

RESEARCH REVIEW
POLITICAL SCIENCE
2013-2019

ONDERZOEKERIJ

De Onderzoekerij
Vondellaan 58
2332 AH Leiden

Phone: +31 6 24812176
Email: info@onderzoekerij.nl
Internet: www.onderzoekerij.nl



Contents

Preface	5
1. Introduction	6
1.1 Terms of reference for the assessment.....	6
1.2 The Review committee.....	6
1.3 Procedures followed by the committee.....	7
2. General observations and recommendations	8
2.1 Quality.....	8
2.2 Societal relevance.....	8
2.3 Funding and Viability.....	9
2.4 PhD programme.....	11
2.5 Integrity.....	12
2.6 Diversity.....	12
3. Multi-layered Governance in Europe and Beyond, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam	13
3.1 Quantitative assessment.....	13
3.2 Organisation, strategy and targets.....	13
3.3 Research quality.....	14
3.4 Societal relevance.....	14
3.5 Viability.....	15
3.6 PhD programme.....	16
3.7 Research integrity.....	17
3.8 Diversity.....	17
3.9 Recommendations.....	17
4. The Institutions of Politics: Design, Workings, and Implications, Leiden University	19
4.1 Quantitative assessment.....	19
4.2 Organisation, strategy and targets.....	19
4.3 Research quality.....	20
4.4 Societal relevance.....	20
4.5 Viability.....	21
4.6 PhD programme.....	22
4.7 Research integrity.....	23
4.8 Diversity.....	23
4.9 Recommendations.....	23



5. Transnational Governance, Political Economy and Democracy, University of Amsterdam	25
5.1 Quantitative assessment	25
5.2 Organisation, strategy and targets	25
5.3 Research quality	26
5.4 Societal relevance	27
5.5 Viability	27
5.6 PhD programme	28
5.7 Research integrity	28
5.8 Diversity	29
5.9 Recommendations	29
Appendix A - Programme of the site visit	31
Appendix B Tables	33
1. Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam	33
2. Leiden University	35
3. University of Amsterdam	37
Appendix C – Meaning of the scores	40



Preface

This report provides an evaluation of the Political Science research programmes of the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Leiden University and the University of Amsterdam. It covers the period 2013-2019 and follows the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP).

It was a real pleasure to evaluate these research programmes. As the following pages make evident, Political Science in the Netherlands is at a very high level and belongs to the international top. Therefore, its prospects seem to be excellent. However, a major threat for the sustainability of this high level is the poor and decreasing funding of Political Science research from the Eerste Geldstroom. Although all three research groups are increasingly successful in compensating the decrease of base funding by acquiring grants from NWO and the ERC, it is our contention that the universities and faculties involved should make a better financial effort to enable Political Science to maintain its present high level.

As I know from experience, an evaluation like this is a demanding exercise for the departments and institutes involved. We were impressed by the high quality of the self-assessments and the professionalism of the whole process including the contributions to the site visits. Due to the Covid-19 pandemic the planned site visits had to be replaced by virtual 'visits'. This was anything but ideal and asked a lot of endurance and flexibility of all people involved in the process. I very much appreciate how easily they all adapted to these unusual circumstances.

On behalf of the committee I would like to thank all PhD candidates, researchers and officials for their cooperation during the whole process of this evaluation.

I also would like to thank my fellow members of the committee for their professionalism, their dedication and good humour. It was a pleasure to work with them. Last but not least I would like to thank Esther Poort. As secretary of the committee she skilfully coordinated this evaluation, led us through all the successive steps of the process and saved us a lot of work.

Jacques Thomassen
Chair of the committee



1. Introduction

1.1 Terms of reference for the assessment

The quality assessment of research in Political Science 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 Political Science covering the period of 2013-2019, is being reviewed by an external peer review committee. The research review comprises three research programmes from three different universities:

- Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam: Multi-layered Governance in Europe and Beyond;
- Leiden University: The Institutions of Politics: Design, Workings, and Implications;
- University of Amsterdam: Transnational Governance, Political Economy and Democracy.

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 Political Science in the Netherlands (to the extent that it is represented by these three groups) from an international perspective, to evaluate its major strengths and weaknesses and to identify possible threats and opportunities. 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) and key publications for each research programme.

1.2 The Review committee

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

- Prof. dr. Jacques Thomassen, University of Twente, Emeritus Professor of Political Science in the Faculty of Behavioural, Management & Social Sciences. (chair of the committee)
- Dr. Fiona B. Adamson, University of London, Reader in International Relations Department of Politics and International Studies SOAS
- Prof. dr. Paul Dekker, Netherlands Institute for Social Research | SCP and Honorary Professor Tilburg University, TS Social and Behavioral Sciences
- Prof. dr. Lisa Herzog, University of Groningen, Faculty of Philosophy and Centre for Philosophy, Politics and Economics
- MSc Indra Römgens, PhD candidate at Radboud University and Roskilde University
- Prof. dr. Frank Schimmelfennig, ETH Zürich, Center for Comparative and International Studies

The Board of the participating universities appointed drs. Esther Poort from De Onderzoekerij as the committee 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 judgement was made without undue influence from the programmes or stakeholders.

1.3 Procedures followed by the committee

Prior to the site visit, the committee reviewed detailed documentation comprising: The Self-assessment report of the institutes including appendices and the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP) 2015-2021. In addition, the committee studied the previous assessment report.

The committee was invited by the three participating universities to assess the participating programmes during a site visit. Originally, the plan had been to spend a day at each university, but the coronavirus pandemic precluded travel and meeting up, so instead the panel “met” the various groups through online video conferencing. Prior to the site visit, all committee members were requested to read the self-evaluation reports of all three research programmes. Each committee member was furthermore requested to independently formulate a preliminary assessment concerning two research programmes under review, based on the written information that was provided. This way all research programmes were reviewed in-depth by a first and second 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 30 November until 2 December 2020 (see Appendix A).

The committee discussed its assessment at its final session during the virtual 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 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 Political Science in the Netherlands. 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 Boards of the Universities and to the management of the programmes.



