal of Internal Medicine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychiatry</th>
<th>Surgery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Archives of General Psychiatry</td>
<td>- Archives of Surgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- American Journal of Psychiatry</td>
<td>- British Journal of Surgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Biological Psychiatry</td>
<td>- Journal of the American College of Surgeons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Journal of Affective Disorders</td>
<td>- Journal of Heart and Lung Transplantation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medical Specialties</th>
<th>Basic Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clinical Cardiology</strong></td>
<td><strong>Neuroscience - Psychology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- European Heart Journal</td>
<td>- Cognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Heart</td>
<td>- Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- American Journal of Cardiology</td>
<td>- Psychophysiology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical Oncology</th>
<th>Neuroscience - Medicine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Journal of Clinical Oncology</td>
<td>- Nature Reviews Neuroscience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Lancet Oncology</td>
<td>- Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Annals of Oncology</td>
<td>- Cerebral Cortex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- International Journal Of Cancer</td>
<td>- Journal of Neuroscience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- European Journal Of Cancer</td>
<td>- Neuroimage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diabetes</th>
<th>Multidisciplinary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Diabetes</td>
<td>- Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Diabetes Care</td>
<td>- Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Diabetologia</td>
<td>- Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Nature Reviews Endocrinology</td>
<td>- Clinical Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Psychoneuroendocrinology</td>
<td>- Psychological Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical Neurology</th>
<th>Methodological</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The Lancet Neurology</td>
<td>- Psychological Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- International Journal of Neurology</td>
<td>- Statistical Methods in Medical Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Neuropsychological Society</td>
<td>- Sociological Methods and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Neuropsychology</td>
<td>- Psychometrika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Journal of Clinical Rehabilitation</td>
<td>- Sociological Methodology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Prof. James A. Blumenthal, PhD
James Blumenthal holds professorships in Psychology and Neuroscience and Medical Psychology at Duke University and Duke Medical Center respectively. He received a PhD in Clinical Psychology from the University of Washington in 1975. His clinical interests are in behavioral interventions in prevention and treatment of cardiopulmonary disease and in the psychosocial aspects of solid organ transplantation. He currently has funded research for studies on stress management in patients undergoing cardiac rehabilitation, telephone – based coping skills training in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, non-pharmacologic treatment of hypertension, exercise and depression, and lifestyle treatment of mild cognitive impairment. Dr. Blumenthal is published widely in these areas and received various awards, honors and distinctions for his research work.
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3.6 Appendix 6: Programme of the site visit CoRPS, Tilburg University

Program Site visit Center of Research on Psychology in Somatic diseases (CoRPS)

Review Committee: Prof. James A. Blumenthal (Chair)  
Prof. Wolfgang Linden  
Prof. Aartjan Beekman  
Secretary: Dr. Robert Braam

Date: Thursday, 26 May 2011  
Location: Hotel Auberge du Bonheur

16.00 - 18.00 Committee internal preparatory meeting:  
- Procedure, roles, etc.  
- Discussion of first impressions  
- Prepare meeting on 27th

18.00 - 20.30 Dinner meeting with Vice-Dean for Research Prof. Klaas Sijtsma and Director Drs. Hans Dieteren.

Date: Friday, 27 May 2011  
Location: Cobbenhagen building, room CZ 111 (2nd floor)

09.00 - 09.30 Welcome Committee, by Rector Prof. Philip Eijlander, in room C 20  
09.30 - 10.00 Meeting with Board Tilburg School of Social and Behavioral Sciences  
Prof. Diederik Stapel, Dean  
Prof. Klaas Sijtsma, Vice-Dean Research  
Drs. Hans Dieteren, Director

10.00 - 10.15 Break

10.15 - 11.15 Meeting with Academic Leader and Program Coordinators CoRPS  
Prof. Johan Denollet  
Prof. Wijo Kop  
Prof. Susanne Pedersen  
Dr. Frans Pouwer  
Prof. Anne Roukema  
Prof. Margriet Sitskoorn  
Prof. Jean Vroomen

11.15 - 11.45 Internal deliberation of Committee

11.45 - 13.00 Lunch and opportunity for internal deliberation of the Committee in “Tilbury” (Food Plaza building)

13.00 - 14.00 Meeting with researchers CoRPS  
Dr. Mirjam Keetels  
Dr. Nina Kupper  
Dr. Paula Mommersteeg  
Dr. Brenda den Oudsten

14.00 - 14.15 Break

14.15 - 15.15 Meeting with PhD students CoRPS  
Henneke Versteeg, MSc.  
Marjan Traa, MSc.  
Annelieke Roest, MSc.

15.15 - 16.00 Internal deliberations of the committee to formulate first impressions and to make appointments for writing the evaluation report

16.00 - 16.30 Informal presentation of the committee’s first impressions and findings

16.30 - Drinks