

RESEARCH REVIEW
SOCIOLOGY
2013-2018

De Onderzoekerij
Vondellaan 58
2332 AH Leiden
Email: info@onderzoekerij.nl
Internet: www.onderzoekerij.nl

Contents

Preface	1
1. Introduction	3
1.1 Terms of reference for the assessment.....	3
1.2 The review committee	3
1.3 Procedures followed by the committee	4
2. Sociology in the Netherlands – an appreciation.....	5
2.1 Introduction	5
2.2 Quality.....	6
2.3 Relevance – from a one-way street to co-creation.....	7
2.4 The Janus head of viability.....	8
2.5 PhDs – continuity on a high level.....	8
2.6 Diversity – the long way to go.....	10
2.7 Integrity – procedures embedded and integrated in the daily practice.....	11
2.8 General recommendations.....	11
3. Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam	19
3.1 Quantitative assessment	19
3.2 Introduction, strategy and targets	19
3.3 Research quality.....	19
3.4 Societal relevance.....	20
3.5 Viability.....	21
3.6 PhD programme	22
3.7 Research integrity.....	23
3.8 Diversity.....	23
3.9 Recommendations.....	24
4. Erasmus University Rotterdam	25
4.1 Quantitative assessment	25
4.2 Introduction, strategy and targets	25
4.3 Research quality.....	26
4.4 Societal relevance.....	27

4.5 Viability.....	27
4.6 PhD programme.....	28
4.7 Research integrity.....	29
4.8 Diversity.....	29
4.9 Recommendations.....	30
5. Utrecht University	33
5.1 Quantitative assessment	33
5.2 Introduction, strategy and targets	33
5.3 Research quality.....	34
5.4 Societal relevance.....	35
5.5 Viability.....	36
5.6 PhD Programme.....	36
5.7 Research integrity.....	37
5.8 Diversity.....	37
5.9 Recommendations.....	38
6. University of Groningen.....	39
6.1 Quantitative assessment	39
6.2 Introduction, strategy and targets	39
6.3 Research quality.....	40
6.4 Societal relevance.....	40
6.5 Viability.....	41
6.6 PhD programme.....	41
6.7 Research integrity.....	42
6.8 Diversity.....	42
6.9 Recommendations.....	43
7. University of Amsterdam.....	45
7.1 Quantitative assessment	45
7.2 Introduction, strategy and targets	45
7.3 Research quality.....	46
7.4 Societal relevance.....	47
7.5 Viability.....	47
7.6 PhD programme.....	48
7.7 Research integrity.....	49

7.8 Diversity.....	49
7.9 Recommendations.....	49
8. Radboud University Nijmegen	51
8.1 Quantitative assessment	51
8.2 Introduction, strategy and targets	51
8.3 Research quality.....	52
8.4 Societal relevance.....	53
8.5 Viability.....	54
8.6 PhD programme	54
8.7 Research integrity.....	55
8.8 Diversity.....	55
8.9 Recommendations.....	56
9. Interuniversity Center for Social Science Theory and Methodology (ICS).....	57
9.1 Assessment PhD programme	57
9.2 Recommendation	57
Appendix A – Curriculum Vitae.....	59
Appendix B – Programme of the site visit.....	62
Appendix C – Tables	65
1. Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam.....	65
2. Erasmus University Rotterdam.....	67
3. Utrecht University	69
4. University of Groningen.....	71
5. University of Amsterdam	73
6. Radboud University	75
Appendix D – Meaning of the scores	77
Appendix E – General indicators.....	78

Preface

Participating in a research evaluation is not a daily task an academic is asked to do. Being asked to be a member of such a research evaluation therefore arouses one's attention. Being asked for a research evaluation in succession of Prof Jos Berghman was an honour, as Jos is still remembered as a distinguished sociologist and an amiable man. Being asked for the Dutch research sociology evaluation was even more of an honour as several Dutch sociologists, now close to their retirement, have formed me as an academic, transferring their skills to a (once) young Flemish scholar as a mentor. It is with great pleasure that I accepted this task and I am glad to present you this evaluation report.

Of course, this report is a group effort that goes beyond the borders of the evaluation committee. Many scholars and administrative personnel have worked hard to write preparatory evaluations and find the right data to document their research efforts. These self-evaluation reports were the basis of our work and we highly appreciate the extra time all these staff members devoted to preparing these documents and compiling all tables and graphs. This group effort is not only limited to the written work. We also want to thank all participants in the interviews in Amsterdam for their highly appreciated contributions, for the constructive and open atmosphere of the talks, and for their willingness to approach the committee with an open mind and spirit.

Each interview was done by eight committee members whom I hope are not known now as the *Tarantino's Hateful Eight*. Evaluating always involves asking about those things you forgot to do or those things that you tried to hide in a self-evaluation report. I want to thank all committee members for taking their task so seriously and digging through hundreds of pages to not only find the excellence of Dutch sociology about which we shall report here, but also to formulate recommendations that could help our Dutch colleagues to flourish even further than their achievements to date. A special thank you hereby goes to the two PhD candidate members of our committee, Danelien van Aalst and Lucille Mattijssen. You endured all these old people for a week while you could have done at least six new regression models for your latest top-10% journal paper. In short, this committee had an inspiring week of "academic sight-seeing in the Netherlands" of which you are about to learn the outcomes.

On behalf of the whole committee, I also want to thank Esther Poort, the process coordinator and secretary of this committee. Esther did an outstanding job by coaching us in being "the committee", and by instructing us about the ins and outs of the Dutch academic system. She was excellently prepared and shared great wisdom to sharpen the ideas of our committee. She also prevented this committee from fully throwing the quantitative scoring overboard so that those who love the metrics will be served in this report as well.

The committee also wants to thank Nicole Schulp of the University of Amsterdam for the practical organisation of the evaluation. Our gratitude also goes to the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW) for hosting us during a rainy week in February, and

we thank the staff for their hospitality and catering. We never, ever ran out of tea, coffee or biscuits; three crucial ingredients that kept the committee up and running for a week.

At the close of this introduction, I address *you*, the reader of this report. Whatever your background, whatever function you have – PhD, professor, board member or minister – whatever interest you have in sociology – friendly or hostile – be warned that what you will read is a report demonstrating the absolute excellence and societal relevance of Dutch sociological research. A story of hard work, intellectual risk taking and international success. I invite you to gain insights into *Sociology in the Netherlands* from 2013 to 2018.

Dimitri Mortelmans

chair of the committee

1. Introduction

1.1 Terms of reference for the assessment

The quality assessment of research in Sociology is carried out in the context of the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP) for Public Research Organisations by the Association of Universities in The Netherlands (VSNU), the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO), and the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW). This research review is part of the six-year cycle of evaluation of research in all Dutch universities.

In accordance with the SEP, the research in Sociology covering the period of 2013–2018, is being reviewed by an external peer review committee. The research review comprises six research programmes from six different universities:

- Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (VU), PARTICIPATING IN SOCIETY (PARIS)
- Erasmus University Rotterdam (EUR), Contemporary Social Problems: The Formation, Governance and Consequences of Public Issues
- Utrecht University (UU), Social Networks, Solidarity, and Inequality Research
- University of Groningen (RUG), Social Networks, Solidarity, and Inequality Research
- University of Amsterdam (UvA), Political and institutional dynamics of culture, inequality and citizenship
- Radboud University Nijmegen (RU), Social Inequality and Cohesion.

In accordance with the SEP, the committee's tasks were to assess the quality of the research conducted by the programmes and their relevance to society as well as their strategic targets and the extent to which they are equipped to achieve them. In addition, the committee provides qualitative feedback on the PhD programmes, research integrity and diversity aspects of the programmes. The committee was furthermore invited to write a review on the performance of Dutch sociology from an international perspective and considering international trends. This review is provided in Chapter 2 of this report.

The committee received detailed information consisting of the self-evaluation reports of the programmes under review, including all the information required by SEP (including appendices), five key publications for each research programme and general information on Sociology in the Netherlands.

1.2 The review committee

The Board of the six participating universities appointed the following members of the committee for the research review:

- Prof. Dimitri Mortelmans, University of Antwerp (chair);
- Prof. (em) Sara Arber, University of Surrey;
- Prof. (em) Abby Peterson, University of Gothenburg;
- Prof. Tobias Wolbring, FAU Erlangen–Nürnberg;
- Prof. Heike Solga, Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung (WZB);
- Prof. Jose Luis Molina, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona;
- Prof. (em) Enzo Mingione, Università de Milano–Bicocca;

- Danelien van Aalst, MSc (PhD candidate), University of Groningen;
- Lucille Mattijssen, MSc (PhD candidate), Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam.

More detailed information about the members of the committee can be found in Appendix A. The Board of the participating universities appointed drs. Esther Poort Onderzoekerij as the committee coordinator and secretary. All members of the committee signed a declaration and disclosure form to ensure that the committee members made their judgements without bias, personal preference or personal interest, and that the judgment was made without undue influence from the programmes or stakeholders.

1.3 Procedures followed by the committee

The committee was invited by the six participating universities to assess the participating programmes during a site visit at a central location in the Netherlands (Amsterdam). Prior to the site visit, all committee members were requested to read the self-evaluation reports of all six research programmes. Each committee member was furthermore requested to independently formulate a preliminary assessment concerning three research programmes under review, based on the written information that was provided. This way all research programmes were reviewed in-depth by a first, a second and a third reviewer. Nevertheless, all committee members are jointly responsible for the review, scoring and report of all the programmes!

The committee proceeded according to the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021. The assessment was based on the documentation provided by the programmes and the interviews with the management, a selection of researchers of the programme, and PhD candidates. The interviews took place on 25-27 February 2020 (see Appendix B).

The committee discussed its assessment at its final session during the site visit. Based on the preliminary assessments and notes taken during the interviews, the committee members wrote an assessment of the programme for which they had been appointed as first reviewer. The second and third reviewer verified and added to this assessment after which the secretary used it for the report. The chair was requested to write the review on Dutch Sociology. The total draft report was verified and added to by the committee before being presented to the programmes concerned for factual corrections and comments. The comments were reviewed by the secretary and incorporated in the final report in close consultation with the chair and other committee members. The final report was presented to the Board of the Universities and to the management of the programmes.

¹ The PhD's only reviewed and scored three of the reports. Neither of them has evaluated the report of their own institution.

2. Sociology in the Netherlands – an appreciation

2.1 Introduction

The committee used the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP) as the general framework to look at the research of the sociology departments in the Netherlands. The committee realises that this framework will lead to a focus on the quantitative scores we are expected to give and which we present in the second part of this report. The committee stresses however that we urge the departments and universities to look at our qualitative judgements as our primary focus in this evaluation report. The SEP requires quantification but at the same time provides only a limited 4-point scale to score the institutes. Therefore, we point to the content of our evaluation rather than the scores as we hope that our recommendations will help to improve Dutch sociology in the coming evaluation period. It is also important to note that the scores cannot be compared with the scores from the previous evaluation period because of the different scales.

This being said, the committee started off with a quantified comparison of the departments² under evaluation. Very quickly, the committee found out that these quantitative measures revealed a sociology discipline that operates on an exceptionally high level. Quantitative differences are present between departments, not always related to differences in size. But when both the input in terms of grants and the output in terms of publications are this high, we can only describe Sociology in the Netherlands as undertaking top-level research competitive with the best in the world. Prioritising these quantitative differences in our evaluation would follow the advice of Darrell Huff³ "to cut off the y-axis". If you zoom in on the top of a distribution, differences appear that would otherwise go unnoticed. Our overall conclusion from the quantitative exercise is that Sociology in the Netherlands is very impressive.

But the extensive self-evaluation reports provided more than just a quantitative picture of the discipline. Despite the differences in size and the breadth of thematic research topics across the institutions under evaluation, the sociology landscape in the Netherlands is also characterised by a huge methodological and theoretical pluralism. This strength of Dutch sociology should be preserved in the future. In this introductory appreciation, we will briefly touch upon the six evaluation dimensions of the SEP. We will give a general overview of points that struck the committee while reviewing the self-evaluation reports and interviewing the departments. We end this introductory part with nine recommendations aimed at the discipline as a whole.

² When referring to FTE (Full Time Equivalent) in this report, we refer to "FTE in research time".

³ Huff, D. (1954) *How to lie with statistics*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

2.2 Quality

Beyond any doubt, the quality of the research in all departments is of a very high level. The number of grants in highly competitive programmes like the NWO and ERC increased substantially since the last evaluation of Sociology and the H-indexes of some scholars prove that they are world-leaders in their fields. The success in obtaining prestigious grants is an indicator of the quality of both the proposals written and the candidates' CVs. Publication strategies in most departments are focussed on high ranked (top 25% and top 10%) journals. This is associated with a high number of publications in more specialised journals. This relatively high output of refereed journal articles will inevitably enhance individuals' professional development and visibility. However, in many departments far less publications have been found in general sociological journals, which might jeopardize the visibility of Dutch scholars to the wider international discipline.

With pleasure, the committee learned that several groups are investing in the construction of research infrastructure. These kinds of infrastructure are important to the wider academic community as many scholars can use the data collected when they are stored in data archives. Collecting data and providing them to the research community is not always valued substantially in researchers' CVs. Therefore, the committee highly appreciates the efforts of the groups that do invest in large data infrastructure and encourages the teams to continue to do so in the future. We also found a widespread habit of documenting the data according to the FAIR principle and making the data available through the Dutch data archive DANS.

Dutch sociology works across a wide variety of topics and subdisciplines, but the quantitative research approach dominates in most departments. The previous evaluation committee saw some signs of cooperation between qualitative and quantitative approaches. However, this committee observed little structural cooperation or mixed methods approaches. Though there are some initiatives, there is no structural collaboration between the different research approaches. The same could also be said about interdisciplinary cooperation for some departments. We realise that this cooperation is not a goal in itself but where the previous commission saw signs of increasing cooperation, we fear that this has halted in the last six years.

When reading through the key publications, we observed the strong "scientification" of sociology. This has to do with the strong quantitative focus among Dutch scholars and the highly standardised manuscripts with identical structures required in much of the international literature. Impressed as we were about the high-quality journal publications, the committee also fears that the fragmentation of research results endangers the development of sociology in the long term. The publication of monographs has decreased, not only in the Netherlands but across the discipline as a whole. Monographs are a communication instrument that goes beyond the limiting 20-page journal article. It allows scholars to develop new ideas without any page limits. Monographs have the ability to set the scene in a field and to inspire scholars for the next decade. The committee therefore points to the underappreciated quality aspect of writing monographs which could help many scholars, especially Dutch full professors, to claim a leading position in their domain of expertise. The full professors should be given time to develop a manuscript and get it published by an internationally visible publisher. Sabbatical leaves specifically with this goal might be a possible formula to achieve this. This could also fit in with the "slow

science" policies (focussing more on quality rather than quantity in output) some departments announce they will develop in the near future.

2.3 Relevance – from a one-way street to co-creation

Most sociological research has the inherent property of being highly relevant for society. It is not surprising therefore that we found a huge impact of the programmes in the public debate, even if this could lead to (online) disputes. All departments have strategies to publish in Dutch outputs that are comprehensible by non-specialised audiences. All staff members across the different layers in the programmes take part in outreach activities. Also within the academic world, Dutch scholars are actively engaged in editorial boards, research evaluation committees and international organisations. The committee did not take into account whether a department concentrated more on national or international impact. It was clear that the visibility of research and outreach were structurally present in all departments.

Some departments had made the switch from one-way communication to co-creation. Popularising lectures or media presence all start from a model where the specialists translate their knowledge and communicate it to a passive receiving audience. With pleasure, the committee learned that pro-active policies and co-creation beyond knowledge transfer activities have been developed in some departments. The step towards co-creation in society is an important one as it reminds us of what Robert Park said to his sociology students in the 1920s: "gentlemen, go get the seat of your pants dirty in *real* research"⁴. Increasingly, sociologists will need to get their hands dirty in co-creation to pick up questions from civil society, translate them into academic research questions, and bring the answers back to the places where they are needed. This automatically involves an integration of applied and fundamental research, a distinction which is becoming increasingly blurred. Several departments have understood this new development and are experimenting with intelligent new systems of co-creation.

With these new evolutions in mind, Dutch Sociology might need a thorough evaluation of the remaining Dutch academic outlets. The committee learned that most departments no longer value publications in Dutch academic journals as the compass is exclusively pointed at high ranked English language journals. Some departments still invest in writing Dutch publications but at the same time admit that these outlets are not fit (anymore) to communicate academic results to a broader audience. Thus, the Dutch academic literature currently falls between two stools; it is neither good for academia, nor a fit product for valorisation. An inter-departmental reflection might be necessary to rethink the position of this type of communication. The model of *socialevraagstukken.nl* might be inspirational, as many interviewees have referred to this website as representing a good practice of current-day communication of sociological findings.

⁴ Cited in McKinney, J.C. (1966) *Constructive Typology and Social Theory*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts: p 71.

2.4 The Janus head of viability

In the previous two sections, the overall conclusion was that Sociology in the Netherlands is (1) qualitatively outstanding and (2) highly relevant and performs well in its valorisation activities. This conclusion stands in sharp contrast with the rather hostile and difficult environment the discipline of sociology is facing nowadays, especially after the publication of the "Wissels om" report ("Turn the switches")⁵ in 2019. The low appreciation of the social sciences and humanities is not in line with the performance of Dutch sociology as a discipline. The committee observed this paradox with great astonishment. We hope that the deans and the university boards will succeed in restoring the appreciation of the social sciences in the Netherlands.