2. General observations and recommendations

This research review covers three of the four Dutch universities offering a full programme in Political Science. Radboud University decided not to participate in this review. The three participating universities might still be considered as representative of the state of Political Science research in the Netherlands.

2.1 Quality

Dutch Political Science has a strong international position. The two biggest institutes¹, those at the Universities of Amsterdam and Leiden, belong to the 30 highest placed Political Science institutes in the world on the QS ranking. The quality of research as measured by qualitative and quantitative standards was considered high in the previous evaluation and continues to be so. There is a gradual shift towards articles in high-ranking international journals as a proportion of all publications and towards more emphasis on the quality rather than the number of publications.

Political Science in the Netherlands is highly internationally oriented, as is evidenced not only by its publication policy but also by the many international research projects Dutch political scientists are involved in and in which they often play a leading role. They also play a leading role in international Political Science organizations like the ECPR. All three institutes have an international academic staff and student body. Also, Dutch Political Science is amazingly successful in acquiring prestigious grants from the NWO-talent programme and ERC grants at all levels, although in this respect not all three institutes are in the same phase of development. The international composition of the academic staff at all three institutes has a self-enforcing effect: a vibrant internationally oriented research community, where the working language is English, is an attractive place for ambitious scholars from all over the world. As a consequence, Dutch Political Science is highly competitive on the international labour market.

Because of the high quality of Political Science in the Netherlands it was a matter of debate within the committee to what extent we should differentiate between the three universities in terms of quality. As a careful reader might conclude from our report there are slight but noticeable differences in quality between the three institutes. However, we were not asked to rank order the institutes but rather to assess where they stand compared to other Political Science research groups in Europe and beyond. We decided that from this perspective, all three belong to the top and deserve the same score for quality of research on a four-point scale.

2.2 Societal relevance

The societal relevance of Dutch Political Science is high. This is evidenced by various activities and positions. Dutch political scientists are engaged with local and national government, foreign governments, international organizations and NGOs. They are members of important and prestigious advisory councils, they do policy-relevant research, they write analytical and opinion pieces in newspapers and their online presence (blogs, twitter) is highly visible. Members of staff are encouraged to get engaged in societally relevant activities and it is a standard subject in annual performance

¹ In this chapter 'institute' is used as a common denominator for 'department' (UvA), 'research group' (VU) or 'Institute'(Leiden).

reviews. Junior researchers (including PhD candidates) are encouraged and supported in outreach activities, e.g., by writing blog posts for broader audiences.

2.3 Funding and Viability

In order to do high quality research, one needs the time to do so. Compared to the previous review period, funding of research time continues to be a problem. If anything, the situation got even worse. Traditionally, the most important source of funding is the eerste geldstroom (first money stream). It is composed of several components but is primarily based on the money the university and subsequently the lower levels of administration within the universities receive for each student receiving a diploma. Based on the philosophy that high quality academic education should be based on academic research, part of this money is meant for research.

From this perspective at first sight the financial perspectives for all three departments are pretty good, because student enrolments have increased rapidly or are at least stable. But because for many years the total budget for higher education has not kept pace with the increase of the number of students, the allocation per diploma has gradually decreased. This development is translated in the internal allocation models of the universities, which de facto often means a decrease of research time because it is far more difficult to reduce the costs of and/or time for teaching. How this works out, on average, for the available research time of individual staff members with a double mandate of teaching and research may vary both between and within universities. But obviously the traditional expectation of 40% research time on the basis of first money stream alone is a dream from the past. At Leiden University the nominal research time for research has even declined to 21%. The situation might even further deteriorate if the proposals of the Van Rijn committee² to transfer part of the funding of the humanities and social sciences to the technical sciences are implemented.

This development made all three institutes realize that they could no longer rely exclusively on the first money stream to maintain an acceptable level of research time and had to find additional funding in order to maintain their position as a first-rate research institute.

At all three universities several mechanisms are in place to increase the actual average research time per individual researcher. One of them is to reduce the time spent on teaching or to concentrate teaching tasks in specific periods.

But by far the most effective way the three institutes have managed to increase their research budget is the acquisition of external funding, even to the extent - as in the case of Political Science at the UvA - that less than half of the budget now comes from the first money stream. This is the result of a very effective strategy where the acquisition of external funding, mostly from NWO and the ERC, is no longer only the result of the individual efforts of ambitious and talented scholars but perhaps even more so of a collective effort in which applying for external funding is facilitated at all stages of the process.

However successful this strategy is, it at the same time raises a few questions about its long-term tenability and consequences. First, the more successful this strategy is, the more it will be copied by other research groups in the social sciences, both at home and abroad and the more competitive the funding programmes concerned will become – a process that is already well on its way. Also, it is still to be seen how the relevant NWO and ERC budgets will develop. Secondly, the expectation to write grant applications only adds to an already high work pressure. More generally speaking, a high work pressure

² 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.

seems to be the price to be paid for a high research output. A high work pressure is a matter of concern at all three institutes although all the scholars we met were willing to accept a high work pressure in their personal situation (at least during teaching-intense periods) as a feature of academic life and a price worth paying. Efforts to allocate teaching in efficient ways (e.g. giving one teaching-free block to all staff members wherever possible) were highly appreciated, and there also seems to be a certain degree of self-selection of hard-working individuals into academic jobs (critics would say a kind of survival of the fittest). Fortunately, there is a growing awareness that there is a limit to the 'publish or perish' culture in academia³. At the institutes we assessed, work pressure now is a standard element in the annual performance review.

Thirdly, the reliance on external funding leads to issues of tenure and promotion. Because of the uncertain and fluctuating success rate of external funding, it is hard to base tenured positions on it. Of course, it will never be possible to offer every temporary post-doc or junior scholar a tenured position, apart from the fact that a certain degree of mobility might be good, both for individual scholars and for the institutes concerned. But at least career perspectives should be clear and transparent. A second issue is promotion to higher ranks. In the traditional pyramidal shaped building of Dutch academia, the stairway to the top is too narrow to let many young scholars through all the way to the top, even though several of them might be perfectly qualified for associate or even full professor. As far as this is not already the case, we advise the universities not to stick rigidly to this traditional pyramid but – within limits - to widen the possibility for talented and successful scholars to be promoted to the higher ranks as part of an individual career pattern rather than having to wait for the possibility to apply for the next position becoming vacant.