With regard to viability, the committee worries about the funding structures of some departments. Even when some departments are relatively large across sociology, the smaller size within the university jeopardises the direct funding. One important danger for the direct funding of sociology programmes is clearly the decreasing number of students that often count as the basis for direct funding. Also, government cuts in general funding were regularly mentioned as threats to the viability of departments. Great care is taken to ensure the recruitment of sufficient and high-quality new students but the numbers of Dutch sociology students keep falling. A strategy to attract international students by introducing an English study programme was successful but showed many side effects of increased teaching load and decreasing research time.

On the other hand, the success in attracting major grants like ERC ensures the viability of sociological research in the coming years. Unfortunately, one could also argue that this model is a colossus built on shaky foundations as programmes need a sufficient critical mass to write proposals and keep educational programmes running. Moreover, transaction costs are high and investments not without risk. This tension is currently guarded by a strict monitoring of teaching time but a further decrease of direct funding could have major consequences on the power and potential to ensure success in (inter)national grant competitions. In the short term, the committee has trust that the sociology programmes will succeed in keeping up their strengths but a long-term strategy might be advised. In this respect, a structural united front of the managers of the sociology programmes, across universities, is strongly advised. Programmes can compete with each other harshly in grant competitions but at the policy level this hostile environment and the potential sharp cuts in the social sciences will only be counteracted by a strong cross-department consultation.

2.5 PhDs – continuity on a high level

The committee was pleased with the enthusiastic and energetic representatives of the PhDs talking so passionately about their work environment and research topics. The training of Dutch PhD candidates is a combination of courses followed in the Graduate

⁵ Van Rijn (2019) *Wissels om. Naar een transparante en evenwichtige bekostiging, en meer samenwerking in hoger onderwijs en onderzoek*. Adviescommissie Bekostiging Hoger Onderwijs en Onderzoek: 140p.

School and the individual guidance in designing the project and writing the publications. Four of the sociology programmes collaborate in PhD training in the joint graduate school Interuniversity Center for Social Science Theory and Methodology (ICS, see chapter 9). The committee learned about the unique Dutch system of having at least two supervisors: the main supervisor and the so-called daily supervisor. Strategic talks and major decisions are discussed with the main supervisor while the daily - or better weekly - talks are done with an experienced researcher helping PhDs with the daily tasks associated with doing research. PhD candidates highly appreciated both the training they received in the doctoral programmes and the help from their supervisors. All were aware of institutional procedures to use when problems would arise. Also more general issues concerning work-life balance and mental health problems are covered in all institutions with persons of trust (known to the PhDs and used by some of them).

A point of worry for the committee was the observation that a significant proportion of the PhD candidates in several departments takes more than 4 years to graduate. The committee understands that graduation during the fifth year is due to the bureaucratic and administrative procedures to follow, but a substantial proportion are only graduating after six or more years. This delay was also noted by the previous review committee and only partial progress has been made in this respect. The completion rate should be monitored and set as a priority. This is both in the interest of the PhD candidates and for society outside academia receiving these young potentials in their organisations and firms. Worrying was the reference an interviewee made to a strategy used by some PhD candidates to live on unemployment benefits in order to be able to finish their PhD. This strategy potentially hurts the further career of the PhD and should be strongly discouraged by the departments. A potential fruitful strategy can be the cohort approach implemented by ICS. Here PhD candidates not only work on assignments or present their preliminary results but also support each other as a group, a PhD cohort. This feeling of belonging was not only highly appreciated, it also has the potential to stimulate timely completion as progression is made by the members of the cohort.

The committee also learned about the Dutch experiment with the bursary system for PhD funding. We learned about the controversy on the practical organisation of the system and the strict framework in which a bursary system is allowed. The committee interviewed one bursary PhD and learned that the department takes their well-being - both in working conditions and in terms of supervision - very seriously. However, the committee believes that the differences in working conditions (and most importantly the lack of social security rights) are unacceptable at the system level. It is not the role of this committee to take up this issue but we do advise the departments to keep pushing higher levels to revise some of the blunt inequalities of the bursary system.

A final point we want to raise is not the general well-being of the PhDs, but in several interviews, insecurity came up as a major theme. Insecurity in terms of contract is something all PhD candidates know and live with as a career step. They signed up for temporary contracts and they know their time is limited. A second type of insecurity however is far less acknowledged and lies in the career decisions these young people need to make (early in their path). In the graduate schools and the departments, the focus lies heavily on academic careers and far less on using their competencies in other non-research related sectors. They are hardly aware of all possible roads they can take to not only finish their PhD but more importantly to prepare for a (non-academic) career

afterwards. This creates another type of insecurity that has little to do with temporary contracts or graduating in time. The committee felt that there is too little awareness among the supervisors about this type of uncertainty. The committee advises paying specific attention to the mid-term career path of PhDs in an early stage of the PhD trajectory, so that this uncertainty can easily be prevented.

2.6 Diversity – the long way to go

Diversity was an important theme during the interviews with the different institutes. In the self-evaluations, diversity was often described rather briefly and mainly in terms of age and gender. Cultural diversity was mostly reduced to diversity in terms of nationality.

The diversity in terms of age was not for all institutes an issue. Some programmes had recently replaced a cohort of full professors; others are facing a retirement wave in the coming period. All programmes were very aware of their age structure and had a vision about the strategy they want to follow to integrate the new colleagues in the programme or to replace the ones about to retire.

With regard to gender, all universities have programmes in place to either help women in building an academic career or stimulating hiring committees to take the gender balance in the department into account. The imbalance of women in academia, especially in the higher rank of full professor, has only marginally improved. The committee realises that financial limitations do impact on the speed of change but we also observed examples of excellent female scholars barred by the 'glass ceiling'. We hope that the gender imbalance at the top of the Dutch sociology programmes remains a top priority and that in the next evaluation period actual changes occur in those programmes where the imminent retirement of some full professors will allow correction of the gender imbalance while hiring new full professors in the coming years.

With regards to ethnic minorities, the self-evaluation reports often reduced this category to nationality turning this diversity issue into an internationalisation question. The committee acknowledges that internationalisation is important but we need to face the fact that international students are mainly coming from privileged families in their home country, and that the so-called international scholars are often very much like us: privileged white men and women.

We realise that we are ourselves a committee of white men and white women listening predominantly to arguments of white faculty members. But still the arguments that senior staff gave for the lack of ethnic diversity of Dutch minority groups would generate huge controversy if one would change "ethnic minority" by "women". The committee was quite astonished by the arguments given for the lack of Dutch students with an ethnic or migration background. A selection of the arguments that we heard during the interviews include: *"they are not there because they choose for high status disciplines like law and medicine"*, *"they are not there because they do not choose the research master"*, *"they are not of sufficient quality to be hired as PhD candidates"*, or *"we did have attention for this since we recently hired an Italian scholar"*. The committee acknowledges the difficulty of the problem and the difficulty to overcome the current absence of minority groups in the sociology departments. But by using the same arguments today, that have previously kept

women out of academia for decades (they were not enrolled in university, they did not have the right background, etc.), then little change is to be expected.

The committee wants to send a wake-up call to all sociology programmes that one fifth or even one quarter of the population in the Netherlands has a minority background and that failing to start developing policies now will ignore these young potentials for another decade or two. The committee is convinced that a combination of strategies is necessary to ensure the gradual introduction of these Dutch minority groups in your research teams and faculty: (1) an individualised approach (reach out to them instead of waiting for them to come), (2) a scaling-up approach (take the most talented and bring them individually to an adequate level to enter the PhD programmes), (3) an empowering approach (e.g. start advisory groups with these students and learn from them how change could work), (4) an exemplary approach (take the barrier breakers in your department and see how they can help in stimulating the growth of first-year students with a migration background), (5) an institutional approach (give yourself targets and monitor your progress; evaluate not only your courses but also your hiring criteria for 'whiteness'). Only with a substantial effort in the coming years, a start can be made to change the ethnic imbalance at the start of academia: the PhD.

2.7 Integrity – procedures embedded and integrated in the daily practice

The extensive fraud of a prominent Dutch psychologist created huge shock waves through academia in the Netherlands. As a consequence, scientific integrity came high on the managerial agenda. The committee learned that all universities have extensively developed procedures to ensure scientific integrity. In all layers of the organisation, the knowledge of these procedures is present and implemented. All staff members are clearly aware of their role and responsibilities in doing ethical research with respect to the standard guidelines of scientific integrity.

2.8 General recommendations

The committee highly appreciates the quality and the depth in Sociology in the Netherlands. Nevertheless, as an outside voice, we have seen several possible ways in which we believe Dutch sociology can further develop and improve. Therefore, we want to give nine general recommendations. We hope these recommendations will help the Dutch Sociology Programmes to further improve their excellence to a next level and to secure their position as nationally and internationally leading institutes for the coming years.

1. The committee senses a tiredness with the so-called "old evaluation system" counting merely top-10% journal publications or research funding gained. Especially among the younger generations, we heard a loud and clear plea to evaluate in a different way, in a qualitative way instead of the quantitative "points system". On the other hand, the different institutes still heavily rely on this system. Also in this research evaluation much attention was paid (and will be paid) to the scores of the committee. As a committee

we are bound to the SEP requirements to attach scores even though we do value the qualitative approach as well.

Our recommendation is that all Sociology programmes gather and develop a new system of evaluation of your staff members that relies more on quality than on quantity. It seems important to the committee to make this a joint effort to avoid structural differences between universities, or between senior and junior staff. In the self-evaluation reports, we already saw changes in this direction and we encourage you all to continue this step collectively to reform the system.

2. All research programmes that took part in this review contribute to educational programmes, which means that the majority of staff have teaching duties. A general complaint among staff of all Dutch sociology programmes evaluated is that their teaching load is quite heavy and leaves too little time for research. The committee found that the researchers are also confronted with an extensive administrative burden, especially in relation to education. We do acknowledge that accountability in teaching quality is required and that this can only be done with a certain amount of paper trail. However, the committee has the impression that the bureaucratic paperwork in relation to education (and to a lesser extend also to research) is taking such a substantial part of the work hours of the staff (at all layers in the organisation) that a critical self-reflection by the administrations of the universities is necessary.

The committee encourages all universities to explore approaches to improve the balance between teaching and research time. We recommend *all universities to start a process of administrative simplification both in the domain of education as well as research. The aim of this exercise is not to give up accountability procedures but to make them lean and with a minimal impact on the research time of the staff. Automated systems based on insights from the field of learning analytics or artificial intelligence could be helpful in lowering the administrative burden for the staff members.*

3. Many programmes have been very successful in attracting major grants from the ERC and the NWO. As a consequence, the number of postdocs has increased substantially. While all universities do have extensive policies in place for their PhDs, little is available for the postdocs.

Our recommendation is to develop guidelines for postdocs and develop training programmes to further enhance their competencies and career prospects. We specifically recommend programmes for grant writing and supervision of PhDs. Also, clear rules to become a co-supervisor are necessary as some postdocs are doing "shadow work" that cannot be formally recognised in their CVs.

4. The graduate schools are all doing great work in training PhD candidates, creating a group feeling, stimulating mutual help and raising the overall level of the PhDs. One aspect returned in some interviews was the lack of clarity about the PhD trajectory when starting and insights about potential later career trajectories. First-year PhD candidates asked for more clarity on what lies ahead of them.

Our recommendation is (1) to develop a clear insightful document on different career paths and its implications at the start of the PhD: for example, if you aim for an academic career (and a Veni grant), this is your PhD trajectory and these are your later possibilities. When your aim is a career outside of academia, this is your trajectory and your future possibilities.

(2) In addition to information, a more pro-active policy is necessary to prepare the skills of PhDs during their trajectory. PhD courses are now nearly exclusively directed to academic skills. Offering a wider range of courses to develop other skills outside academia is necessary in order to enhance the career opportunities of your PhDs. Often a non-academic career path is sought in ministries and research positions outside academia. Doctors in Sociology could also perfectly function in the private sector conditional on a proper preparation. The committee believes that a broader spread of PhDs outside academia would also strengthen sociology as a discipline in the Netherlands. Let these PhDs be your ambassadors in environments that have hardly heard from sociologists. (3) Start reflecting on the use of internships for co-creation with society. The committee believes that a co-creation internship outside academia could significantly stimulate innovation in research in the Netherlands. This could also create innovative academic papers for the PhDs.

5. Regarding gender balance, all universities still have a considerable way to go. The committee appreciates the awareness across the research programmes, but regrets the slow progress in this respect.

We recommend that all programmes continue to address the gender imbalance and develop a clear action plan to speed up the hiring of female full professors.

6. The committee urges the universities to no longer see ethnic diversity in terms of nationality only. We learned that some universities do have programmes to stimulate students with an ethnic background in bachelor programmes. Unfortunately, these efforts are more on the university level than on the departmental level.

Our recommendation is to start initiatives in the bachelor programmes to increase the number of participants from first generation students and Dutch students with a migrant background to choose the research master. Additionally, look at the efforts done with regards to women in academia and employ similar but adapted initiatives to increase the number of PhDs among this group. The target for EUR, VU, UvA and UU should be to have at least two Dutch students with a migrant background in the PhD trajectory at the end of the next evaluation period. Due to population composition outside the urban regions, for Groningen and Nijmegen, we expect at least one Dutch

student with a migrant background in the PhD trajectory at the end of the next evaluation period.

7. The committee experiences considerable sensitivity among the departments concerning ethical behaviour of staff members in hierarchical relationships. Research integrity is high on the agenda. Nevertheless, the committee finds little formal rules on co-authorship.

Our recommendation is not to develop formal rules on co-authorship that must apply in all cases. Many decisions are taken in consensus between PhDs, junior staff and senior staff. But the committee recommends departments to write down and distribute the common practice in their faculty, define red lines and explicitly point parties involved to procedures they can rely on in case of problems. As practices are not always shared among all ranks, we recommend that this document is made widely available among all staff members.

8. Following up on the previous recommendation, the committee feels that the independence of PhDs needs to be more visible. Within the Netherlands, all universities more or less use the same norms and standards but when applying for positions outside the Netherlands, the silent rules of the Netherlands might jeopardise the chances of promising young scholars.

We recommend including a footnote in each publication stating the contribution of each author obligatory for all PhDs. In addition, the committee encourages the current practice to send PhDs on an internship and have their 3rd or 4th paper written with a co-author that is not their own daily supervisor or promotor. We also strongly encourage that PhDs write at least one solo authored paper during their trajectory.

9. As previously indicated, the committee was impressed by the overall strength and depth of Sociology as a discipline in the Netherlands, but considered the differences between the six Sociology programmes to be rather small. Nevertheless, these are extraordinary times whereby sociology as a discipline is threatened from the bottom by a decrease in students but also from the top as overall finances for the social sciences might decrease in the coming years.

We recommend to (1) create a structural united front of the managers of the sociology programmes, across universities. Programmes can compete with each other harshly in grant competitions but at the policy level the external threats will only be counteracted by a strong cross-department consultation. (2) Keep the discipline united in the future by using joint communication channels such as socialevraagstukken.nl to show the Dutch society what its sociologists do and to demonstrate the knowledge and solutions they produce. (3) Keep your evaluation discipline bound. Already one sociology programme is missing from this round's evaluation but a joint evaluation is a moment where you can show the overall quality and strength of Dutch sociology as a whole.

Paradoxically, internal comparisons between departments within universities are much less powerful than a joint evaluation.

Assessments of the research programmes

3. Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

3.1 Quantitative assessment

The committee assessed the research programme 'PARTicipating In Society (PARIS)' both quantitatively and qualitatively. For the quantitative assessment a four-point scale is used, according to the standard evaluation protocol 2015-2021. The explanation of the criteria underlying the scores can be found in appendix D.

According to the SEP scoring system, the committee has awarded the following scores to the research programme 'PARTicipating In Society (PARIS)'.

Research quality:	2
Relevance to society:	1
Viability:	2

The qualitative assessment of the programme can be found in the next sections.

3.2 Introduction, strategy and targets

The sociology research programme PARIS – PARTicipation In Society – within the Faculty of Social Sciences (FSS) at Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (VU) focuses on formal and informal societal participation in late modern Western societies. Participation in society is studied from a variety of theoretical perspectives using diverse methodological approaches. PARIS encompasses five research groups: Social Inequality in the Life Course (SILC); Social Context of Aging (SoCA); Social Conflict and Change (SCC); Identities, Diversity and Inclusion (IDI); and the Centre for Philanthropic Studies (CPhS). CPhS was previously a separate research group in FSS, and following a mid-term review in 2016 joined PARIS as a fifth sub programme in 2017. The research groups are largely autonomous and much effort has been put into connecting the program leaders with regard to shared research management policies and research plans in the domain of societal participation. All of the groups are committed to engaging with relevant societal stakeholders and policy makers, maximising the valorisation of their research. Furthermore, PARIS' themes are integrated in the teaching offered at the Department of Sociology at the Bachelor, (research) Master and PhD levels.

3.3 Research quality

The various research groups within PARIS have substantial international and national reputation, which, however, varies somewhat between groups. SILC has had an outstanding reputation for their macro-level (cross-national and historical) comparative research using a wide range of (pooled) cross-national datasets. SILC has produced numerous world-leading quantitative research studies often using cutting-edge statistical techniques. SoCA has a strong national and international reputation for their research, especially on social networks and loneliness. The methodology of SoCA is largely

quantitative, especially using the Longitudinal Aging Study Amsterdam (LASA). The work of the two leaders of SCC is highly regarded internationally for their empirical and theoretical contributions to the study of contemporary social movements. IDI has a high national and international reputation, undertaking mainly qualitative research and particularly focuses on research of national and international societal relevance. CPhS undertakes a significant quantity of research relevant for understanding philanthropy in the Netherlands, and is very active in terms of societal relevance.

Publication activity is very strong in respect of both volume and quality. Among the 315 English publications in WoS journals published during the audit period 63 articles (20%) were in the top 10% of journals and 116 articles (37%) in the top 25%. These shares account for about 3.9 top-25% articles per research FTE and 2.1 top-10% articles per research FTE (total research staff) between 2013 and 2018 (see appendix E).

During the audit period the research programme has been highly successful in securing external funding and the ratio between direct and external funding is very good. The research programme has secured, among other grants, two ERC Advanced Investigator Grants in 2014 and 2017, one ERC Starting Grant in 2017 and one NWO-Vici grant in 2018. There has been a very substantial increase in the amount of contract research funding, which is largely because of the inclusion of CPhS within PARIS. Between 2013 and 2018, the scientific staff acquired, on average, funds for 2.5 FTE research staff (see appendix E).

The programme has produced an impressive number of large-scale quantitative (often cross-national) datasets (particularly SILC) and survey instruments, which are only in part open access but those are often used by other researchers. Also, there has been a harmonisation of existing data, for example, collecting surveys with questions on social trust. These databases are also made available via open access.

3.4 Societal relevance

The committee is impressed by the commitment to contributing to societal impact. The societal relevance of research undertaken by PARIS is high, in particular in the areas of loneliness, refugees, polarisation and philanthropic giving. The work on loneliness and the development of an online intervention to combat loneliness is widely used by professionals. The work on informal care has clearly influenced the general public, as well as professionals, practitioners and policy makers. An Expertise Lab on young informal carers has been established.

The work of IDI has high policy relevance with the Refugee Academy established in 2017. This brings together practice and research related to the issue of refugee inclusion in Dutch society, and has been very active in bringing together academics with diverse groups of stakeholders on issues of human rights, integration, diversity and inclusion.

The work of CPhS has very high societal relevance and engagement with a wide range of research users. It is very influential among fund-raising organisations and charities in the Netherlands and across Europe. CPhS is an active advocate of open science, and very active with blogs, social media and the regular media. Thus, CPhS research has high visibility in the national media and social media.

The SCC set up an ISR Expertise Lab on Polarization in 2019 to act as a hub for knowledge creation and utilisation for societal stakeholders and academics, which potentially should help address this critical societal trend towards political and societal polarisation.

All of the research groups have an open and active interface with society. All are highly engaged in communicating their research through professional journals and newsletters, media, invited talks and consultations, membership in civil society bodies, and social media. PARIS will continue to invest in 'expertise labs', which they describe as 'living labs', to enhance dialogue with societal stakeholders in co-creating research topics and questions.

Ten PhD graduates have found employment in the professional domain during the audit period. A further mark of the strong societal relevance of research in PARIS is that 5 chairs are sponsored (with 0.2 funding) by other organisations; by the National Institute of Social Research, Statistics Netherlands, the Netherlands Institute for Social Research, the Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute, and the Historical Sample of the Netherlands. These sponsored chairs create very valuable direct links and enable liaisons with non-academic research institutes. PARIS members have extensive involvement on advisory committees, illustrating the strong structural ties with various societal stakeholders.

In summary, the committee concludes that the PARIS aim to reach out and connect to various target groups has paid off a high societal profile of PARIS.

3.5 Viability

The PARIS programme's strategic planning and future investments are well thought out and achievable. The SWOT analysis clearly outlines the substantial strengths of the research programme. However, there are weaknesses in terms of the PhD programme (low completions), as well as the need to carefully manage senior retirements and the changing age structure of research staff. The age structure of PARIS indicates that a number of professors are close to retirement, with 6 of the 10 full Professors (and 2 of the 6 associate professors) over age 55. Therefore, it will be challenging for PARIS to manage replacements and ensure a balanced age structure of staff. The future strategy indicated in the self-evaluation report reflects this and includes the shrinking in size of the SoCA, SCC and SILC research groups. Specific actions have been taken in order to deal with the retirement of the SILC group leader in 2019 (and other SILC professors in 2023): the recent ERC Consolidator Grant and the continuation of the CBS chair after 2023 guarantees the viability of SILC research with a focus on labour market issues'. The SCC group started a new expertise lab in collaboration with colleagues from Communication Science and Organisation Science on the topic of online protest and polarisation to pick up the slack and regain critical mass with the retirement of the (now retired) SCC group leader; but the question remains if this will be enough.

The recent embedding of PARIS in the FSS research Institute for Societal Resilience (ISR) is a significant venture that strengthens the viability of the programme.

All in all, viability is actively addressed. However, the precarious position of promising non-tenured staff threatens to disrupt continuity in the programme. In general across the

board in the Netherlands research programmes are walking a tightrope navigating, on the one side, the danger of becoming too top-heavy and thus vulnerable *and*, on the other side, unable to attract and retain the most promising young researchers.

3.6 PhD programme

In the period 2013-2018 PhDs have contributed to on average 13.23 FTE research. The research programme shows alarmingly low completion rates among PhD candidates. However, measures have been taken in the last two years to speed-up the completion rates.

PhD candidates start with a 12-month contract. For all projects a go/no go assessment is held after eight months. The management team indicated that there are sometimes no go-decisions, but that they also have put a lot of effort into PhD selection. Furthermore, there is a strict limit for teaching (5%) and there is more emphasis on having a feasible plan with realistic expectations. All PhD candidates (including external students) are member of the FSS Graduate School of Social Sciences (GSSS). After admission to the Graduate School they take a 30 ECTS educational programme, aside from research masters PhDs who have only 10 ECTS. PhD candidates write a Training and Guidance Plan with details about work appointments and a plan for the first year. PhD candidates indicated that they would have liked more detailed long-term planning, and that especially in the fourth year a month-to-month planning would have helped them to finish in time and divide their work better over the final contract year.

PhD candidates have meetings with their daily supervisor (bi-)weekly and an annual meeting with all supervisors. However, PhD candidates indicated that they saw their supervisor on a daily basis in the office. Supervisors also receive supervision focusing on expectation management, which we think is a good innovation to address completion rates. There is no limit regarding the number of PhD candidates that can be supervised by one supervisor – the committee noted with concern that one full professor (co)supervised 13 PhDs.

The PhDs indicated that they perceive some work pressure due to their ambition to be a good scientist, together with some worries about future career possibilities, the pressure to publish and to balance writing with teaching. PhD candidates indicated that this work pressure did slow them down, as did their efforts in teaching, especially when they had never taught a subject or course before. One course (Research Integrity and Responsible Scholarship) is mandatory for all PhD candidates. In addition, PhD candidates can choose courses that fulfil their specific need. For broader training, they are able to attend broader courses, including teaching courses designed for PhD's to help them with their teaching tasks or the University Teaching Qualification (BKO), a course on learning for junior staff on how to teach.

The PhD candidates with whom the committee spoke, mentioned having a PhD representative, together with peer-to-peer meetings where external PhD candidates also participate. The committee did not meet an external PhD and could therefore not interrogate their situation and low (non)completion rates.

Regarding co-authorship, there are no formal rules, but the PhD candidates indicated that they were always first author, and often the daily supervisor, the supervisor whom they met most often, was second author. One PhD candidate interviewed also had a solo paper.

3.7 Research integrity

Research integrity is well attended to. The FSS has appointed two confidential counsellors (one for PhD candidates and one for all personnel) with whom researchers can seek advice, which is very innovative. As mentioned above, the GSSS offers an obligatory course in Research Integrity and Responsible Scholarship, which was developed by one of the staff members from PARIS, who is also chair of the Research Ethics Review Committee. Principal investigators prepare data management plans involving the processing of data. While an expedited ethics review is implemented for minimal risk studies, full ethics reviews are required for all others. Within the FSS the national guidelines for data availability are not yet fully implemented and the self-evaluation report mentions that compliance varies between the five PARIS research groups. However, CPhS is fully committed and is taking a leading role in pushing FSS and PARIS in the direction of open access data. The PARIS programme has written guidelines regarding co-authorship for PhDs, but does not offer formalised guidelines for staff. However, the practice of footnotes explaining the contribution of authors appears to be used.

3.8 Diversity

PARIS is confronted with the usual problem, too few women full professors. All in all, among full professors, 33% are women, whereas 66% of associate professors, 63% of the (tenured) assistant professors and 89% of the untenured postdocs/researchers are women. Therefore, the research programme should consider their future recruitment in order to increase the proportion of women among full professors. Nonetheless, the future looks bright if many associate professors will develop into full professors. There is an alarming over-representation of full professors (6 of 9) who are over 55, but there is a large group between 35 and 55 years of age who can be expected to pick up the slack when professors retire.

There was little discussion in the departmental strategy regarding diversity (gender and ethnicity), apart from: "All selection committees include at least one female member" and "PARIS is quite homogenous in terms of ethnicity...". The self-evaluation report doesn't indicate the number of ethnic members of staff, but it would appear that at least one full professor and one associate professor have ethnic minority backgrounds – both are women and rather unique in the Dutch sociology landscape. An increase of ethnic diversity is reported among PhD candidates. However, Dutch ethnic minorities are not represented.

3.9 Recommendations

1. The research programme is not very clear in how they adapt to new societal developments. There is some sensitivity to new trends, but the programme lacks a clear and straightforward strategy to adopt these new developments in their research groups.

Our recommendation is to have a more explicit and recurring reflection on how new topics can be identified and taken up in the research programme.

2. The committee observed the relatively small size of some groups within the department.

We recommend establishing structures for more systematic exchange between the different groups within the research programme. These structures could stimulate new innovative research among the sociologists from different groups within the research programme counterbalancing potential size issues.

3. The committee misses substantial courses in sociology and sociological theory in the PhD programme.

We recommend to review the PhD training programme and to bring more balance between methods and theory.

4. The committee observed a very low completion rate (within 5 years) of the PhDs.

We recommend developing procedures that improve timely completion and to continuously monitor the PhDs' progress.

5. The department is well aware of the top-heavy age structure among the tenured staff.

We recommend developing a clear strategy to deal with the coming retirement wave.

6. With regard to (mental) well-being, the committee has observed that the department lacks a more preventive policy.

We recommend strengthening a preventive detection system and a more personal approach than the current online questionnaire available to the staff. We also advise to extend attention in this respect beyond potential (mental) health problems among PhDs, but take the whole staff into account in their mental well-being policy.

7. The committee welcomes the new policy to invest in new assistant professors to assure them a 50-50 ratio in teaching/research. We are, however, worried for the current generation of assistant professors who are still employed in the 70-30 system. A potential inequality might arise for this "squeezed generation".

Our recommendation is extending the new policy to all assistant professors and not only the new ones.

4. Erasmus University Rotterdam

4.1 Quantitative assessment

The committee assessed the research programme 'Contemporary Social Problems: The Formation, Governance and Consequences of Public Issues' both quantitatively and qualitatively. For the quantitative assessment a four-point scale is used, according to the standard evaluation protocol 2015-2021. The explanation of the criteria underlying the scores can be found in appendix D.

According to the SEP scoring system, the committee has awarded the following scores to the research programme 'Contemporary Social Problems: The Formation, Governance and Consequences of Public Issues'.

Research quality:	2
Relevance to society:	1
Viability:	2

The qualitative assessment of the programme can be found in the next sections.

4.2 Introduction, strategy and targets

The Sociology programme at Erasmus University Rotterdam (hereinafter referred to as EUR-SOC) is broadly based and characterised as 'Understanding Societal Challenges'. The aim is to consider key sociological questions concerning social inequality, social cohesion and identity formation, and apply them to a range of contemporary societal challenges. The programme values both theoretical and methodological pluralism, and actively bridges the divide between qualitative and quantitative strands of sociological research. Key concerns are to undertake interdisciplinary research and inter-departmental (inter-university) collaboration with a continuing focus on high quality research and societal relevance, undertaking 'sociology that matters'.

Sociology at EUR merged with Public Administration in 2015 to create a combined Department of Public Administration and Sociology (DPAS). The merger has resulted in benefits for EUR-SOC, enabling more collaboration of sociology academics with public administration researchers. This has led to greater success in obtaining research grants and success in undertaking research of societal relevance. EUR-SOC aims to undertake research of societal relevance, which includes a pluralistic publication strategy that values, among others, Dutch language publications, and encourages staff to be involved in public contributions (e.g. through memberships, providing policy advice, and media- and public-sphere participation). Objectives since the 2016 Mid-Term Review included implementing various governance and coordination measures to optimise PhD trajectories, increasing staff diversity and taking steps to maximise viability.

4.3 Research quality

EUR-SOC research is of a very high quality. It addresses five main themes: families; migration and ethnic relations; political attitudes and behaviours; the changing nature of welfare institutions; and work and organisations. Each research theme addresses the impact of societal changes and focuses on issues of societal and policy relevance. The five selected key publications exemplify each of the five main themes, the methodological pluralism and interdisciplinary work of EUR-SOC.

EUR-SOC aims to focus on quality rather than quantity of articles. Among the 189 English publications in WoS journals published during the audit period 34 articles (18%) were in the top 10% of journals and 67 articles (36%) in the top 25%. These publications represent about 1.3 top-10% articles per research FTE (total research staff) and 2.6 top-25% articles per research FTE (total research staff) between 2013 and 2018 (see appendix E). The high level of publications in non-sociology journals is noteworthy (73% of 220 peer reviewed articles covered in Scopus) and highlights the strong emphasis on interdisciplinary research.

In addition, to peer-reviewed articles, 24 non-Dutch books (including edited volumes) and 97 book chapters were published, many with highly internationally recognised publishers (among them MIT, Cambridge University Press, Cornell University Press, NYU University Press, Routledge, Wiley, Sage). The pluralistic publication strategy also emphasises Dutch language publications: 60 peer-reviewed articles, 10 monographs/edited books and 22 book chapters over the review period. Thus, EUR-SOC has a stronger emphasis on publications in Dutch and publishing monographs and edited books than most research programmes reviewed. This aligns well with their strong focus on policy advice.

EUR-SOC has been very successful at grant capture, especially by mid-career staff. Over the review period, the programme members have obtained an impressive array of highly competitive grants, including three NWO-Veni and three NWO-Vidi grants, and high value ERC Starting and Advanced Grants. They have successful international collaborations, evidenced by NWO-ORA and EU FP7 grants. EUR-SOC has also been successful in obtaining EUR Fellowships and EUR/Strategic investments, increasing the programme's amount of direct funding. Between 2013 and 2018, the scientific staff acquired, on average, funds for 2.2 FTE research staff (see appendix E).

Many of the associate/full professors are highly recognised nationally and internationally, and some have received international and national awards. Programme members are active on editorial boards of international journals and as members of Dutch and European Academies, together with national scientific boards and public organisations. Programme members have given numerous international keynote lectures and are widely involved in research collaborations with non-EUR scholars and interdisciplinary research consortia.

EUR-SOC actively contributes to the Dutch social science data infrastructure, by managing ODISSEI, through which social science researchers have access to large-scale, longitudinal data collections connected to registrations from Statistics Netherlands (CBS).

4.4 Societal relevance

EUR-SOC makes an outstanding contribution to society through undertaking and disseminating societally relevant research: their strategic aim is to have societal impact embedded within all staff levels. Programme members are active in giving policy advice to government and semi-government organisations, providing reports informing policy making, through non-academic (Dutch) publications and media contributions. The joint department with public administration scholars offers unique opportunities for creating a societal impact with research.

EUR-SOC has founded two Rotterdam knowledge-labs, one on urban big data and the other on liveable neighbourhoods, and actively participates in a third Rotterdam knowledge-lab on urban labour markets. These knowledge-labs hold regular meetings between researchers, policy-makers and professionals. EUR-SOC is also involved in the Erasmus Institute for Public Knowledge (EIPK), which involves collaborations with ministries and local government, as well as research institutes outside academia, demonstrating fruitful and important exchange with politics, society, and citizens. These initiatives involve active engagement of scientific staff with a range of users and stakeholders in the co-creation of research.

Examples of research by members of EUR-SOC with a substantial societal impact include (1) a research report on the labour-market consequences of new technological developments, which informed government policies on innovation, life-long learning, work and income; (2) research as part of the BOLD Cities programme which produced an awareness tool developed to investigate citizen's knowledge, privacy concerns and behaviour regarding the 'datafication' of public spaces. This online 'game' has been extensively played by non-academic audiences and received very widespread media attention; and (3) the editorship of *De Correspondent*, which is an online journalistic medium with over 60,000 subscribers in the Netherlands and encourages active collaboration between readers and authors, generating extensive social media and live (online) discussions.

Research by EUR-SOC has generated considerable media attention through Dutch newspapers, public broadcasts, and online blogs. Examples include research on parenting becoming front-page news and being discussed on national television and various news programmes. In summary, the committee was impressed by the very active engagement of EUR-SOC scientific staff in ensuring that their scientific knowledge has an influence outside academia: they use reports, media appearances, a digital forum for policy makers and professionals, articles in professional journals, public lectures, and provide policy advice to ministries and local governments.