Still, in general the prospects for Dutch Political Science seem to be good. At least two of the institutes are facing serious challenges but these seem to be transition problems, mainly caused by a sudden and unexpected increase of the number of students or the departure of the most productive members of staff. Paradoxically, this increasing number of students is also the lifeline to a more stable future. However low the research time attached to it, increasing numbers of students bring in more money to hire new staff, in general junior scholars. As noticed above, Dutch Political Science is highly competitive on the international labour market and seems to succeed in hiring many ambitious and talented young scholars who need some time to get settled but then will be an asset for a research group with the ambition to belong to the best Political Science departments in Europe and beyond.

But hiring junior scholars can only be part of a successful strategy. Playing permanently and successfully in the champions league does not come cheap. It is impossible to maintain a world class position in Political Science without a competing basic funding of research. Above we referred to the high work pressure. Of course, this is primarily a mental health issue but it is also an academic concern. Cutting edge research is not only a matter of hard working but even more of creativity. One cannot endlessly squeeze academics and still expect them to do cutting edge research. At a certain point they get too tired to come up with fresh ideas. Also, eventually too little research time might have a negative effect on the competitiveness of Dutch Institutes on the international labour market.

Therefore, we advise the universities and faculties involved to increase the basic funding for research to an acceptable level and – as far as this is not the case already – to add an incentive for excellent research in their allocation model.

³ See e.g. the joint publication of VSNU, NFO, KNAW, NWO and ZonMw., Room for everyone's talent.

2.4 PhD programme

The most important issue with regard to the PhD programmes is once again a matter of funding. In the PhD programmes in Political Science we assessed there is hardly a single PhD position left that would be funded from the first money stream. This is one of the negative effects of the declining funding of the Social Sciences discussed in the previous section. As a consequence, a basic financial infrastructure for a viable PhD programme no longer exists. But without such forms of PhD funding, which do not presuppose an external grant, it can be very difficult for PhD candidates with their own original ideas – rather than the task to make sense of a “work package” a senior PI wrote into a grant application – to find positions. This means that an important source of creativity and new approaches is lost.

Still, as discussed above, Political Science as a whole has been extremely successful in acquiring external research funding from NWO and the ERC. This at least partly compensates the drying up of first money stream resources for PhD positions. However, only one of the programmes, at the UvA, so far manages to acquire sufficient external funding to maintain a full-blown PhD programme. But even then, external grants, won in highly competitive programmes are an uncertain and fluctuating basis for a solid and stable PhD programme of international standing.

Therefore, if they take their Political Science programmes seriously, we advise each of the universities involved, to allocate at least a minimum number of PhD positions to the institutes involved.

Also, where applicable, we advise them to give the institutes more leeway to use part of their own research budget for the funding of PhD positions.

The need to find alternative sources to fund PhD positions has led to all kinds of constructions that might lead to two concerns we advise management to be aware of. In particular when PhD candidates bring in their own funding, there is the danger of a trade-off between external funding and quality. Also, differences in the terms and length of their contracts between PhD candidates might easily lead to issues of equal treatment.

The training of PhD candidates has been strongly professionalized. The traditional situation of a PhD candidate being supervised by, and therefore dependent on, a single supervisor hardly exists anymore. At least two supervisors has become the rule, PhD candidates are welcome at and participate in all kinds of research colloquia and are facilitated to attend (inter)national conferences in their field. Progress is monitored by a number of instruments: at the start supervisors and PhD candidate agree on a training and guidance plan that needs to be approved by the graduate school, there is a go/no go assessment at the end of the first year and there are annual assessment interviews. This system seems to work pretty well. Although we haven't seen any PhD candidate evaluations of local PhD training, the PhDs we spoke to seemed to be quite satisfied.

However, this positive development is not everywhere reflected in a high completion rate or a nominal completion time. Why this is the case is not totally clear. Apart from local factors like a relatively high teaching load, as a cue we might refer to good practices in renowned PhD programmes in the Social Sciences like the European University Institute or the Interuniversity Research School for Sociology (ICS). An important characteristic of these programmes is that PhD candidates are admitted and trained in cohorts and therefore form successive communities of PhD candidates who are more or less at the same stage of their research project and therefore can support each other. However, with the exception of the UvA the programmes we evaluated are too small to form cohorts of a critical size. They also are too small to set up a training programme with a wide choice of substantive courses. The VU therefore wisely participates in the Netherlands Institute of Governance (NIG), the Interuniversity Research School for Public Administration and Political Science.



The change in publication culture from an emphasis on book publications to articles (in top journals) also had its consequences for the kind of dissertations PhD candidates tend to write. Whereas until shortly most PhD candidates in political science used to write a book-length monograph, now a collection of articles has become common practice. This is a logical consequence of the developments in the discipline: PhD candidates are supposed to be trained in doing academic research. If academic research increasingly implies writing articles in journals, then logically this is what PhDs should learn to do. Also, it still is an effective training for doing high level scientific research outside academia. The new practice inevitably leads to a continuation of the discussion on whether articles included in the dissertation might be co-authored or should be single-authored and if they are co-authored whether they might be co-authored with the supervisor(s). As a general rule we believe the co-authorship of the supervisors of articles included in the dissertation should be discouraged as it brings them in the impossible position that they should evaluate their own work. Also, it might bring the doctorate committee in an awkward position.

2.5 Integrity

Ever since a major case of scientific fraud shocked Dutch academia almost ten years ago, integrity has become an important issue at Dutch universities. It led to The Netherlands Code of Conduct for Scientific Practice that all Dutch universities adhere to. This growing awareness of integrity issues is reflected in all three self-assessments. Several mechanisms are in place to maintain integrity and to make staff members aware of integrity issues. Also, research integrity is an integral part of PhD training. In general integrity policies meet contemporary standards and seem to be adequate.