4.5 Viability

The committee was concerned to see a decrease in scientific staff from 8.7 FTE in 2013 to 6.2 FTE in 2018; a trajectory that differs from other sociology programmes reviewed. The committee learned that this was due to a decline in the level of direct funding per student

and the EUR university allocation model which is heavily dependent on student numbers. In contrast, over the same period, there was a substantial increase in postdocs/non-tenured staff – from 4.2 FTE (n=10) in 2013 to 10.95 FTE (n=21) in 2018 – reflecting the programme's success in grant capture.

EUR-SOC has clear and carefully considered strategies regarding viability, which is especially important given that a number of key staff is over age 60. The future strategy includes that five mid-career staff have recently started to draft a new sociology research programme. In addition, there is current involvement of mid-career staff in activities to foster governance and leadership skills. EUR-SOC mid-career researchers have a high success rate in securing research grants and are likely to be well placed to take on greater management roles within EUR-SOC.

The merger with Public Administration in 2015 to form DPAS is positive in terms of ensuring future viability, in particular it enables a greater diversification of research funding (especially from contract research) and more collaborative research. EUR-SOC appears well managed, with clear management structures in place and effective annual P&D assessments with all academic staff. The SWOT analysis by EUR-SOC is very thoughtful, and includes that one of their strengths is the pluralism of research topics and approaches. This enables quick reaction to changing funding priorities and societal challenges. Thus, the focus of EUR-SOC on societal relevance, interdisciplinary research and research collaborations nationally and internationally is a strength, which enhances their viability.

4.6 PhD programme

In the period 2010–2014, 16 PhD candidates (internal and contract) began their PhD project at EUR-SOC. In 2018, ten PhD candidates were hired, which reflects the high success rate in obtaining funding from various grants. Most PhD candidates from 2010–2014 completed their PhD in six (69%) or seven (94%) years. In 2016, EUR-SOC implemented various new measures to optimise PhD trajectories and ensure timely completion. PhD candidates write a PhD trajectory plan two months after the start of their programme, which is approved by the supervisors, promotor and research director. At nine months, the PhD candidate meets with the supervisory team to discuss his/her research project paper. After 18 months, a 'go/no go' decision is made, based on results up to that moment. In future, this will be moved to 12 months, with annual P&D meetings with their promotor and supervisors in the remaining years.

Every PhD candidate has at least two supervisors, and can choose to write their dissertation as a monograph or a series of articles. PhD candidates interviewed indicated that they met their supervisor (bi-)weekly for a formal meeting, or had a loose style, where they saw each other daily at the office. PhD candidates are embedded in one of the research lines of the programme, which have monthly meetings where work in progress is discussed and the PhD candidates present their work. PhDs are automatically enrolled in the EGSH where they follow a tailor-made training programme. Additionally, PhDs present their work in progress at annual PhD meetings where all PhD candidates and staff are present. Regarding authorship, PhD candidates indicated that supervisors did not require to be named as co-author, nor did PhDs perceive any pressure to do so. They were also

not aware of formal rules about this or the use of footnotes to specify co-author contributions.

All PhD candidates indicated that they did not perceive much work pressure, and that there are opportunities to go to a counsellor (who introduced themselves to all new PhD candidates), with whom the PhD candidate can have five sessions to address a problem. One PhD candidate spoke from experience and was very satisfied. The committee was pleased to hear that there are initiatives for PhD wellbeing, such as a buddy program and a PhD council, and activities such as a play about harassment.

4.7 Research integrity

EUR-SOC pays excellent attention to issues of research integrity and all aspects of ethics associated with academic staff and PhD research. Issues of research integrity are discussed at PhD assessments and with scientific staff at annual P&D assessments. There is a DPAS Ethics Review Committee of six members, which provides advice about ethical issues, as well as reviewing integrity aspects of research grant applications and PhD research proposals prior to the start of data collection. A data-management plan must be put in place in all cases where data is collected or used.

The formal and informal mechanisms at EUR-SOC provide a strong basis for the integrity of their research. PhD candidates undertake a compulsory integrity course. There are clear policies for data safety and storage. When confronted with specific problems or questions concerning integrity, staff members can consult a dedicated Erasmus School of Social and Behavioural Sciences (ESSB) integrity-coordinator. EUR-SOC promotes research integrity and open-science practices by securely storing data, software codes, protocols, research material and corresponding metadata. There is a Privacy Officer within each EUR School.

4.8 Diversity

The proportion of scientific staff who are women is low, 22% in 2018 (up from 15% in 2013). This contrasts with 75% women among postdocs and non-tenured staff and 70% among PhD candidates. EUR-SOC should more actively pursue their strategic goal to increase the proportion of women among all levels of scientific staff. The age profile of staff has become more 'top heavy' over the review period, from 24% age 55+ in 2013 to 43% in 2018. EUR-SOC will need to take active steps to ensure the future success of the programme following predicted retirements over the next 5 years.

The committee was impressed that a strategic goal of EUR-SOC is to increase staff diversity regarding ethnicity, focusing on Dutch with a migrant background. All hiring committees are gender and, if possible, ethnically diverse. There is a Diversity Officer in ESSB, who through a taskforce has formulated a recently implemented diversity and inclusion plan. This includes implicit-bias training and guidelines to ensure that recruitment and selection is 'equality-proof'. EUR-SOC also pays attention to strategies to recruit and support first-generation students and scientific staff, and this is recognised as a continuing goal.

4.9 Recommendations

1. EUR-SOC has a strong belief in its philosophy to do 'sociology that matters'. The committee highly appreciates this strong vision and the excellent translation of this into societal impact. However, the committee feels that visibility in the larger sociological community is also important. There seems far less attention in Rotterdam to play this visible role in sociology on the international forum.

Our recommendation is to cultivate (international) visibility in the sociology discipline. One possible strategy might be to reconsider the specialised publication strategy (73% in non-sociology journals) and give more attention to general sociology journals. This also relates to the following recommendation to help junior staff members to publish in these outlets.

2. The committee appreciates the philosophy of the management and the senior staff to do 'sociology that matters'. However, a consequence of this policy is that Rotterdam may give less attention to the competitiveness of their PhDs and postdocs on the Dutch and the international market. Even though Rotterdam values the principle of societally relevant research, the junior staff face an outside world that still heavily stresses a publication culture based on (non-Dutch) journal articles.

Our recommendation is to stay close to your philosophy but still help PhDs and postdocs to be competitive in academia outside Rotterdam. More specifically, junior staff members ask for more guidance regarding publishing in internationally leading journals or in high ranked books. In addition, we recommend reconsideration of the points system for publications as this still has a strong focus on quantity and shows several limitations.

3. EUR-SOC is excellent in attracting external funds from the EU and the NWO. Despite this success, this does not translate into a more substantial direct funding. The internal allocation model relies heavily on student numbers and the smaller size of the department within the university jeopardises the direct funding. It would be highly desirable to have an allocation model in which research efforts and the societal relevance of the research are weighted more heavily.

We recommend that the university board at Rotterdam develops sensitivity towards the unbalance between direct funding based on student numbers and research excellence. We advise the board to take some indicator of research output (grants/FTE or publications/FTE) into account when calculating the direct funding of their faculties or departments.

4. The committee observed an inequality between PhD candidates coming from a research master and those not having this background. Even though both groups of PhD candidates have an equal amount of time to finish their PhD, the students without a research master need to do 30 ECTS in the PhD programme compared to only 10 ECTS when coming from a research master.

We recommend *revising the PhD programme requirements in such a way that both groups have an equal amount of ECTS to fulfil. We leave it up to the programme to decide whether they want to increase or decrease the number of ECTS required.*

5. The committee found it striking that none of the (three) assistant professors interviewed were supervising a PhD candidate.

Our recommendation is *that PhD supervision should be a standard (and formalised) element in the CV of each assistant professor and preferably also for each postdoc.*

6. The PhD completion time has been addressed within the department's policy. The committee highly appreciates the efforts taken to ensure timely PhD completion.

We recommend *to continue the current efforts and continuously monitor PhD progress and completion times.*

5. Utrecht University

5.1 Quantitative assessment

The committee assessed the research programme 'Social Networks, Solidarity, and Inequality Research' both quantitatively and qualitatively. For the quantitative assessment a four-point scale is used, according to the standard evaluation protocol 2015-2021. The explanation of the criteria underlying the scores can be found in appendix D.

According to the SEP scoring system, the committee has awarded the following scores to the research programme 'Social Networks, Solidarity, and Inequality Research'.

Research quality:	1
Relevance to society:	2
Viability:	2

The qualitative assessment of the programme can be found in the next sections.

5.2 Introduction, strategy and targets

The research programme 'Social Networks, Solidarity, and Inequality' is embedded in the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences at Utrecht University (UU) and belongs to the Behaviour in Social Contexts research priority area. The main strategy of the research programme is to develop different research lines based on a common core. The common core consists of a mutual understanding to aim at innovative, high-quality, theory-driven research as well as shared theoretical and methodological foundations. Theories are typically, but not exclusively, tested and developed by the use of rigorous quantitative methods such as for the analysis of longitudinal, social network and experimental data. Based on that common core, the main research lines are developed along the following six themes: (1) cooperation in social and economic relations, (2) cultural diversity and ethnic relations, (3) families and employment, (4) immigration, (5) social stratification and inequality, and (6) computational sociology.

For the evaluation period under consideration, the members of the research programme have targeted to establish a leading position in the strategic theme 'Institutions for Open Societies' at UU, to acquire prestigious NWO and European funding, to foster collaboration with colleagues from other disciplines, international partners, and societal stakeholders, to increase outreach activities, and to provide excellent training and support for research master and PhD candidates. In line with that, the specific objectives for the next decade are mainly to further strengthen these activities.

5.3 Research quality

The programme conducts original quantitative and experimental research with excellent quality in a number of interlocking areas, well integrated among them. The coherence encourages cross-line collaborations as documented by various co-authorships across the research lines. The five key publications submitted are very strong examples of their scientific publications in general and highlight that each of the research lines produces outstanding academic contributions of high societal relevance.

The research programme has specialised on non-Dutch language articles in peer-reviewed journals. The output in terms of quality and quantity is impressive. Among the 533 English WoS journal articles published during the audit period 92 articles (17%) were in the top 10% of journals and 222 articles (40%) in the top 25% journals. These shares account for about 3.0 top-10% articles per research FTE (total research staff) and 6.9 top-25% articles per research FTE (total research staff) between 2013 and 2018 (see appendix E). In addition, staff members contributed to the construction of 22 data sets and 25 experiments. Open access is strongly supported and UU participated in DANS' advisory board. In line with the chosen strategy, the number of academic publications in Dutch – which was already on a low level in the last evaluation period – further declined between 2013 and 2018. The committee highly appreciates the department strategy to mainly publish in highly ranked journals and is impressed by the output. However, in order to set the research agenda and take a world-leading role, a diversified strategy including more monographs, edited volumes/special issues and review articles might be helpful to further increase impact.

Many researchers involved in the research programme are highly cited and received various awards. Each research line is led by an outstanding, internationally well-known scholar. Most of the senior staff members either have been editors of a journal or book series or sit on an editorial board. Many are members of scientific committees, elected to learned societies, are active in international research organisations, and are jury members in funding organisations. Members of staff have a sizeable number of invited keynotes and lectures. Plenty of marks of recognition can be also found for mid-level career researchers who are already often very highly cited and provide services to the scientific communities by memberships in editorial boards and boards of professional organisations.

The programme has been highly successful in acquiring external funding resulting in a still relatively healthy ratio between direct funding and external/other funding. Successful funding applications both concern individual initiatives as well as team applications and interdisciplinary research. Overall, the scientific staff acquired, on average, funds for 2.2 FTE research staff between 2013 and 2018 (see appendix E). The acquiring of 3 ERC grants and of in total 6 Veni, Vidi, Vici grants from NWO is particularly remarkable. Furthermore, the researchers serve on various boards of professional organisation and editorial boards of top journals further documenting their international reputation and networks. What is promising for the future is that the research quality is driven by many contributors, which makes it likely that the research programme will be able to sustain and maybe even extend its excellent output in the future.

5.4 Societal relevance

The overall focus of the research programme on topics of solidarity and inequality is of high societal relevance as is the strong involvement of programme members in the strategic themes of UU 'Institutions for Open Societies' and 'Dynamics of Youth'. While programme members are not formally involved in the UU strategic theme 'Sustainability', they also conduct related research on climate change and energy consumption. The overall high societal relevance of the research programme is corroborated further by the five key examples reported in the self-evaluation: (1) attitudes towards commemoration, (2) immigration and religion, (3) workforce sustainability, (4) gender discrimination in labour markets, (5) citizen-based initiatives. These examples show that the research programme makes important and significant contributions to societal problems in a wide range of areas.

As compared to the last evaluation period, the programme members have substantially extended their outreach activities. Research projects with a focus on policy making at the national and European level – such as on gender equality, migration, and workforce sustainability – are increasingly conducted. Furthermore, the programme has a long list of societal collaborations ranging from the international to the municipal level, which witnesses the programme's societal relevance and impact. While the programme concentrates its energies on international publishing, it nonetheless has produced a considerable number of professional publications, policy reports, publications for the general public, press media, and invited lectures/workshops. In this vein, the programme aims to increase its involvement in the gravitation award 'Sustainable Cooperation for a Resilient Society' (SCOOP) for the next period.

Moreover, interesting outreach activities have been implemented and developed more recently in the department. Thematic hubs such as 'The Future of Work Hub' and 'The Future of Citizen-Based Initiatives' aim to be an interface with society and to bring researchers from different disciplines and societal partners together. The committee likes the HUBS' ambition to reach out to society. This is an example in the department that could be taken up by the other groups. The recently introduced position of an impact manager is another innovation, which has the potential to further increase societal impact by connecting researchers and stakeholders and facilitate the exchange of ideas. The committee appreciates the position of the 'impact manager' in the department. It is a remarkable innovation to help staff members reach out to society in different ways. However, the committee has the impression that the task definition of the manager is not yet optimised. To sum up, these measures can help to overcome a one-sided sending model from academics to society and can foster processes of co-creation. These more recent activities with respect to co-creation and citizen-based science appear very promising. They should be continued and strengthened in the future by developing them further, putting them on a more stable institutional basis, and linking them with a programme-wide outreach strategy.

5.5 Viability

The SWOT analysis clearly depicts the key strengths of the research programme, chief among them a coherent programme with a common core, impressive publication output in terms of quality and quantity in international journals, and high success rate in the competition for prestigious funding at the national and European level. Interviews with staff members at different career levels further revealed the highly supportive and cooperative atmosphere among the staff as another key asset of the department. Furthermore, the sociology programme has acquired a central role in two of Utrecht University's four university-wide strategic themes, which significantly boosts its viability.

The sociology programme is using recruitment offensively. Viability was considerably enhanced with the appointments of four promising mid-career associate professors with excellent track records and a new full professor to replace the leader of the research line 'Cultural diversity and ethnic relations' who will retire in 2022. The future flourishing of all six research lines is thus secured with excellent and well-known leaders as well as very promising and highly productive mid-level and early career staff in all areas. The research programme is a forerunner in computational Sociology in the Netherlands being the first to establish a separate research line for this nascent and important field. These efforts should be continued and strengthened in the future. The research programme also puts a particular emphasis on interdisciplinary research to advance knowledge. A plan to strengthen the networks and collaboration across disciplines within the UU reduces vulnerability to external and internal threats and improves viability.

The SWOT analysis mainly points to external threats such as dependence upon Bachelor student intake due to lump sum funding, the increasingly fierce competition for second stream funding, and developments affecting Sociology in the Netherlands in general. The committee observed that the Utrecht staff had little critical self-reflection on potential internal problems or weaknesses. We do agree that the outside pressure can make life in the department difficult and our rating on viability highlights that these external uncertainties might negatively affect viability (see general recommendations). At the same time, the committee is not convinced that there is no room for improvement by internal measures. This point was clearly visible when discussing the relatively low number of sociology students. Societal trends do play a role here but also faculty policies are possible to turn the tide.

5.6 PhD Programme

Utrecht University cooperates with the University of Groningen, Radboud University and the University of Amsterdam in the ICS graduate training programme. This programme is elaborated in chapter 9.

In Utrecht, 18 of 26 PhDs have finished their trajectory after four years, which is a very good completion rate. The PhD programme is characterised by close supervision by a daily supervisor and a promotor. The frequency of supervision is dependent on the stage of the PhDs, with more frequent supervision at the start of the PhD trajectory, and less frequent supervision as the PhD project progresses. The PhDs are very satisfied with their PhD programme. Many PhD candidates have published papers in international peer-reviewed

journals during their qualification phase, and many have their first job after completion of the programme within academia. These achievements highlight both the strong research orientation of the programme as well as the excellent reputation within academia.

5.7 Research integrity

All necessary measures are in place. A Faculty Ethics Review Board, a Protocol on Research Data and a Committee on Academic Integrity were installed in 2014. Research involving human subjects is submitted to the Faculty Ethics Review Board for ethical approval. The Faculty Protocol on Research Data guides collection, processing and storage of research data. In line with recent European privacy legislation, new empirical studies are required to make a Data Management Plan (DMP). The Committee on Academic Integrity and Data Protection Officers check for adherence to these protocols. The faculty possesses state-of-the-art facilities to store highly sensitive research data. Educational programmes at the Research Master and PhD level contain mandatory modules on research integrity, ethics, and data management. Furthermore, informal mechanisms to secure research integrity are implemented, chief among them a close supervision by and collaboration with different scholars.

5.8 Diversity

In general, UU devotes a lot of attention to issues of diversity including a task force, a prize for outstanding diversity activities, a buddy system, participation in a NWO programme for PhD candidates with refugee status, and, very recently, a large-scale education innovation project on the development of an inclusive curriculum.

With respect to gender, the research programme performs well as compared to the other programmes under assessment. Women hold 42% of the tenured positions and 39% of non-tenured positions. Notably, 50% of the associate professors in 2018 were female. However, continued efforts are needed at the level of full professor to secure gender balance. In 2013, the percentage of females amounted to 33%, but reduced to 17% in 2018 due to the hiring of a new male professor and the departure of a female professor.

With respect to age, the research programme has a healthy balance. The department consists of a critical number of established senior scholars, highly productive researchers in mid-level career, and very promising assistant professors and postdocs.

While the research programme hosts a large number of international scholars from across the globe, similar to other sociology programmes in the Netherlands (see general recommendations), less attention is devoted to Dutch students with an ethnic minority background.

5.9 Recommendations

1. The committee highly appreciates the departmental strategy to mainly publish in highly ranked journals. In order to set the research agenda and take a leading role, a diversified strategy might be helpful.

We recommend considering to use different publication formats such as books, special issues, or review papers.

2. The committee appreciates the position of the ‘impact manager’ in the department. It is an innovation to help staff members reaching out to society in different ways. However, we have the impression that the task definition of the manager is not yet optimised.

We recommend strengthening the function of the manager in order to fully utilize its unique expertise on how to integrate impact and valorisation in the scientific work of all staff members.

3. The committee likes the HUBs’ ambition to reach out to society.

We recommend to guard that the HUBs firmly integrate in all research groups in order to stimulate the co-creation processes throughout the whole department.

6. University of Groningen

6.1 Quantitative assessment

The committee assessed the research programme 'Social Networks, Solidarity, and Inequality Research' both quantitatively and qualitatively. For the quantitative assessment a four-point scale is used, according to the standard evaluation protocol 2015-2021. The explanation of the criteria underlying the scores can be found in appendix D.

According to the SEP scoring system, the committee has awarded the following scores to the research programme 'Social Networks, Solidarity, and Inequality Research'.

Research quality:	1
Relevance to society:	2
Viability:	2

The qualitative assessment of the programme can be found in the next sections.

6.2 Introduction, strategy and targets

The research programme 'Social Networks, Solidarity and Inequality' is embedded in the Department of Sociology at the Faculty of Behavioural and Social Sciences. The programme consists of 5 thematic clusters: (1) Social Development of Young People, (2) Family, Life Course and Ageing, (3) Sustainable Cooperation, Institutions, and Organisations, (4) Norms and Networks, and (5) Statistical Methods for the Analysis of Social Network Data.

The programme plays an internationally acknowledged leading role in the development of theoretical micro-foundations, model-building, and (social network) methodology for the study of complex social phenomena. This focus on social mechanism explanations constitutes the common core of the five clusters, which are oriented to the development of evidence-based solutions to societal problems in collaboration with external stakeholders, institutional frameworks like SCOOP, and intervention programmes like GRIP&GLANS and KiVa (see paragraph 6.4).

A key strategy of the research programme for the future is to strengthen its internal structure by increasing intergroup collaboration, developing interdisciplinary collaborations, attracting competitive international students, and seeking opportunities for EU funding through international consortia. Additionally, the research programme intends to lead the development of SCOOP and its focus on mixed methods research, in collaboration with the university's Sustainable Society programme.

6.3 Research quality

The research quality of the programme is outstanding: 339 articles in international journals, 62 of which (18%) were published in top 10% journals and 179 (53%) in top 25% journals (WoS). The productivity per research FTE (total research staff) is also remarkable: 2.6 papers in the top 10% and 7.6 in the top 25% on average between 2013 and 2018 (see appendix E).

The scientific relevance of this research output can be assessed by looking at the citation record: the research staff generated 19,000 citations in Scopus and 46,000 citations in Google Scholar. In addition, two of the ten most cited sociological articles worldwide in 2010-2014 were written by faculty from the programme.

The key publications reported by the programme show a wide range of international collaborations in sociological methodology, interdisciplinary journals, social psychology, and organisational theory. The committee believes that this international recognition and transdisciplinary contributions could be anchored in a stronger strategy of contributing to substantive sociological journals, publishing monographs or special topics aimed at setting the sociological agenda.

Other strengths of the programme during the period have been its capacity to obtain funds either by research grants or contract research. Quoting the self-evaluation report: "In the previous period 2007-2012, the Department acquired 40 grants amounting to 6.6 M€ (...). In the current period 2013-2018, the Department acquired 50 grants (21 NWO, 3 ZonMW, 3 EU, 4 Government, 12 private/public organisations, 7 from the Faculty or University Board), amounting to 9.6M€." Between 2013 and 2018, the scientific staff acquired, on average, funds for 2.0 FTE research staff (see appendix E).

The teaching and research infrastructure are also assessed positively, especially the SocioQuest framework which provides access to intervention programmes within schools, municipalities and the society at large following an open data philosophy. The data collected by research projects within the programme are shared through the DANS service.

6.4 Societal relevance

Societal relevance is a core principle in the research programme and the self-evaluation report contains many examples indicating how the programme contributes to the development of evidence-based solutions to societal problems. The societal relevance of the programme is achieved through institutional collaborations, intervention programmes, and media coverage of the research outputs. The cluster (1) 'Social Development of Young People' conducts the KiVa anti-bullying project (implemented by more than 300 schools), a clear example of application of basic research to societal problems. This programme fosters collaborations with parents, schools, and the Youth Institute, among other stakeholders.

The cluster (2) 'Family, Life Course and Ageing' explores the interaction between social networks, ageing, and health through GRIP&GLANS (www.gripenglans.nl) interventions, which support older adults in strengthening their self-management skills (GRIP) and well-being (GLANS) which are now applied at the national level.

The cluster (3) 'Sustainable Cooperation, Institutions, and Organisations' studies the institutional conditions and related social mechanisms that sustain or undermine cooperation at the level of groups, organisations, societal sectors, and (across) nations. The research is not limited to the Netherlands but also includes Europe and other regions.

The cluster (4) 'Norms and Networks' is currently engaged in a project funded by Top Sectors policy, which is aimed to enhance sustainability at the neighbourhood level, helping people to organise themselves collectively into owners' associations in order to achieve an energy neutral city.

Finally, the cluster (5) 'Statistical Methods for the Analysis of Social Network Data' includes the software SIENA, a world acknowledged package in R for the study of longitudinal network data, which is accompanied by teaching manuals and application papers that have been cited many thousands of times.

All these achievements are accompanied by an active presence on the media and collaborations with Public Administration (reports for the Ministry of Education, Ministry of Justice, and European Commission), teacher manuals to tackle bullying, training of professionals (e.g. social and health care professionals), and memberships in scientific advisory councils of civil society organisations.

This societal impact may be further developed in the future through new co-creation programs and promoting the greater active participation of junior staff and graduate students in impact generation.

6.5 Viability

The SWOT-analysis presents a realistic account of both strengths and weaknesses. The programme enjoys a high level of permanent staff and direct funding (63%). In this regard, the number of tenured faculty increased from 16 in 2013 to 20 in 2018 (or 5.1 and 6.5 research FTE, respectively) and the number of non-tenured staff decreased from 9 to 7 (four postdocs and three non-tenured assistant professors), while the number of PhD candidates has been quite stable, ranging between 25 and 29 (with 30% bursary students). One strategy of the department is to recruit at the level of assistant professors, in order to keep a balance between junior and senior staff.

The committee encourages the programme to actively explore new areas of sociological research in which staff have special expertise like computational social science, among others. These strategic choices could contribute to strengthening the programme's future viability.

6.6 PhD programme

University of Groningen cooperates with the Utrecht University, Radboud University and the University of Amsterdam in the ICS graduate training programme. This programme is elaborated in chapter 9.

Generally, the PhDs of the sociology department are very satisfied with their PhD programme. They feel they get sufficient autonomy in their projects and good supervision, adapted to the needs of the PhDs. The PhD completion rate at the University of Groningen is very good, with 80% of PhDs defending their dissertations within five years. However, the PhD candidates miss contact between the different clusters and would like to see more formalised exchange between the clusters.

The University of Groningen currently participates in a national experiment with bursary PhD students. Only Research Master graduates were hired as bursary PhDs to ensure quality. In the sociology department, bursary PhDs do not have to teach, but can teach if they desire to do so.

In all other respects, bursary PhDs are treated the same as regular employee PhDs: supervisors do not make distinctions between types of PhDs. Bursary PhDs are also enrolled in the ICS and follow the same course programme as regularly employed PhDs. Bursary students appreciate the opportunity to undertake research on topics they otherwise would not have been able to do, and accept lower incomes in exchange, but lack the social security that employed PhDs enjoy.

6.7 Research integrity

Research integrity and ethics concerns are addressed by the existence of an ethics committee at the programme level, and also by the everyday example of experienced researchers. The programme complies with the European Regulation on Personal Data Protection (GRPD) and the national code of conduct for scientific practice. The programme has appointed a data management coordinator who stimulates and safeguards that the scientific staff and PhD candidates handle their data in a responsible way. In addition, the Open Science Policy is promoted with clear guidelines for documenting and sharing research data with secure repositories.

6.8 Diversity

The Department of Sociology has recruited international research staff in the period 2013-2018: German (2), Italian (1), Hungarian (1), Singaporean (1), and Turkish (1). One limitation of the hiring policy is that candidates must be able to teach in Dutch, because the regular program is taught in Dutch. Only the Research Master is taught in English. The gender balance in the programme is biased (11 females, 14 males): Women represent just 40% of tenured staff while they are slightly overrepresented among younger non-tenured staff (86%) and among PhD candidates (59%). The programme is aware of this situation and it may provide a policy for achieving gender equity in the near future. However, there is no current policy for recruiting more staff and PhDs with a minority ethnic Dutch background.

6.9 Recommendations

1. The department is very effective in publishing journal articles in highly ranked, internationally peer-reviewed journals. Often, the staff members thereby choose for excellent quality, but also very specialised outlets. The committee feels that visibility in the larger sociological community is also not to be underestimated. The philosophy to undertake interdisciplinary work is highly appreciated but the committee does feel that the core discipline should not be forgotten. There is far less attention in Groningen to playing a visible role in sociology on the international forum outside their specialised domains.

Our recommendation is to cultivate (international) visibility in the sociology discipline. One possible strategy might be to move the specialised publication strategy into a more balanced profile with more attention to general sociology journals.

2. The committee highly appreciates the department strategy to mainly publish in highly ranked specialised journals. In order to set the sociological research agenda and take a leading role, a more diversified strategy might be helpful.

We recommend considering greater use of different publication formats such as books, special issues, or review papers.

3. The committee received insight about some excellent examples of valorising and co-creating academic research to the wider society. On the other hand, the impression remains that the focus on valorisation is not a department wide endeavour.

Our recommendation is to spread the valorisation of research more widely across all clusters in the department and across all levels of the staff.

4. The committee observed some possible lack of clarity about future teaching of the junior staff. Not all staff members interviewed knew what courses they would continue to teach or the new courses that would need to be developed in the near future.

We recommend to write reliable plans in consultation with all staff members about their teaching load and the specific courses to be continued, discontinued or planned for a 2-3 year period. At least a substantial core of the teaching assignment should be stable over this period.

5. The committee observed a great appreciation among PhDs on the organisation in clusters in the PhD training. However, PhDs would like to have more formalised contact moments with the other clusters on the PhD level.

We recommend to establish structures for more systematic exchange between the clusters. These structures could also stimulate new innovative research among the sociologists from different clusters within the department.

6. With regard to the experiment of bursary students, the committee found a great respect from the part of the department to integrate the PhDs in the department while at the same time respecting their freedom to develop their own research theme and the absence of teaching obligations. Nevertheless, serious issues in labour conditions, outside of the responsibility of the departmental management, are inherent for bursary PhD students. The lower wage could be a price to be paid for the greater academic freedom but the committee sees no reason for the blunt lack of social security protection these bursaries are facing.

We recommend to look systematically into the advantages and disadvantages of the "bursary system" and to document the necessary changes this system needs in order to better balance out the academic freedom with the working conditions of these PhDs. At the same time, we recommend the department to continue their current approach towards these bursary PhDs as this shows a great respect to the people in this position.

7. University of Amsterdam

7.1 Quantitative assessment

The committee assessed the research programme 'Political and institutional dynamics of culture, inequality and citizenship' both quantitatively and qualitatively. For the quantitative assessment a four-point scale is used, according to the standard evaluation protocol 2015-2021. The explanation of the criteria underlying the scores can be found in appendix D.

According to the SEP scoring system, the committee has awarded the following scores to the research programme 'Political and institutional dynamics of culture, inequality and citizenship':

Research quality:	1
Relevance to society:	2
Viability:	2

The qualitative assessment of the programme can be found in the next sections.

7.2 Introduction, strategy and targets

The research programme 'Political and institutional dynamics of culture, inequality and citizenship' is embedded in the Amsterdam Institute for Social Science Research (AISSR), which encompasses research in anthropology, political science, sociology, and human geography, planning and international development studies.

The sociology department consists of three research groups: (a) Cultural sociology (CULSOC), focusing on dynamics of culture as crucial foundation of human social life; (b) Institutions, Inequality and the Life Course (IIL), examining how institutions develop and change and how they affect inequality and life courses and (c) Political Sociology (PolSoc), addressing issues of power, place and difference, investigating how contemporary inequalities and global power differentials shape specific local contexts.

The large size of the programme and its internal diversity in terms of research specialisations and methodological approaches is an important strategical resource. The programme's mission is to generate innovative, high quality, and theoretically grounded empirical research on a number of core analytical foci of the discipline: culture, inequality and citizenship. It aims at academic leadership in the discipline by bringing together a wide array of theoretical and methodological approaches and different styles of sociology.

7.3 Research quality

The quality and scientific relevance of the research programme and of the researchers are excellent. The research programme shows balanced competences on both rigorous empirical research and the capacity to produce sound interpretations and theory. Within the Netherlands and compared to other European countries, the research programme is very large with 37 professors (full, associate, and tenured/tenure-track assistant professors). The programme is internationally highly visible and recognised. The research is of a high quality and cutting-edge, and the range of topics covered by the programme is very broad. The commitment to public sociology and to critical sociology is important and a good resource for the interaction with societal problems and stakeholders in society.

Publication activity is very strong with respect to both quantity and quality. Among the 396 English publications in WoS journals published during the audit period, 75 articles (19%) were in the top 10% of journals and 171 articles (43%) in the top 25% of the relevant research field. These shares account for about 4.2 top 25% articles per research FTE (total research staff) and 1.8 top 10% articles per research FTE (total research staff) between 2013 and 2018 (see appendix E). It is worth mentioning that among the top journals, the research programme succeeded to publish, are five articles in *American Journal of Sociology*/*American Sociological Review* and 18 in *European Sociological Review*. Moreover, the programme has published 14 non-Dutch books with highly internationally recognised publishers and 39 edited volumes, including 18 special issues as guest editors of recognised international journals.

UvA sociologists have a very high national and international reputation. They are well represented in national and international scientific bodies, editorial boards of international journals, as well as in various national scientific boards and advisory boards of ministries and local advisory and governmental bodies. Several researchers involved in the research programme are highly cited, while other staff members perform less well with respect to citation indicators. As compared to the previous evaluation period, this heterogeneity in performance is less pronounced.

Between 2013 and 2018, the scientific staff acquired, on average, funds for 1.8 FTE research staff (see appendix E). The budget of the department has increased considerably since 2016, mainly owing to successful grant applications. Whereas the direct funding increased only by 4.2 FTE (4%) between 2013 and 2018, research grant funding increased by 104% (from 12.8 to 26.0 FTE). The relationship between direct and research grant funding changed from 30% resp. 37% (2013) to 26% resp. 46% (2018). These developments have resulted mainly in an increase in postdoc and non-tenured assistant professorship positions. Programme members were awarded with prestigious research grants. The acquisition of three ERC grants is particularly remarkable as is the number of NWO Veni, Vidi, Vici grants (n=10) and the participation in international collaboration for several Norface and EU Horizon 2020 grants. The high and increasing number of the research grants is a very good sign, even if it may produce difficulties with the allocation of time of some programme members.

7.4 Societal relevance

The research programme shows a strong commitment to society, stakeholders and institutions. The self-evaluation report explicitly underlines the importance of the relations with Amsterdam as a city that is attractive, a centre for international intellectual exchange and a place open to social innovations.

The research programme is very active in the dissemination of their scientific knowledge outside academia. However, the initiatives to co-create research opportunities in collaboration with societal stakeholders are rather limited.