2.6 Diversity

Both gender and ethnic diversity are still problematic, in particular in the higher ranks. The awareness of the gender gap – at least at senior level – is high and all three institutes seriously try to come to a better balance. The diversity of the academic staff in terms of ethnicity is still problematic. As with the gender balance we noticed an awareness of the problem and the willingness to address it. However, we also noticed that both the awareness and policies to address the problem are not everywhere as self-evident as in the case of the gender gap. The argument that there is no diverse pool of qualified academics is not really convincing. Also, internationalization of the staff should not be mistaken for ethnic diversity.



3. Multi-layered Governance in Europe and Beyond, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

3.1 Quantitative assessment

The committee assessed the research programme ‘Multi-layered Governance in Europe and Beyond’ 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 C.

According to the SEP scoring system, the committee has awarded the following scores to the research programme Multi-layered Governance in Europe and Beyond.

Research quality:	1
Relevance to society:	1
Viability:	3

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

3.2 Organisation, strategy and targets

The research programme of political scientists at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (VU) is ‘Multi-layered governance in Europe and beyond’ (MLG). Whereas MLG was continued from the previous research review period, its sub-themes were redefined from ‘scope, institutions and agency’ to ‘democracy, inequality, international conflict, and climate change’. In addition, political scientists at the VU are engaged in a large number of interdisciplinary and interdepartmental units such as the Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, the Network Institute, the Amsterdam Sustainability Unit, the VU Institute for Environmental Studies and the VU Interdisciplinary Centre for European Studies. Finally, the VU Department of Political Science merged with the Department of Public Administration (with its own research programme) during the review period.

The main targets that the MLG programme has set for itself during the review period are: to maintain high quality of research and the PhD programme, attract external research grants, manage the process of generational replacement and change in leadership, increase the diversity of the team and to expand networks and collaborations inside and outside VU.

The committee applauds the continuation and refocusing of the MLG programme. MLG is of considerable scientific significance in the discipline and political relevance in Europe in particular. The MLG programme bridges international relations, comparative politics and political theory and covers the entire scope of policies. The VU has been at the forefront of MLG research internationally – not least because some of the best-known representatives of this research were based at the Department. The committee further commends the programme for redefining the sub-themes along substantive political problems. The new sub-themes (democracy, inequality, international conflict and climate change) take up some of the most pressing contemporary political problems and are more accessible and easier to communicate. In general, the MLG programme aligns well with the broader VU-level theme of ‘Governance for Society’.

The sub-themes further indicate clear venues of collaboration with interdisciplinary networks and units beyond the Department working on the same issues. The programme participants at senior and junior staff level that we spoke to value these opportunities in terms of creating additional research networks, gaining visibility beyond the department and attracting resources. They do not consider them to come



at the expense of coherence or cooperation within the MLG programme. Moreover, the sub-themes are taken seriously in hiring junior faculty and structuring collaboration. In sum, the MLG programme appears highly suitable to achieve the objectives of the group.

The 2013 merger with the Department of Public Administration seems to have been arduous. It has been a 'top-down' restructure undertaken largely for financial and administrative reasons rather than a 'bottom-up' merger motivated by shared research and teaching synergies. In the meantime, after a slow and conflictual start, the merger seems to have been completed at the administrative level and accepted by both former departments. It appears to have achieved the expected financial consolidation and reduction of management tasks. Due to diverse research orientations and methodologies, however, substantive collaboration is still rare. Joint research, supervision or publication remains highly exceptional. Given the obvious thematic affinities between multi-layered governance and public administration, more could be done to integrate public administration research with the MLG programme and to create synergies through common hires and projects.

3.3 Research quality

The research programme on MLG speaks to core issues and mainstream agendas of the political science discipline. Indeed, members of the programme have been highly influential in defining the MLG agenda in the discipline. The research programme has continued to produce high-quality contributions to research in the review period. Publications have appeared in some of the most prestigious US-based generalist journals of the discipline (such as APSR, AJPS and JOP), in highly visible International Relations journals (ISQ and RIO) and in some of the most read and cited European politics journals (JEPP, JCMS, WEP), among others. Moreover, members of the programme have published highly acclaimed books. In addition, the programme's contributions to research on democracy – and parliaments, specifically – in multi-level governance and foreign and security policy is highly visible and broadly cited. The same is true for its work on environmental governance.

In addition to the scientific publications, the programme has also produced a range of datasets and indices that are widely used in the discipline. All contributors to the programme are research active, and all of them publish in visible international journals and presses. The programme has continued to benefit from a prestigious ERC Advanced Grant and a NWO Vidi grant in the review period. Other indications of quality – such as awards, invitations to speak and professional service – are strong, too.

At the same time, the programme has experienced downward trends in research capacity and funding in the reviewing period. Research staff has declined at all levels from professors to PhD candidates. Moreover, the programme has lost some of its most senior and internationally renowned and visible members. These scholars contributed disproportionately to the research funding of the group. By the end of the review period, the department had not been able to compensate fully these losses in research capacity either quantitatively or qualitatively.

3.4 Societal relevance

The research topics of MLG are geared clearly towards key contemporary political challenges. Programme members contribute to important contemporary debates around issues such as climate change, the political impacts of the global financial crisis, US-China relations, parliamentary governance, the future of the European Union and other topical policy issues. In addition, there is a strong emphasis on societal relevance in the programme and its self-assessment. Societal impact is a regular item in discussions of research and in the annual reviews of research staff. All senior staff appear to be engaged



regularly in media communication, opinion formation and political consulting. In addition to high-quality scientific publications, the programme members produce policy papers. There seems to be a fair amount of demand from society for the expertise of the staff. The School of Governance provides an additional venue for societal impact. Overall, the programme has achieved an impressive balance of output of primarily scientific and primarily societal relevance.

3.5 Viability

Thematically, and with regard to its societal impact, the MLG research programme seems well positioned for the future. Multi-level governance and the thematic foci chosen by the group are undoubtedly of high relevance both in the discipline and in society and politics. Moreover, the thematic reorientation of the programme provides for alignment with the university research priorities and for interdisciplinary and cross-departmental networking and collaboration opportunities.

At the same time, the MLG research programme has been and is still going through a turbulent transition. The programme has experienced the loss of senior and world-class staff, the concomitant loss of research capacity and visibility and need for generational change, a significant rise in the number of students, an equally significant reduction in the number of internal PhD researchers, and the merger of the political science and public administration departments. Topicality and relevance notwithstanding, these developments could have a lasting negative impact on the standing and quality of the research programme. In particular, the situation requires sustained efforts of the remaining and new members of staff to maintain the programme's research funding and publication standards.

Whereas the transition is still ongoing, and it is too early to evaluate its outcome and success, we observe many positive and encouraging developments. First, the management and staff are well aware of and open about the challenges ahead – both in the self-evaluation report and in the discussions with the committee. Second, the programme management and its senior staff have a clear and plausible strategy for overcoming the challenges. So far, the leadership seems to have done a good job of navigating the programme through some rocky waters. It has managed to address some of the primary challenges in ways that has also allowed the programme to rebuild, recruit new staff, secure additional grants and maintain its emphasis on world-leading research.

Despite the loss of prominent senior staff, the programme benefits from a core group of next-generation senior members who have been associated with it for a long time and have assumed leadership positions during the review period. This development indicates a successful generational change and high institutional stability. The committee gained the impression that the loss of prominent staff had individual and personal reasons and did not stem from systematic and structural weaknesses.

Moreover, the current management has used the departure of these senior members as an opportunity to change the recruitment strategy from hiring 'big names' from outside the VU to cultivating home-grown talent. This shift is expected to make the group less top heavy and increase its financial leeway. The department has hired several promising junior staff in recent years and introduced measures to award those on a tenure track with additional research time. Junior staff feel supported and mentored well and value the collegial and informal atmosphere in the research group. This strategy appears to be bearing fruit: in 2018 and 2020, two junior staff members were successful in winning Veni grants.

These successes need to be mirrored at the senior staff level, however, to compensate for the loss in research funding and the shrinking number of (standard) PhD candidates in the review period. Junior staff indicated that they highly appreciate informal collegiality and support. However, they miss formal support structures such as competitive seed money or funding of small-scale research, and a clearer policy for promotion beyond the assistant professor level.



In conclusion, the overall judgement of the committee on the viability of the research programme is positive because ‘the research unit makes responsible strategic decisions and is therefore well equipped for the future’. And this is literally the explanatory text in the SEP of the viability score we allocated to the programme.

3.6 PhD programme

The PhD programme is in transition, having moved from a fully funded research-driven programme, to a more mixed programme that includes different PhD pathways and funding arrangements. Overall, the programme is small and decreasing in size but of a high quality, with a good completion and placement record. PhD candidates benefit from the small size of the unit, and close supervisory relations. Each PhD candidate has a supervision team of at least two staff members and receives a training and guidance plan, with a go/no go assessment after eight months based on a detailed research proposal. Progress is monitored via an annual PhD progress report and appraisal.

All PhD candidates are enrolled in the Graduate School, which provides training and professional development opportunities, and facilitates networking across the PhDs via workshops and social events. PhD candidates must take a 30 ECTS educational programme, including a mandatory course on research integrity. The committee learned that, according to the PhD candidates, some courses provided by the faculty are deemed to be below PhD standard (‘master-level’). PhD graduate council is also in place. Adequate support is available for external networking and conference attendance, and there are possibilities to participate in PhD exchanges abroad. Opportunities for career advice and social support systems are in place, including buddy systems, PhD counsellors and a “Bridging programme” for international PhD candidates to facilitate integration into the Dutch academic system. There are opportunities for research exchange at the Graduate School and through recent initiatives to develop research seminars in the MLG, which have been led by junior faculty. PhD candidates appreciate the freedom and availability of financial resources to set up their own initiatives, such as organising a graduate conference on political theory.

In response to funding cuts, the programme has innovated and moved from a fully funded research-driven programme to a more mixed programme that includes different PhD pathways and funding arrangements. The three main pathways introduced over the period have been the development of a junior lectureship pathway linked to the new PPE teaching programme; an increase in externally-funded PhD candidates; and a cohort of PhD candidates funded by the Chinese Scholarship Council. The junior lectureship pathway in a 5-year contract includes a 50% teaching position in the new PPE degree. PhD Candidates in this pathway must navigate their relationship between the PPE programme and their home Department. The committee noted that, while there were some challenges in balancing workload and the demands of being located across two different units, PhD candidates overall were satisfied with the arrangement and felt that they received adequate support. Nevertheless, there were some concerns about the impact of the new pathways on completion rates and quality. High teaching loads for junior lecturers, financial pressures to accept externally-funded candidates, and additional adjustment times for those on foreign government scholarships, were all cited as issues that require close monitoring.

The small size of the PhD programme and funding pressures are clearly a concern, but there are strategies in place to grow the PhD programme by bringing in more research council grants, by nurturing talent within the existing MSc programmes, and by investing in international PhD candidates with government scholarships.



There are questions as to whether the current arrangements for PhD candidates would be sustainable with an increase in the number of PhD candidates. The current mix of informal interaction in the context of the small MLG unit, and a structured training and support programme at the Faculty Level and the NIG seems to work well for the current size of the programme. Yet, some aspects of the PhD programme may need to be more institutionalized at the Department level, especially strengthening opportunities for sharing and exchanging research beyond the immediate supervisory relationship.

3.7 Research integrity

The MLG adheres to the core principles of the Netherlands Code of Conduct of Research Integrity (2018), including honesty, scrupulousness, transparency, independence and responsibility. Ethical considerations are applied to a range of research activities, including the collection, analysis and management of data. A number of formal and informal mechanisms are in place at the Faculty level to ensure research integrity, including a Faculty Data Management Policy, a Faculty Research Ethics Review Committee, and a network of counsellors. In addition to the formal mechanisms, there was evidence of a unit-level culture that placed a strong emphasis on open discussions about research integrity. Overall, the committee was satisfied with the policies in place to ensure research integrity.