The self-evaluation report highlights activities in three areas:

- *Critical sociology*: teaching future university graduates to critically reflect on their thinking, practices and structures; critically engaging with clinical researchers, health care professionals and public health specialists.
- *Policy sociology*: providing policy-makers with the knowledge they need to make evidence-based decisions and influencing policy-making across local, national and international governmental bodies, among others by eight endowed chairs from policy-shaping organisations (e.g. SCP, CBS, City of Amsterdam and Amsterdam GGD). Various researchers are actively engaged in policy discussions in the public sphere. UvA sociologists also advise or collaborate with several European institutions. For example, Jan Rath is the European Chair of International Metropolis, a global network connecting academic researchers, policy advisors and civic society practitioners around international migration and migrant integration.
- *Public Sociology*: providing commentaries on topical issues on television or newspaper interviews, in writing opinion pieces in (inter-)national newspapers and magazines or more local level talks and more intensive forms of engaging publics.

7.5 Viability

The research programme has shown very good results in the period of assessment and has clear and realistic views for its future. The explicit commitment to consolidate its leading role in international networks and to continue to invest on interdisciplinary, comparative, public orientation research on a wide variety of topics, from a wide array of perspectives and different styles of sociology, is to be regarded as extremely positive. Important is also the intention to devote attention to new subjects and problems that have not been studied in depth in the past, like environment and global change, for example. Moreover, the programme has a strong and lively PhD culture. The research programme has foreseen a strategy to confront the unbalanced gender composition of faculty (especially at the associate and full professorship level) with new recruitments of women.

The programme depends increasingly on external funding. The transformation of the bachelor programme into a bi-lingual programme (Dutch and English) has substantially increased the student base. This will ultimately translate into more direct funding, however, presumably also in higher teaching loads that might reduce competitiveness at an

international level. This appears particularly important in face of increasing numbers of Master and PhD candidates.

The programme members are very successful in grant applications. The viability of the research strategy thus depends on this competitive funding with increasing competition and high transaction costs. Several programme members have excellent records of accomplishment and the applications are distributed on many members. Nonetheless, the heavy reliance on external research funding poses a certain threat. The successful research strategy implies a large number of temporary staff at the postdoc and assistant professorship level resulting in increasing difficulties in their careers without internal perspectives. The increasing number of PhD candidates poses a similar threat and suggests the idea to reinforce supportive measures to help them to develop not only careers inside, but also outside of academia.

7.6 PhD programme

In the period 2013–2018, 62 PhD candidates have graduated; of whom 52 found a job in (academic) research and/or higher education.

At the start of their project, PhD candidates write a research time plan, and a PhD trajectory plan. The latter is evaluated in annual meetings. They are automatically enrolled in the Graduate School AISSR PhD training programme, and PhD candidates from the IIL research group are also part of the ICS (and take part in the PhD training programme there).

At least two supervisors supervise every PhD candidate, and the students meet regularly with their supervisors. The PhD candidates indicated that they were very satisfied with their supervision. All three PhD candidates interviewed during the assessment wrote a cumulative thesis, although there is an option for a monograph as well. According to the PhD's, the requirement is that two out of four articles have to be accepted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal before the defence can take place. However, the AISSR PhD Guide notes that at least one article should be accepted and three other articles formally submitted and under review.

PhD training includes methodology clinics, advanced social theory, English academic writing and short intensive courses organised by the PhD candidates themselves. However, PhD candidates do not have any course that is compulsory for all students.

The PhD candidates were not aware of the formal rules regarding co-authorship described in AISSR documents (such as the PhD Guide and Integrity Protocol) and most had at least one supervisor as co-author for each paper. While the use of footnotes, indicating who did what, is not obligatory or a common practice, AISSR regulation stipulates that the dissertation contains a page indicating the role of the PhD student in each of the publications that are part of the dissertation

PhD candidates, mainly due to future career possibilities, feel work pressure. However, they feel supported and have internal rules to reduce work pressure, such as no emailing in the weekends. They have discussions among peers how to deal with stress, and they can contact a trust person (belonging to other departments) and a psychologist in order to face difficulties. Furthermore, AISSR is working on developing workshops for work pressure

and future career opportunities, courses about career planning are also provided by ProActief (university level), but not obligatory. PhD candidates would like to see more attention paid by their supervisors to different career prospects, also earlier in their PhD trajectory, to make strategic choices in consideration of their work opportunities.

For the PhD cohort starting between 2010 and 2014, UvA shows very long PhD durations: only 42% graduated after 5 years; and after 7 years, the majority of the cohort graduated. The research programme as well as the entire department are aware of this problem and are committed to changes in order to improve the situation.

7.7 Research integrity

UvA sociologists follow the VSNU's Netherlands Code of Conduct for Research Integrity: Honesty, Scrupulousness, Transparency, Independence, and Responsibility. The research programme falls under the auspices of the AISSR, which has developed a number of social science specific protocols (the AISSR research integrity protocol with specific rules and norms to avoid scientific fraud, plagiarism, and self-plagiarism, to pursuing good practice regarding ownership and intellectual property rights, authorship, declaring conflicts of interest, and research data management). The AISSR ethics committee evaluates research involving primary data collection, including qualitative and ethnographic research data.

The formal and informal mechanisms established within the research programme provide a strong basis for integrity of their research. The close PhD supervision by and collaboration with different scholars are particularly noteworthy.

7.8 Diversity

Concerning the age composition, UvA sociology has achieved a healthy mix of young and senior colleagues. However, the gender balance at higher levels is low, and the presence of non-white/ethnic minorities in the staff (including PhD candidates) appears quite limited.

The self-evaluation report states: "female staff members, regardless of age, are more likely to occupy junior-level positions. The proportion of female staff members at higher levels in our department (notably associate and full professorships) is very low." In order to contrast the gender unbalance the department has already taken the important decision that female sociologists will preferably fill new senior posts. This is already happening with a new post of full professor where the final shortlisted candidates are all females.

7.9 Recommendations

1. Sociological research at the UvA is at an impressive level. Still the committee feels that the three research groups operate predominantly as lone islands. However, we saw signs of collaboration across the groups in terms of co-teaching, which could lead to a better understanding of each other's traditions and intensify internal collaboration.

We recommend to *deepen the collaborations in research in the coming years between the different groups. Look for each other's strengths and exploit them to form alliances strengthening the overall research capacity of the UvA.*

Next, we also recommend to *further invest in collective planning on (1) common research themes, (2) collaborations on methods (e.g. explore the possibility of mixed methods) and (3) a more institutionalised model of valorisation and outreach.*

2. The internationalisation of education has proven to be an effective way to attract new sociology students and secure basic funding as a department. However, the committee was also informed about the shadow side of this success: having international students clearly influences your programme as new teaching methods and additional guidance of international students shall be developed and, consequently, the teaching load and students' assistance requirements of the staff might increase significantly.

We recommend to *the university board to foresee additional basic financing for each international student attracted in order to cope with the start-up costs of this programme and to secure a high level of academic achievement in order to secure the influx of these students in the Research Master and the PhD programme afterwards.*

3. The completion rate of PhDs was problematic at UvA. The committee has found substantial policy measures to increase the completion rate. Both the policy plan on the PhD programme is promising as is the current PhD support network that has been formed.

We recommend to *continue the current efforts, to strengthen them and to continuously monitor the PhD progress.*

4. There is a high pressure due to career insecurity on PhD candidates and junior staff due to the large size of the junior staff of the UvA. We fear for an unhealthy environment as we received signs during the site visit of hazardous limits on (mental) well-being.

We recommend to *take action on the following domains:*

1. *Develop alternative career strategies and career plans for PhD candidates and junior staff members. Help them to broaden their scope away from an academic career.*
2. *As senior staff look actively in your networks for places where your junior staff members can be employees and realise their ambition and aspirations.*
3. *Use your outreach activities more strategically as opportunities to develop career trajectories for young staff members that orient outside academia.*

8. Radboud University Nijmegen

8.1 Quantitative assessment

The committee assessed the research programme 'Social Inequality and Cohesion' both quantitatively and qualitatively. For the quantitative assessment a four-point scale is used, according to the standard evaluation protocol 2015-2021. The explanation of the criteria underlying the scores can be found in appendix D.

According to the SEP scoring system, the committee has awarded the following scores to the research programme 'Social Inequality and Cohesion'.

Research quality:	2
Relevance to society:	2
Viability:	1

The qualitative assessment of the programme can be found in the next sections.

8.2 Introduction, strategy and targets

The research programme 'Social Inequality and Cohesion' is embedded in Radboud Social Cultural Research (RSCR) institute. RSCR consists of two research groups: (a) Sociology and (b) Cultural Anthropology and Development Studies – both hosting researchers from the Gender & Diversity group. Among the six sociology programmes assessed, Nijmegen's programme is the smallest (with on average 15.64 FTE total staff in research between 2013 and 2018, incl. PhD candidates). The number of PhD candidates increased substantially since the last evaluation, as suggested by the previous evaluation committee.

The sociology research programme contributes to advance theoretical and empirical knowledge on overarching questions related to social inequality (differences in access to and control over resources that affect individuals' opportunities in education, in organisations, and on the labour market) and social cohesion (social disparities in social and civic participation in varying economic, cultural, and demographic contexts). Both lines of research pay particular attention to vulnerable groups (e.g. ethnic minorities or economically marginalised groups). With its strong focus on quantitative and problem-oriented research, it studies how macro-societal phenomena influence micro-level behaviours under specific contextual conditions, mostly in contemporary Western societies. The research strategy emphasises a quantitative, theory-based/hypothesis-testing approach and includes systematic data collections and developments of advanced data analysis. Since the last evaluation, Nijmegen has increased its efforts in multi-disciplinary research (e.g. with anthropology, education science and political science).

8.3 Research quality

As for the previous evaluation period 2007–2012, the Nijmegen programme can be characterised as small, coherent, integrated, and highly professional. The research carried out at Nijmegen is of a very high standard. The group has achieved to conduct and publish cutting-edge research. Still, its emphasis on theory testing somewhat restricts the great potential of the group for theory development and agenda setting. A very good example of how to strengthen theory development might be the review paper on the relationship between ethnic heterogeneity and social cohesion, which was selected by Nijmegen as one of the five key publications for the evaluation. Another way is to consider mixed methods more strategically to enhance the innovative value of theory development.

Nijmegen's sociology methodological and statistical work has proven to be relevant even to biological and medical (e.g. cancer) research with practical health care implications. An outstanding example of Nijmegen's methodological work is the paper on how to best estimate the internal consistency of a measure that has only two (survey) items (published in *International Journal of Public Health* 2013). This paper is among the top 1% most cited papers within the Social Sciences.

Nijmegen's sociology group is outstanding in contributing to the Dutch as well as international data infrastructure. Three long-running surveys are (partly) organised in Nijmegen and financed by facilities provided by the Radboud Faculty of Social Sciences: the Family Survey Dutch Population (FSDP), the NETHERLANDS Longitudinal Life course Study (NELLS), and the Social and Cultural Developments in The Netherlands survey (SOCON). Additionally, the group has been responsible for collecting the European Social Survey (ESS) data for the Netherlands (rounds 7 to 9).

Nijmegen's researchers published 232 non-Dutch articles in WoS journals in the evaluation period, thereof 92 (40%) in the top 25% journals and 42 (18%) in the top 10%. These shares account for about 5.9 top 25% articles per research FTE (total research staff) and 2.7 top 10% articles per research FTE (total research staff) between 2013 and 2018 – indicating a very high productivity of Nijmegen's researchers (see appendix E). Moreover, several books and book chapters were published with highly internationally recognised publishers (among them Oxford University Press, Palgrave, Routledge, Sage). All associate and full professors are highly recognised in their field, visible by their high citation index. Adjusted to age, this also applies to most of the tenured assistant professors as well as non-tenured researchers.

Nijmegen's researchers are well represented in national and international scientific bodies and editorial boards of international journals (especially in the fields of health, medicine, and gender).

Between 2013 and 2018, the scientific staff acquired, on average, funds for 0.9 FTE research staff (see appendix E). Looking at the kind/type of grants as indicator of recognition of researchers, the result is good. Among the research grants obtained are four NWO Veni grants, three international NWO ORA or Norface grants, several (14) other NWO research grants. EU research grants and advanced personal NWO (Vidi, Vici) grants are missing, however. Concerning collaborative international research, the Nijmegen's sociology programme relies on the networks of the individual researchers but has not yet

strategically planned and used preparatory activities to take on the lead in international consortia.

8.4 Societal relevance

Nijmegen's sociology research programme strives to conduct policy-oriented societal relevant research. The group is very actively engaged in the dissemination of their scientific knowledge outside academia: they use reports, media appearances, cooperation with societal partners (among them are the Netherlands' Institute of Social Research (SCP) and the Dutch Scientific Council of Government Policies (WRR)), and provide policy advice (at the ministry and municipality level). Quite a number of staff members are involved in outreach activities. Moreover, several professors by special appointment and the research assignment of the director of Mulier Institute have established a vivid link between policy stakeholders and Nijmegen's research on inequality in education, health care, and sports. Since 2012, the department also offers a MA programme in Sociology focusing on policy evaluation.

Examples of their valorisation activities are:

- Policy reports commissioned by ministries, participation in expert and national think tanks meetings, as well as interviews to newspapers and TV (including 43 opinion pieces). Examples are the reports on the inclusion of women on company boards and 'Harassment in Academia' or tools to prevent gender bias in the recruitment and selection of senior and early career researchers.
- Research on discrimination against immigrants in application procedures has led to tangible policy advice on 'anonymous' soliciting. Moreover, the New Immigrant Survey among recent immigrants from Eastern and Southern Europe (with CBS/SCP), coordinated by Nijmegen, is used for several policy reports commissioned by Dutch Ministries.
- The cooperation with other Dutch research institutes (ROA, Institute GAK, WRR, and SCP) and the national coordination for the ESS have resulted in policy reports, and an interactive website (which has already attracted over 20,000 visitors) on pressing social inequality issues (e.g. in health behaviour, the precarious position of the middle class, or youth unemployment). Their work is discussed at (expert) meetings at the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment, the parliamentary commission of Social Affairs, and the municipality of Nijmegen.
- Researchers are engaged in blogging, web-sites, social media, and keynotes/lectures at public events for presenting new research findings, providing background information, and responding to claims in media or politics.

Moreover, Nijmegen's researchers received 14 grants by ministries, foundations and other organizations to conduct contract work.

So far, Nijmegen's sociology outreach activities mostly occur after research has been conducted and rely on individual researchers' initiatives; co-creation activities, in which researchers and stakeholders together generate research questions and designs, are seldom and not yet strategically channelled into more institutionalised forms. To extend

its valorisation activities and strategies to more often and strategically stimulate co-creation processes, participation in 'knowledge labs' or other kind of citizen science initiatives could be used.

8.5 Viability

The Nijmegen sociology programme assesses its funding as solid and healthy. During the period 2013-2018, the programme experienced an absolute and relative increase in direct funding. On average, 55% of the available FTE is based on direct funding. The standard teaching-research division for professors (at all levels) is 50%-50%, which is the highest basic research time among the six programmes. This research time is based on a lump sum, number of students and the (increased) number of PhD candidates. The number of sociology students in the Nijmegen programme is stable and expected to remain stable the next years. The funding of research is stated to be ensured stable and continuous by the Faculty of Social Sciences. The funding for data collection is also guaranteed by a partnership with the nation-wide ODISSEI data platform initiative. Moreover, the university's Faculty Innovation Funds will provide additional opportunities to support new data collections. The internal budget is stated to provide stable hiring of at least one PhD candidate per year, alongside PhDs who are funded by external grants and external part-time PhDs.

With respect to the infrastructure, the membership in the Interuniversity Center for Social Science Theory and Methodology (ICS) in combination with the Research Master's program in Social and Cultural Science (FSW-RU) supports the programme's assessment that PhD candidates will also have excellent opportunities for doing innovative research in the future.

Based on its detailed and sound SWOT analysis, the department will continue its research programme on social inequality and cohesion in comparative perspective. It will continue its effort of multi-disciplinary research and increase its effort to cross-connecting the two overarching themes inequality and cohesion – both as strategies to engage more in theory development (by means of developing innovative hypotheses). Nijmegen's sociology programme plans to expand its outreach activities. Finally, it recognises the need to broaden its grant portfolio by increasing the activities for acquiring grants from the EU and from societal partners.

The achievement and improvements over the last years (e.g., in terms of outreach, multi-disciplinary research, broadening the research portfolio by, at the same time, providing a coherent research profile, and high PhD completion rates) as well as the perceptive SWOT analysis reveal strong leadership and proper organisation of the research programme. This organisational strength provides a good foundation for improving strategic planning concerning research grants and societal relevance activities.

8.6 PhD programme

The PhD program is integrated into the Interuniversity Center for Social Science Theory and Methodology (ICS), which supports a broader and excellent education of PhD candidates

despite the small size of the Nijmegen's sociology groups and helps attracting PhD candidates also from abroad.

The ICS graduate training programme is a collaboration of four Dutch universities (the University of Groningen, Radboud University, Utrecht University and one sociology subgroup at the University of Amsterdam). The ICS graduate training programme is elaborated in chapter 9.

Nijmegen's self-evaluation report states that the Research Master in Social Cultural Science is a very good preparation for starting a PhD project. The PhD training focuses on cumulative dissertations consisting of four journal articles (with PhD candidates as at least first author) and a synthesis. The success rate with bringing PhD candidates to graduation is excellent. For the PhD cohort starting between 2010 and 2014, Nijmegen shows the highest completion rate of PhD candidates during the evaluation period in general (100%) and within five years (86%) of all the six programs assessed. The number of PhD candidates (in FTE) has doubled over the evaluation period.