3.8 Diversity

The programme has made improvements in obtaining a greater gender balance amongst faculty, moving from 21% female in 2013 to 45% female in 2020. This has occurred largely through the advancement and hiring of new faculty. Nevertheless, there is still a gender imbalance at the senior level. The programme has policies in place to support and invest in junior faculty, which bodes well for maintaining and increasing the gender balance in the unit. There are also diversity initiatives in place, including a faculty-level network designed to support female staff, and awareness of the need to rectify gender imbalances at the senior level, including plans to hire at the full professor level.

The programme also aims to be an international research group: it advertises and recruits internationally, and its working language is English. There is a notable absence, however, of ethnic and racial diversity amongst MLG staff, which stands in contrast to the diversity of the student body. The self-assessment notes the small size of the programme as a possible factor. Yet, the committee was unconvinced that programme size should necessarily pose an obstacle to obtaining greater diversity, and recommended that the research programme take a closer look at its hiring and promotion strategies, to ensure that they are in line with Faculty and University level targets, with the aim of hiring, promoting and retaining staff that will reflect the growing levels of diversity in the student body, and in Dutch society as a whole.

3.9 Recommendations

The committee appreciates the strategic choices of the MLG group to complete the current transition period and to maintain or regain its research capacity and research quality. The strategy is bearing fruit and the committee generally recommends continuing on the current path. At the same time, the committee would like to emphasize points that require additional or particular emphasis.

First, the merged Departments of Political Science and Public Administration are advised to do more to integrate their research and develop substantive collaboration so that scale benefits are not limited to financial consolidation and the alleviation of managerial burdens but extend to a common research program.



Second, and in addition to the ongoing overhaul of tenure-track regulations and requirements, the committee recommends developing a career track policy beyond the level of assistant professor to provide junior staff with clearer prospects for their further advancement within the VU. Moreover, the MLG programme should consider additional formal support structures such as low-level seed and research funding.

Third, the MLG programme should expand the number of internal PhD candidates in order to create a larger and more coherent PhD community. Given the decline in base funding, and that grants for junior staff do not fund (many) PhD candidates, this objective requires senior staff to increase their efforts to win research grants. If the MLG group achieves the aim of larger PhD cohort, it should also take measures to institutionalize the PhD programme further.

Finally, the committee recommends that the MLG programme intensify its efforts to increase the diversity of its staff beyond gender and national diversity.



4. The Institutions of Politics: Design, Workings, and Implications, Leiden University

4.1 Quantitative assessment

The committee assessed the research programme ‘The Institutions of Politics: Design, Workings, and Implications’ 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 C.

According to the SEP scoring system, the committee has awarded the following scores to the research programme The Institutions of Politics: Design, Workings, and Implications.

Research quality:	1
Relevance to society:	1
Viability:	3

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

4.2 Organisation, strategy and targets

The years 2013-2019 were a turbulent period for the Leiden Institute of Political Science. The yearly intake of new students almost doubled, with many students in the new International Relations and Organizations (IRO) bachelor and the new second locality of the Institute in The Hague. Substantial new staff was hired, in particular at the end of the period of evaluation. Research staff increased from 26 (nominally 6.9 fte research) to 39 (9.4) in 2018, up to 49 (10.9) in 2019. Also as a follow-up of recommendations in the 2014 Political Science Research Review 2007-2012 to reconsider its unified all-encompassing research programme on ‘institutions’, the Institute moved in 2017 to a new, more diversified programme on ‘Institutions, decisions and collective behaviour’ with six thematic research clusters (Politics in the Netherlands; Representation, Public opinion and communication; Identity, ethnicity and political community; Globalization and the state; International organization and European integration; and Conflict, conflict resolution and crisis management). In addition, interdisciplinary research centres were developed and are still in the process of implementation. In the meantime, the official ‘nominal’ time available for research went down to 21% (from 35% before 2007 and 27.5% in the previous assessment period 2007-2012).

The committee appreciates the transparent self-assessment and SWOT analysis of the Institute and the open way it faces the challenges due to the changes. The committee welcomes the move from the unified programme about institutions to a broader set of topics, and acknowledges the steps undertaken to implement the new structure. However, as it is formulated as a weakness in the SWOT-analysis: “Research cluster structure is not yet fully integrated into institute routines and expectations and internalized by academic staff.” Positive experiences with developments of the clusters so far raise confidence that this will improve in the coming years, but given the limited time for research and competing requests from the interdisciplinary research centres, there is a danger of fragmentation and overcommitment of individual researchers.

Overall, the committee trusts that political science in Leiden(/The Hague) will consolidate after the fast growth and programmatic and organizational changes led by its constant aim “to conduct research of



high scholarly quality and societal relevance” and its still strong tradition of academic informality and joining around research interests instead of managing and monitoring formal targets and structures.

4.3 Research quality

The institute had an impressive scientific output, both in qualitative terms as in quantitative terms, in particular given the limited time for research⁴ and distracting changes of the Institute. Members of the Institute continuously publish in highly recognized and visible international journals. There is a strong focus on European journals, publications in top-ranked general political science journals are rare. In addition, members of the Institute have published monographs in the most renowned European university presses (Oxford and Cambridge). Whereas the quantitative output has stagnated despite the increase of research staff, this can be explained by the fact that mainly junior faculty were hired at the end of the review period, who were busy to set up teaching and starting new research projects. Citation scores of most senior staff members are good but not particularly high.

It is difficult to say what, if anything, the programme, clusters and centres have contributed to developing research and publications. Staff members indicate, however, that presentations and discussions in formal and informal meetings have been fruitful for them. Yet it is less clear if there have been initiatives, changes in focus, co-authorships and other forms of cooperation that would not have developed without the new programme.

The Institute has experienced a stagnation in national and international research funding during the reviewing period. Yet the record of 2019 is excellent again featuring two ERC grants (Starting and Consolidator) and two NWO grants (Veni and Vidi). Moreover, this successful development appears to have continued into 2020. Recovery at the end of the period appears to have been facilitated by a more pro-active policy and a better support structure.

It is noteworthy that the Institute appears not to have participated in any FP7 or H2020 networks. Otherwise, however, engagement in national and international research networks, editorships and institutions is strong. The Institute is not only a founding member of ECPR, but has also organized its joint sessions more than once (the 2021 sessions were cancelled because of Covid, and the institute has offered to organise the 2023 sessions in Leiden). Moreover, a member of the Institute has served as the Chair of ECPR.

4.4 Societal relevance

Most members are committed to engagement with and service for society. The self-assessment report lists an impressive number of faculty engaged with local and national government, foreign governments, international organizations, NGOs and media. Members of the Institute play a prominent role in discussions about Dutch politics, contribute significantly to the quality of public debates by making research relevant and understandable (e.g., the Peilingwijzer) and are active in advisory bodies for policy makers as well as for the broader public. The self-assessment documents a large number of ‘professional’ and ‘public’ publications in English and Dutch. Societal contributions are a theme in the annual performance and developments talks with staff members.

⁴ It is difficult to judge the quality of research in terms of productivity. The nominal time available for research (21%) is just a day per week, but this is ‘just an administrative norm’ according to various staff members during the site visit. According to them 30% of the official work time might be a better guess.

It is very evident that the Institute puts a strong emphasis on societal relevance. It is less clear how contract research is seen as a contribution in this respect. The self-assessment presents it as a rather marginal source of income (fluctuating between 0 and 14% per year in the assessment years) but does not discuss it as a way to valorise research.

4.5 Viability

Several points of concern raised in the previous research assessment have not been resolved but rather appear to have deteriorated further: lack of research time, teaching overload, lack of PhD funding and excessive duration of PhD completion. In spite of continuing strong performance and visibility of many faculty members, the failure to redress these structural shortcomings raise concerns about the viability of the Institute as one of the top European political science departments.

The reduction of research time is the most worrying issue for an institute that has the ambition to remain one of the strongest institutes of its kind in Europe. Official research time of just one day a week (21% research time in the allocation model of the University) not only makes it almost impossible to maintain research output at a high level, both quantitatively and qualitatively, it also might make Leiden a less attractive place for the best qualified scholars in the field and therefore less competitive on the job market. The Institute benefits from a large pool of young faculty. The decision to hire new faculty, is based mainly on teaching needs. However, the actual process of selecting candidates is based on their research and teaching performance, as well as their prospect for good Institute's citizenship. Whether the Institute will be able to keep the best young researchers and develop their potential will depend on providing them sufficient research time and opportunities to write grants and to publish. The Institute is aware of these challenges and recent developments (extra-funding for PhD candidates, prestigious research grants, increasing number of publications) appear promising, but structural adjustment is necessary to ensure success in the longer term.

Fortunately, by increasing the actual research time significantly above 21%, the Institute managed to make the situation less dramatic than the nominal research time suggests. The currently practiced course relief (one free teaching bloc per year for all staff members, four instead of five teaching tasks) is helpful and much appreciated by the staff, but it is still to be seen whether these relief measures can be sustained. The committee considers this situation to be highly problematic for a leading research university and hopes the University management will be able to create more structural research room for the Institute.

The extensive hiring of junior staff in recent years will inevitably produce a promotion bottleneck in the near future. Therefore, as far as this is not already the case, we advise the faculty and university to not stick rigidly to this traditional pyramid but to widen the possibility for talented and successful scholars to be promoted to the higher ranks as part of an individual career pattern rather than having to wait for the possibility to apply for the next position becoming vacant.

The extremely low number of PhD candidates (5 at the end of the assessment period) is another worrying issue for a research university. As a consequence of winning research grants, the situation appears to be improving somewhat after 2019, but again a more structural solution is necessary and cannot be realized by the Institute without additional means from the Faculty/University – or the Ministry at the end of the day. (See more about the PhD programme in the next section).

Lack of financial resources is the core issue here and uncertainty about external funds and political priorities are serious threats to viability, as described in the SWOT analysis. The only thing the Institute can do about it is trying to get more grants. According to the self-assessment, everybody is now stimulated to write grant proposals, and this is facilitated by more administrative support (e.g. through a



research grant officer) and eventually teaching relief. This strategy has come rather late compared to other universities and it is still to be seen how successful it will be. The first signs are positive, however.

Another viability issue is the bi-locality of the Institute. So far, it seems to function reasonably well with people having teaching obligations and staff meetings in both places and possibilities for flex work in both localities. In the long run, however, bi-locality might threaten the coherence of the Institute (and is mentioned as a threat in the SWOT analysis). The choice and development of the localities is probably only for a very small part in the hands of the Institute. Apart from University decisions, it mainly depends on choices of students (specialization and Dutch or English tracks). Without conscious countermeasures, this development might even lead to two different institutes, each with its own subfields and competing for the best students.

The overall judgement of the committee on the viability of the programme is positive because ‘the research unit makes responsible strategic decisions and is therefore well equipped for the future’. This is literally the explanatory text in the SEP for the viability score the committee allocated to this research programme. The resilience of the programme and the institute could be strengthened by equally responsible decisions of the faculty and university.

4.6 PhD programme

The Institute has had a small PhD cohort over the years under review – nine (with 5.2 fte research time) in 2013, up to 15 (8.0) in 2015 and down to 5 (3.0-3.5) in 2018 and 2019. This is not in line with the size and ambitions of a research institute of this size and is also deemed as ‘problematic’ by the Institute itself. However, the number of PhDs is currently growing as a result of successful grant applications in 2019-2020. The Institute’s PhD programme therefore seems to be in a period of transition as well.

Generally, the PhD candidates expressed content with their PhD trajectories at the Institute. All of them emphasized their appreciation for the freedom they have to design their own project. They have easy access to their supervisors and are satisfied with the regularity and quality of supervision. A supervisory team consists of 2-3 people. In case of issues with supervision, the PhD candidates know who/where to turn to – but none of the PhD candidates the committee talked to has experienced any such issues. One year after the start of the PhD, an evaluation takes place including a go/no-go decision for the project. Admirably, in spite of the small PhD programme, several PhD dissertations were awarded with national and European prizes in the years 2014-2019.