PhD candidates are assigned at least two supervisors (with one supervisor sometimes from different departments or other universities within the ICS programme). The 'open door' policy aims to prioritise PhDs and other young researchers. The frequency of supervision is dependent on the needs of the PhDs; being always higher in the beginning of the PhD period. Based on the interviews during the site visit, the number of PhDs per promotor has increased to 5-6 and 2-3 PhDs per daily supervisor over the evaluation period. Together with the ICS environment, Nijmegen's sociology programme is strongly committed to provide high quality supervision of PhDs also in the future.

8.7 Research integrity

The policy on research integrity of the Nijmegen sociology group is excellent and exemplary: (1) All primary data collections require a positive advice by the faculty's ethics committee. (2) Researchers follow an institutionalised system of archiving information related to all publications in publication packages (see <https://www.ru.nl/rscr>) and the Dutch Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (established in 2018). (3) Nijmegen's sociology group highly values and enforces strict regulations regarding clear, accurate, and safe processes of data management, described in a data protocol (see the RSCR website). (4) 'Open science' is enhanced by making datasets available to the scientific community (of course, in accordance with data protection regulations). These measures support the need to ensure the transparency of research and the reproducibility of results in scientific publications. The department has established a 'trust person' which in case of work pressure and research integrity issues supports PhDs and staff.

8.8 Diversity

The age distribution of the Nijmegen's scientific staff is healthy with a good balance of experienced senior and 'hungry' younger researchers.

The self-evaluation report mainly addresses the gender distribution as a critical diversity issue. Despite the substantial increase of women in staff functions and the female majority among all staff members (mainly because of an overrepresentation at the PhD level and among non-tenured staff), the male-female ratio among senior staff is still skewed (only 2 out of 8 associate/full professors in the sociology programme are female). RSCR therefore actively develops a Gender & Diversity policy to promote the careers of female employees – including improvement of the starting position of women competing for grants and positions (e.g., by promoting international research experience, additional training and education, facilitating innovative data collection) and policies aiming at removing possible (experienced) barriers (e.g., by mentoring and coaching, supporting to combine work with care obligations, and improving regulations concerning nominations counteracting possible gender biases).

Concerning ethnic diversity, Nijmegen's self-evaluation report mainly refers to nationality when acknowledging the low representation of ethnic minorities. Ethnic minorities with Dutch citizenships are not on its 'radar' yet, and active policies or measurements to increase the programme's ethnic diversity have not been mentioned.

8.9 Recommendations

1. The committee thinks that academic networks are an excellent instrument to stimulate future success in acquiring grant proposals. The staff members clearly showed to the committee that they are integrated in several larger academic networks.

We recommend taking on a more leading role in the networks you are involved in. Instead of teaming up in a consortium as a partner, we recommend taking a leading role for well-chosen grant proposals (identified in the strategic plan mentioned above). In this way, Nijmegen's sociology will become more agenda-setting and more successful in obtaining research grants.

2. The programme has a clear vision on the direction it wants to develop their research in terms of content. The programme deliberately chooses the card of interdisciplinary research starting from their problem driven sociological approach.

The committee welcomes the clear choices made in the department and encourages the department to continue on the path chosen.

3. Sociological research at the University of Nijmegen is at a high level. Nevertheless, the size of the department needs to be a constant point of attention. Limited resources require Nijmegen's sociology to make hard choices because it cannot do everything.

We recommend acting more strategically and plan actions on (1) grant proposal writing and (2) agenda setting in your fields of expertise. A strategic master plan on these domains is necessary to plan your actions carefully during the coming years.

4. The committee appreciates the manifold valorisation activities of the programme. However, we do see less examples of co-creation than in other universities.

We recommend extending its valorisation activities and strategies to more often and strategically stimulate co-creation processes.

9. Interuniversity Center for Social Science Theory and Methodology (ICS)

9.1 Assessment PhD programme

The Interuniversity Center for Social Science Theory and Methodology (ICS) is a Graduate school in which four Dutch universities (the University of Groningen, Radboud University, Utrecht University and one sociological sub-group at the University of Amsterdam) collaborate in the training of Research Master students and PhD candidates. It was founded in 1989 and was accredited by the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW), most recently in 2012. The goal of the ICS PhD program is to educate highly qualified researchers and (potentially) faculty in conducting theoretically and methodologically advanced social science research. The committee believes that all participating universities benefit very much from participation in the ICS.

Every year, the four universities recruit 15 to 20 PhD candidates to start in the ICS graduate training programme. Together these PhD candidates form a cohort, in which they will progress through their training programme. This cohort structure often results in strong bonds between PhDs, supporting peer-to-peer advice when encountering problems during their PhD trajectory.

The ICS training programme is characterised by a very clear structure in the first 18 months, during which the PhD candidates follow a mandatory course programme. During the rest of the training programme, they regularly present their work on Forum days twice a year. An external traineeship is also incorporated in the training programme, which is often used to work with researchers who are not part of their supervision team. The completion rates of PhDs in the ICS programme are excellent, with the vast majority of the PhDs defending their dissertations within four to five years.

Participation in the ICS can be considered as a strength of the four participating universities, as the clear structure of the ICS seems to be related to the high completion rate of the PhDs. The PhDs themselves also highly appreciated the cohort style and the clear structure of the ICS programme. The career outcomes of the ICS are also very good, with 67% of ICS graduates having their first job in academia, and 60% still working in academia.

9.2 Recommendation

The committee was informed about potential issues for international PhDs with regard to the start of the new cohorts in ICS. Due to visa issues, it is not always possible to start at September 1st leading to difficulties following the programme. They therefore miss out on the valuable structure of the ICS programme.

We recommend to either hire the PhDs earlier (at least 4 months before the start of the ICS programme) or to delay the start of the ICS programme to November 1st or January 1st.

Appendix A – Curriculum Vitae

Sara Arber is Emeritus Professor of Sociology and Co-Director, Centre for Research on Ageing and Gender (CRAG) at the University of Surrey, UK. At Surrey, she was Head of the School of Human Sciences (2001-04) and Head of the Sociology Department (1996-2002). Sara was President of the British Sociological Association (1999-2001) and President of the International Sociological Association Research Committee on Sociology of Aging (RC11) (2006-2010). She received the British Society of Gerontology Award for Outstanding Achievement in 2011 and the British Sociological Association Distinguished Service to Sociology Award in 2017. She is a Fellow of the British Academy (FBA) and was a member of the Sociology Panel for the UK Research Excellence Framework (REF) for 2014. Sara has over 300 publications on gender and ageing, inequalities in health, and sociology of sleep.

Lucille Mattijssen is a PhD candidate at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam. She works on the project "Non-standard employment: Prospect or precarity", which was funded by a NWO Research Talent Grant. Two of the chapters of her dissertation are (in the process of being) published in international peer-reviewed journals. Next to this, she currently is the president of the PhD Candidate Network Netherlands (PNN).

Dimitri Mortelmans (chair) is Senior Full Professor in Sociology at the Faculty of Social Sciences of the University of Antwerp (Belgium). He teaches Introduction to Scientific Work, Quantitative Research methods, Qualitative Research Methods, Applied Multivariate Statistics and Advanced topics in family sociology, life course sociology and demography. He is head of the Centre for Population, Family and Health (CPFH). His research concentrates on family sociology and sociology of labour. He has published on divorce, new constituted families, gendered labour careers and work-life balance. He is also the main author of the Step in Statistics book series of which six volumes have been published (in Dutch). On qualitative methodology, he published the Handbook of Qualitative Research Methods and Qualitative Analysis with NVivo. In demography, he (co-)edited Changing Family Dynamics and Demographic Evolution. The Family Kaleidoscope (Edward Elgar), Lone parenthood in the Life Course (Springer) and Divorce in Europe (Springer)

José Luis Molina is full professor of Anthropology at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (UAB). He is an Economic Anthropologist interested in the emergence of socioeconomic structures, like migrant enclaves and transnational fields. Molina is interested in mixed method approaches, combining ethnography and personal network analysis. He is specialized in Southeast Europe, and Romania in particular. Currently, he is the president of the Research Ethics Committee of the UAB, co-PI of the research project "The Role of Social Transnational Fields in the Emergence, Maintenance and Decay of Ethnic and Demographic Enclaves" (ORBITS), and co-editor of the journal REDES-Revista Hispana para el Análisis de Redes Sociales.

Abby Peterson is Professor emerita of Sociology in the Department of Sociology and Work Science, University of Gothenburg. She has held visiting professorships in the Department of Sociology, Vytautas Magnus University in Lithuania and the Centre for Criminology, Oxford University. She conducts research within the fields of political sociology and cultural sociology and the interface between the two fields, as well as within the fields of criminology and sociology of law. In particular, Peterson has made contributions within social movement theory, culture and politics, policing political protests, classical sociological theory, and ethnic relations. She has served as editor of *Acta Sociologica* and is a past president of the Swedish Sociological Society.

Enzo Mingione is Professor Emeritus at the Department of Sociology and Social Research of the University of Milano Bicocca. He has been Chair of the Departments of Sociology of the University of Messina and Padua, Dean of the Faculty of Sociology of the University of Milano Bicocca, Director of the Doctorate School in the Social Science at the University of Milano Bicocca. He has been an evaluator for the ERC. He has been invited in various foreign Universities, among which UCLA, SciencePo, the London School of Economics, University College London and Stanford. He has been one of the Founding Editors of the *International Journal of Urban and Regional Studies*, president of the ISA Research committee on Urban and Regional Research and member of the executive committee of the ISA. He is the author and editor of various books (among which *Fragmented Societies and Urban Poverty and the Underclass*) and a great number of articles in English. His research topics range from urban studies to welfare, economy and society, poverty, unemployment and the future of work.

Heike Solga is director of the research unit "Skill Formation and Labor market" at the WZB – Berlin Social Science Center (member of the Leibniz Association) and full professor for Sociology at the Freie Universität Berlin. Her research interests are sociology of education, labour market research, and life course research. She is one of the Principal Investigators of the German National Education Panel Study (NEPS), responsible for vocational education and training and entry into the labour market. Her current research projects are on school-to-work transitions of less-educated youth, information asymmetries and educational decisions concerning higher education, cross-country variation in employment opportunities of low-skilled workers, and the impact of technological change on training participation as well as use of work skills at the workplace. She is member of the Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and Humanities and of the German Council of Science and Humanities ("Wissenschaftsrat").

Danelien van Aalst is a PhD candidate at the Sociology Department of the University of Groningen. She graduated cum laude from the research master Sociology and Social Research in Utrecht University and wrote her master thesis on Relative Age Effect on popularity among adolescents in class. Her PhD project focuses on the role of teachers in identifying, preventing, and reducing bullying. Danelien has been a part of the Sociology education committee as a bachelor student, and she was a student member of the Social Science faculty board during her research master. In 2018–2019, she was part of the organization of the National PhD Day that took place in Groningen.

Tobias Wolbring holds the chair of Empirical Economic Sociology at the School of Business, Economics, and Society of Friedrich-Alexander-University Erlangen-Nürnberg. He is editor-in-chief of the journal *Soziale Welt*, chair of the section Methods of Social Research of the German Sociological Association, and board member of the Research Committee 45 Rational Choice of the International Sociological Association. His interests include economic sociology, methods of social research (in particular experiments, evaluations, panel analysis), research in higher education, and research in social stratification and mobility. Tobias Wolbring has published four monographs, eight edited volumes, and over 30 articles in peer reviewed journals such as the *European Sociological Research*, *Rationality & Society*, *Social Science Research*, *Sociological Methods and Research*, and the *Journal of Happiness Studies*.

Appendix B – Programme of the site visit

Monday 24 February 2020, Radisson blu hotel,

Time	
16.30-19.30	Preparatory committee meeting
19:30	Diner (Radisson blu) (committee only)

Tuesday 25 February: Trippenhuis

Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

8.30 - 9.00	Internal preparatory meeting
9.00 - 9.40	Management
9.40 - 10.10	Junior staff
10.10 - 10.25	break
10.25 - 10.55	PhD candidates
10.55 - 11.35	Senior staff
11.35 - 12.05	Reflections + preparing questions management
12.05 - 12.30	Management
12.30 - 13.30	Reflection and lunch

Erasmus University Rotterdam

13.30 - 14.10	Management
14.10 - 14.40	Junior staff
14.40 - 14.55	Break
14.55- 15.25	PhD candidates
15.25 - 16.05	Senior staff
16.05 -16.35	Reflections + preparing questions management
16.35 - 17.00	Management
17.00- 18.00	reflection

Wednesday 26 February: Trippenhuis

Utrecht University

8.30 - 9.00	Internal preparatory meeting
9.00 - 9.40	Management
9.40 - 10.10	Junior staff
10.10 - 10.25	break
10.25 - 10.55	PhD candidates
10.55 - 11.35	Senior staff
11.35 - 12.05	Reflections + preparing questions management
12.05 - 12.30	Management
12.30 - 13.30	Reflection and lunch

University of Groningen

13.30 - 14.10	Management
14.10 - 14.40	Junior staff
14.40 - 14.55	Break
14.55- 15.25	PhD candidates
15.25 - 16.05	Senior staff
16.05 -16.35	Reflections + preparing questions management
16.35 - 17.00	Management
17.00- 18.00	reflection

Thursday 27 February: Trippenhuis

University of Amsterdam

8.30 - 9.00	Internal preparatory meeting
9.00 - 9.40	Management
9.40 - 10.10	Junior staff
10.10 - 10.25	break
10.25 - 10.55	PhD candidates
10.55 - 11.35	Senior staff
11.35 - 12.05	Reflections + preparing questions management
12.05 - 12.30	Management
12.30 - 13.30	Reflection and lunch

Radboud University Nijmegen

13.30 - 14.10	Management
14.10 - 14.40	Junior staff
14.40 - 14.55	Break
14.55- 15.25	PhD candidates
15.25 - 16.05	Senior staff
16.05 -16.35	Reflections + preparing questions management
16.35 - 17.00	Management
17.00- 18.00	reflection

Friday 28 February Trippenhuis

8.30 - 9.00	overall reflection and preparation report
9.00 - 9.40	Presentation

Appendix C – Tables

I. Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

Table 1.1 Number of staff and research fte – Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018	
	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#
Scientific Staff	7.03	25	7.76	25	8.33	26	8.74	26	8.09	25	7.48	25
Post-docs	3.82	10	6.66	15	10.01	18	7.72	21	9.90	26	14.14	30
PhD candidates	13.06	21	13.73	24	12.82	20	13.58	21	12.15	18	14.05	21
Total research staff	23.91	56	28.15	64	31.16	64	30.04	68	30.14	69	35.67	76

Table 1.2 Funding - Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018	
	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%
Funding												
Direct funding	10.76	44%	9.89	35%	8.46	27%	9.44	31%	9.90	33%	10.63	30%
Research grants	2.88	12%	6.38	23%	9.11	29%	8.49	28%	9.06	30%	15.02	42%
Contract research	10.44	44%	11.88	42%	13.59	44%	12.11	40%	11.18	37%	10.02	28%
Total funding	23.91	100%	28.15	100%	31.16	100%	30.04	100%	30.14	100%	35.67	100%
Expenditure	K€	%	K€	%	K€	%	K€	%	K€	%	K€	%
Personal costs	1.451	87%	2.455	84%	1.733	85%	2.224	83%	1.911	85%	2.154	84%
Other costs	261	13%	478	16%	303	15%	444	17%	347	15%	416	16%
Total Expenditure	1.667	100%	2.933	100%	2.036	100%	2.668	100%	2.258	100%	2.571	100%

Table 1.3 Output - Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Dutch						
Dutch-language article in peer-reviewed journal	3	2	9	3	7	4
Dutch-language monograph, scientific publisher	1	2	0	1	0	0
Dutch-language edited book, scientific publisher (1)	1	0	1	1	1	1
Dutch language chapter in a book, scientific publisher	3	1	1	4	1	5
Non-Dutch						
Non-Dutch language article in peer-reviewed journal	56	62	59	54	76	68
Non-Dutch language monograph, scientific publisher	2	2	1	1	0	1
Non-Dutch language edited book, scientific publisher (1)	7	3	4	2	5	1
Non-Dutch language chapter in a book, scientific publisher	34	23	21	16	11	20
PhD theses	5	3	7	3	4	7

Note 1: this category also includes guest editorship of a journal

Table 1.4 PhD candidates (internal) - Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

Enrolment															
Starting year				Graduated after 4 years		Graduated after 5 years		Graduated after 6 years		Graduated after 7 years		Not yet finished		Discontinued	
	M	F	M+F	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	0	3	3	1	33%			2	67%						
2011	1	2	3					1	33%	1	33%	1	33%		
2012	2	1	3			1	33%					1	33%	1	33%
2013	1	1	2					1	50%			1	50%		
2014	2	2	4									4	100%		
Total	6	9	15	1	7%	1	7%	4	27%	1	7%	7	47%	1	7%

2. Erasmus University Rotterdam

Table 2.1 Number of staff and research fte – Erasmus University Rotterdam

	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018	
	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#
Scientific Staff	8.69	21	7.42	22	6.40	20	5.63	18	6.20	18	6.23	18
Post-docs	4.18	10	7.53	15	9.43	17	9.41	16	7.87	29	10.95	21
PhD candidates	9.76	16	13.33	22	13.13	20	11.65	17	9.25	15	9.66	19
Total research staff	22.63	47	28.28	59	28.96	57	26.69	50	23.32	52	26.84	58

Table 2.2 Funding – Erasmus University Rotterdam

	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018	
	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%
Direct funding	9.1	40%	9.9	35%	9.8	34%	12.9	48%	11.7	50%	14.6	54%
Research grants	10.9	48%	15.8	56%	16.4	57%	11.3	42%	8.8	38%	8.0	30%
Contract research	2.6	11%	2.6	9%	2.8	10%	2.5	9%	2.8	12%	4.2	16%
Total funding	22.6	100%	28.3	100%	29.0	100%	26.7	100%	23.3	100%	26.8	100%
Expenditure	K€	%	K€	%	K€	%	K€	%	K€	%	K€	%
Personal costs	3.921	85%	4.062	91%	3.866	88%	3.552	84%	3.488	79%	3.765	77%
Other costs	679	15%	394	9%	539	12%	654	16%	905	21%	1.098	23%
Total Expenditure	4.600	100%	4.456	100%	4.405	100%	4.206	100%	4.393	100%	4.863	100%

Table 2.3 Output – Erasmus University Rotterdam

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Dutch						
Dutch-language article in peer-reviewed journal	13	13	7	10	7	10
Dutch-language monograph, scientific publisher	2	1	1	1	1	0
Dutch-language edited book, scientific publisher (1)	1	0	1	0	2	0
Dutch language chapter in a book, scientific publisher	10	1	2	2	4	3
Non-Dutch						
Non-Dutch language article in peer-reviewed journal	42	42	43	30	40	36
Non-Dutch language monograph, scientific publisher	1	0	3	0	2	1
Non-Dutch language edited book, scientific publisher (1)	1	5	3	2	3	3
Non-Dutch language chapter in a book, scientific publisher	12	16	18	21	12	18
PhD theses	2	4	5	2	3	4

Note 1: this category also includes guest editorship of a journal

Table 2.4 PhD candidates- Erasmus University Rotterdam*

Enrolment															
Starting year				Graduated after 4 years		Graduated after 5 years		Graduated after 6 years		Graduated after 7 years		Not yet finished		Discontinued	
	M	F	M+F	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	0	3	3	2	67%	1	33%								
2011	2	1	3	2	67%			1	33%						
2012	2	3	5	1	20%	2	40%	2	40%						
2013	1	2	3			1	33%	1	33%			1	33%		
2014	1	1	2	2	100%										
Total	6	10	16	7	44%	4	25%	4	25%			1	6%		

* The self-assessment report of EUR used a different format, and the table above was sent to the committee separately.

3. Utrecht University

Table 3.1 Number of staff and research fte – Utrecht University

	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018	
	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#
Scientific Staff	7.33	18	8.19	20	7.79	23	8.29	25	9.11	25	9.53	24
Post-docs	3.35	8	6.29	11	6.41	14	5.34	15	6.85	18	5.78	13
PhD candidates	15.94	29	16.00	26	15.82	28	17.10	25	16.49	30	17.52	28
Total research staff	26.62	55	30.48	57	30.02	65	30.73	65	32.45	73	32.83	65

Table 3.2 Funding – Utrecht University

Funding	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018	
	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%
Direct funding	8.52	32%	10.06	33%	8.41	28%	11.68	38%	8.44	26%	14.12	43%
Research grants	17.04	64%	12.80	42%	14.71	49%	16.29	53%	19.47	60%	12.15	37%
Contract research	1.06	4%	5.79	19%	3.60	12%			0.65	2%	2.95	9%
Other*			1.83	6%	3.30	11%	2.77	9%	3.89	12%	3.61	11%
Total funding	26.62	100%	30.48	100%	30.02	100%	30.74	100%	32.45	100%	32.83	100%
Expenditure	K€	%	K€	%	K€	%	K€	%	K€	%	K€	%
Personal costs	2.014	82%	2.368	81%	2.268	86%	2.382	72%	2.596	92%	3.563	91%
Other costs	429	18%	544	19%	350	14%	925	28%	230	8%	341	9%
Total Expenditure	2.444	100%	2.913	100%	2.618	100%	3.308	100%	2.826	100%	3.905	100%

* Funds that do not fit into the other category, including first stream money secured in competition

Table 3.3 Output – Utrecht University

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Dutch						
Dutch-language article in peer-reviewed journal	14	8	13	10	8	1
Dutch-language monograph, scientific publisher	2	1	2	2	2	1
Dutch-language edited book, scientific publisher (1)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dutch language chapter in a book, scientific publisher	6	0	5	1	1	0
Non-Dutch						
Non-Dutch language article in peer-reviewed journal	94	94	83	103	82	77
Non-Dutch language monograph, scientific publisher	1	2	2	3	2	3
Non-Dutch language edited book, scientific publisher (1)	0	0	2	1	0	1
Non-Dutch language chapter in a book, scientific publisher	10	20	17	3	14	9
PhD theses	7	6	7	4	2	6

Note 1: this category also includes guest editorship of a journal

Table 3.4 PhD candidates - Utrecht University

Enrolment															
Starting year				Graduated after 4 years		Graduated after 5 years		Graduated after 6 years		Graduated after 7 years		Not yet finished		Discontinued	
	M	F	M+F	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	3	5	8	6	75%	1	13%	1	13%						
2011	1	2	3	2	67%			1	13%						
2012	2	1	3											3	100%
2013	3	4	7	6	86%							1	14%		
2014	1	4	5	4	80%									1	20%
Total	10	16	26	18	69%	1	4%	2	8%			1	4%	4	15%

4. University of Groningen

Table 4.1 Number of staff and research fte – University of Groningen

	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018	
	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#
Scientific Staff	5.1	16	4.6	15	5.2	15	5.2	16	5.1	17	6.5	20
Post-docs	4.7	9	2.4	7	1.2	4	3.1	5	3.2	6	2.4	7
PhD candidates	14.1	25	15.5	29	13.6	26	15.2	25	15.7	27	18.5	29
Total research staff	23.9	50	22.5	51	20.1	45	23.5	46	24.0	50	27.4	56

Table 4.2 Funding – University of Groningen

	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018	
	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%
Funding												
Direct funding	15.3	60	14.2	59	13.4	62	14.8	58	14.9	57	18.6	63
Research grants	7.4	29	7.7	32	7.3	33	10.1	39	10.2	39	10.0	34
Contract research	2.9	11	2.3	10	1.1	5	0.8	3	1.1	4	1.0	4
Total funding	25.6	100	24.2	100	21.8	100	25.7	100	26.2	100	29.6	100
Expenditure	K€	%	K€	%	K€	%	K€	%	K€	%	K€	%
Personal costs	1.390	84	1.240	86	1.120	88	1.300	87	1.380	85	1.510	79
Other costs	260	16	200	14	150	12	190	13	250	15	390	21
Total Expenditure	1.650	100	1.440	100	1.260	100	1.490	100	1.630	100	1.900	100

Table 4.3 Output – University of Groningen

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Dutch						
Dutch-language article in peer-reviewed journal	3	5	5	4	3	6
Dutch-language monograph, scientific publisher	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dutch-language edited book, scientific publisher (1)	0	0	0	0	0	1
Dutch language chapter in a book, scientific publisher	2	1	3	2	1	0
Non-Dutch						
Non-Dutch language article in peer-reviewed journal	64	55	51	54	59	56
Non-Dutch language monograph, scientific publisher	0	0	0	0	1	0
Non-Dutch language edited book, scientific publisher (1)	2	1	1	1	2	1
Non-Dutch language chapter in a book, scientific publisher	17	19	9	6	10	8
PhD theses	2	3	7	6	5	5

Note 1: this category also includes guest editorship of a journal

Table 4.4 PhD candidates - University of Groningen

Enrolment															
Starting year				Graduated after 4 years		Graduated after 5 years		Graduated after 6 years		Graduated after 7 years		Not yet finished		Discontinued	
	M	F	M+F	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	3	2	5	5	100%										
2011	2	3	5	3	60%	1	20%							1	20%
2012	2	1	3	2	67%							1	33%		
2013	1	5	6	2	33%	2	33%					1	17%	1	17%
2014	3	2	5	3	60%	1	20%					1	20%		
Total	11	13	24	15	63%	4	17%					3	13%	2	8%

5. University of Amsterdam

Table 5.1 Number of staff and research fte – University of Amsterdam

	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018	
	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#
Scientific Staff	11.01	32	11.55	29	13.01	35	15.59	37	15.33	37	16.10	37
Post-docs	5.52	9	6.28	10	6.53	15	9.83	18	12.81	20	16.93	26
PhD candidates	17.62	29	14.95	25	13.12	24	15.58	25	19.99	36	23.55	36
Total research staff	34.15	70	32.78	64	32.66	74	41.00	80	48.13	93	56.57	99

Table 5.2 Funding – University of Amsterdam

Funding	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018	
	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%
Direct funding	10.35	30%	12.21	37%	11.14	34%	14.32	35%	16.34	34%	14.57	26%
Research grants	12.78	37%	12.01	37%	12.82	39%	19.22	47%	25.20	52%	26.01	46%
Contract research	8.26	24%	5.90	18%	5.67	17%	4.80	12%	3.29	7%	9.86	17%
Other	2.77	8%	2.67	8%	3.03	9%	2.67	7%	3.30	7%	6.13	11%
Total funding	34.15	100%	32.78	100%	32.66	100%	41.00	100%	48.13	100%	56.57	100%
Expenditure	K€	%	K€	%	K€	%	K€	%	K€	%	K€	%
Personal costs	2.295	58%	2.413	61%	2.520	62%	3.085	62%	4.023	62%	4.099	65%
Other costs	1.658	42%	1.536	39%	1.540	38%	1.883	38%	2.512	38%	2.173	35%
Total Expenditure	3.953	100%	3.950	100%	4.059	100%	4.968	100%	6.535	100%	6.272	100%

Table 5.3 Output – University of Amsterdam

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Dutch						
Dutch-language article in peer-reviewed journal	15	8	12	12	9	14
Dutch-language monograph, scientific publisher	2	0	0	0	1	1
Dutch-language edited book, scientific publisher (1)	5	1	1	1	2	1
Dutch language chapter in a book, scientific publisher	34	12	13	9	3	4
Non-Dutch						
Non-Dutch language article in peer-reviewed journal	78	68	83	75	83	96
Non-Dutch language monograph, scientific publisher	3	2	1	3	4	1
Non-Dutch language edited book, scientific publisher (1)	5	12	9	4	5	4
Non-Dutch language chapter in a book, scientific publisher	31	34	39	29	15	23
PhD theses	11	14	9	11	11	6

Note 1: this category also includes guest editorship of a journal

Table 5.4 PhD candidates - University of Amsterdam

Enrolment															
Starting year				Graduated after 4 years		Graduated after 5 years		Graduated after 6 years		Graduated after 7 years		Not yet finished		Discontinued	
	M	F	M+F	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	3	3	6	1	17%	1	17%	2	33%	2	33%				
2011	4	5	9	1	11%	2	22%	1	11%	3	33%	2	22%		
2012	0	2	2	1	50%							1	50%		
2013	2	2	4	1	25%	2	50%					1	25%		
2014	3	2	5	1	20%	1	20%					3	60%		
Total	12	14	26	5	19%	6	23%	3	12%	5	19%	7	27%	0%	

6. Radboud University

Table 6.1 Number of staff and research fte – Radboud University

	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018	
	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#
Scientific Staff	5.29	12	5.63	15	5.88	15	6.62	18	7.62	22	7.45	19
Post-docs	3.35	5	2.13	4	1.97	4	1.3	4	2.39	4	1.65	4
PhD candidates	4.03	5	5.02	8	8.17	9	8.42	10	8.49	11	8.41	12
Total research staff	12.67	22	12.78	27	16.02	28	16.34	31	18.5	36	17.51	35

Table 6.2 Funding- Radboud University

	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018	
	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%
Funding												
Direct funding	6.42	51%	9.5	74%	11.06	69%	10.42	64%	10.76	58%	10.69	61%
Research grants	4.5	36%	1.68	13%	3.54	22%	4.88	30%	5.75	31%	4.8	27%
Contract research	1.75	14%	1.6	13%	1.42	9%	1.04	6%	1.99	11%	2.02	12%
Total funding	12.67	100%	12.78	100%	16.02	100%	16.34	100%	18.5	100%	17.51	100%
Expenditure	K€	%	K€	%	K€	%	K€	%	K€	%	K€	%
Personal costs	924	70%	937	74%	1.082	85%	1.118	86%	1.240	86%	1.243	91%
Other costs	396	30%	322	26%	187	15%	179	14%	198	14%	121	9%
Total Expenditure	1.320	100%	1.259	100%	1.269	100%	1.297	100%	1.438	100%	1.364	100%

Table 6.3 Output - Radboud University

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Dutch						
Dutch-language article in peer-reviewed journal	12	9	7	6	9	2
Dutch-language monograph, scientific publisher	1		2			
Dutch-language edited book, scientific publisher (1)		2	3	3	1	
Dutch language chapter in a book, scientific publisher	3	3	17	5	3	
Non-Dutch						
Non-Dutch language article in peer-reviewed journal	40	39	22	38	52	42
Non-Dutch language monograph, scientific publisher		2	3	1		1
Non-Dutch language edited book, scientific publisher (1)			1	1		
Non-Dutch language chapter in a book, scientific publisher	1	6	9	5	9	6
PhD theses	1	2	2	2	2	3

Note 1: this category also includes guest editorship of a journal

Table 6.4 PhD candidates - Radboud University

Enrolment															
Starting year				Graduated after 4 years		Graduated after 5 years		Graduated after 6 years		Graduated after 7 years		Not yet finished		Discontinued	
	M	F	M+F	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	0	0	0												
2011	0	1	1	1	100%										
2012	1	1	2	2	100%										
2013	0	1	1	1	100%										
2014	2	1	3	2	66%	1	33%								
Total	3	4	7	6	86%	1	14%								

Appendix D – Meaning of the scores

Category	Meaning	Research quality	Relevance to society	Viability
1	World leading/ excellent	The research unit has been shown to be one of the few most influential research groups in the world in its particular field	The research unit makes an outstanding contribution to society	The research unit is excellently equipped for the future
2	Very good	The research unit conducts very good. internationally recognised research	The research unit makes a very good contribution to society	The research unit is very well equipped for the future
3	Good	The research unit conducts good research	The research unit makes a good contribution to society	The research unit makes responsible strategic decisions and is therefore well equipped for the future
4	Unsatisfactory	The research unit does not achieve satisfactory results in its field	The research unit does not make a satisfactory contribution to society	The research unit is not adequately equipped for the future

Appendix E – General indicators

Table 1: Publications in WoS top-10%* and WoS top 25%**

	TOP 10 N	TOP 10 %	TOP 25 N	TOP 25 %	TOTAL Pub in WoS Journals
VU Amsterdam	63	20,0%	116	37,0%	315
Erasmus University Rotterdam	34	18,0%	67	35,5%	189
Utrecht University	92	17,0%	212	40,0%	533
University of Groningen	62	18,0%	179	53,0%	339
University of Amsterdam	75	18,9%	171	43,2%	396
Radboud University Nijmegen	42	18,0%	92	40,0%	232

* Number of publications in top 10% journals of WoS (core collection)

** including the publications in top 10% journals

The committee asked the institutes to provide this additional information on the number of publications in WoS top 10% and WoS top 25% journals. This request was accompanied with the following instruction:

- It concerns top-10 or top-25 of the journals of a domain orientation (the subject-category in WoS). This question does not exclusively concern the subject-category Sociology.
- The numbers of the top 10 are fully included in the numbers of the top 25. The numbers of the top 25 are therefore by definition greater than (or equal to) those of the top 10.

Table 2: Number of publications in WoS top-10% and WoS top 25% per FTE total research staff*

	TOP 10 / FTE	TOP 25 / FTE
VU Amsterdam	2,1	3,9
Erasmus University Rotterdam	1,3	2,6
Utrecht University	3,0	6,9
University of Groningen	2,6	7,6
University of Amsterdam	1,8	4,2
Radboud University Nijmegen	2,7	5,9

* Mean FTE research staff during the review period (2013-2018)

Table 3: External research funding* per FTE scientific staff

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	MEAN
VU Amsterdam	1,9	2,4	2,7	2,4	2,5	3,3	2,5
Erasmus University Rotterdam	1,6	2,5	3,0	2,5	1,9	2,0	2,2
Utrecht University	2,5	2,3	2,4	2,0	2,2	1,6	2,1
University of Groningen	2,0	2,2	1,6	2,1	2,2	1,7	2,0
University of Amsterdam	1,9	1,6	1,4	1,5	1,9	2,2	1,8
Radboud University Nijmegen	1,2	0,6	0,8	0,9	1,0	0,9	0,9

Sum of FTE funded by research grants and FTE funded by contract research

This table is based on the tables 1 (staff) and table 2 (funding) in appendix C. The staff table displays the distribution of the types of functions of all FTEs, while the funding table shows how the total FTEs were funded in a specific year. The funding table does not directly show the acquisition in a specific year that is, the funding of FTEs in 2013 could be based on acquisitions in preceding years.