All PhD candidates interviewed feel being part of the Institute’s staff: they have easy access not only to their own supervisors, but also to other academic staff. There are lunch seminars organized within the Institute where PhDs can also participate. Both article-based and monograph-based PhDs are possible; the decision is taken on an individual basis. Co-authorship with supervisors of articles that are part of the dissertation is discouraged. Although this is not a formal policy, currently there seem to be no issues regarding the practice of co-authorship.

Due to the small number of PhDs in the years 2013-2019, the Institute relies on the Faculty’s Graduate School for a large part of PhD infrastructure, including PhD courses and social events. The only mandatory course is on research integrity. The PhD candidates indicated that, for substantive courses, they mostly seek opportunities outside of the Faculty and/or university. Within the Institute, there is no environment organized especially for PhDs with the aim to give feedback on each other’s work, discuss others’ research and exchange PhD experiences. PhD candidates are stimulated to participate in research seminars. Currently, the institute is considering to assign PhD candidates to a research cluster. As the number of PhD candidates at the Institute is now growing, this opens up opportunities to



develop a viable political science PhD community. The committee recommends the Institute to use these opportunities to pro-actively nurture and organize such a community.

A large concern is the low number of PhD candidates that manage to graduate within four to five years. There are various factors associated with this. Firstly, it seems that a number of current PhD candidates are on a three-year contract, which they regard as insufficient time to finalize their project. The Institute often offers in these cases a contract extension that includes a heavy teaching load (up to 80%). This hampers PhD candidates in graduating on time. Another factor is teaching obligations in general, during the entirety of the PhD period. There is a difference between PhD candidates funded within research projects and those with other types of funding; the latter seem to have a higher teaching burden (up to 25%) than the former (up to 10%).

It was indicated that the Institute is moving away from three-year contracts (which were introduced at some point for those candidates who graduated from the Institute's former research master's programme) and offering recent and new PhD candidates four-year contracts. This is an improvement. Yet the Institute needs to do more to balance research time and teaching obligations in the case of contract extensions in consultation with the PhD candidates.

4.7 Research integrity

The self-assessment pays appropriate attention to scientific integrity. It underscores the importance of the topic and describes several activities to stimulate awareness and to guarantee procedures are followed. Attention for integrity is an explicit and mandatory component of the PhD programme and it is planned to make ethical approval part of all research projects. The Institute has not yet developed a universal, integrated policy with respect to data management but consults with the faculty on data management issues and politics and conforms to faculty regulations. Therefore, the committee is confident that all research, "quantitative-positivist" and other approaches, is AVG-proof and well consolidated.

4.8 Diversity

Systematic efforts to promote diversity are underway and successful. A task force on diversity and inclusion is in place. The gender balance has improved markedly, especially at the junior faculty levels. In addition, the staff was internationalized and rejuvenated. However, internationalization of research staff as such should not be considered a proxy of ethnic diversity. An international staff can still be very white and western.

4.9 Recommendations

- Assuming there are no big changes ahead concerning new educational programmes, number of students, inflow of large numbers of new staff, we recommend the Institute to put an emphasis on further consolidation. This includes turning the clusters into salient working environments for all researchers and making sure that there is substantial time to do research.
- The rise of the number of PhD candidates should nevertheless become a priority target. Thanks to successful grant proposals, the number is rising currently, but still remains clearly below the level of what can be expected of an Institute of this reputation and size. We recommend the Faculty and University to fund a structurally higher number of PhD positions.
- As the number of PhD candidates is growing, we recommend the Institute to further invest in building and organizing a vibrant PhD candidate community without sacrificing the present benefits



of integrating PhD candidates in staff meetings and work processes. Whether the PhD programme is best developed with the present combination of graduate school and (ECPR) summer and winter courses, or by a return to NIG is an open question for the committee. It recommends, however, to do a systematic analysis of the pros and cons of both possibilities (see also the recommendations of the previous assessment report).

- Excessive workload has been a main threat to the research culture of the Institute for a long time.⁵ At the level of the Institute, the consolidation of current measures to free up time for research (teaching-free periods, reduction of teaching load especially for grant writing) would be important. However, the university and faculty management need to do their part, too. For the Institute to play in the ‘premier league’ of political science, the current norm of 21% research time must be raised considerably.
- To keep talented junior staff, we advise the Institute and the university to widen the possibility for talented and successful scholars to be promoted to the higher ranks as part of an individual career pattern rather than having to wait for the possibility to apply for the next position becoming vacant.
- Finally, the cohesion of the Institute deserves continuous attention, in particular because of the bi-location and the unbalanced and unpredictable popularity of study programmes at both localities. The committee advises the faculty and university management to look for possibilities to relocate the Institute in a single place.

⁵ See also The mid-term research review (2013-2016) of Monique Leyenaar (August 2017), expressing satisfaction with the measures the Institute took to meet the recommendations of the previous Research Assessment committee, but describing the too heavy workload as a threat to the research culture and recommending to put more effort in monitoring this problem and finding ‘smart solutions both at a personal as well as an institutional level’.



5. Transnational Governance, Political Economy and Democracy, University of Amsterdam

5.1 Quantitative assessment

The committee assessed the research programme 'Transnational Governance, Political Economy and Democracy.' 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 C.

According to the SEP scoring system, the committee has awarded the following scores to the research programme Transnational Governance, Political Economy and Democracy.

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

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

5.2 Organisation, strategy and targets

The programme is very large (62 fte) and very broad in its thematic coverage. It successfully cultivates its goals of excellence, pluralism and societal engagement. It is organized into three programme groups: Challenges to Democratic Representation, Political Economy and Transnational Governance, and Transnational Configurations, Conflict and Governance. These serve as core structures (e.g., they hold monthly research seminars, have responsibilities in HR terms, and organize various flows of money), but they are supplemented by a number of cross-cutting themes and involvement in other research groups and centres (e.g., the Amsterdam Center for European Studies) and certain events series at the level of the faculty. Staff members also encounter each other in their teaching capacities, which are organized at a different level, not along the lines of the programme groups. Total staff numbers have almost doubled from 2013 to 2019 (from 34.26 fte to 62.16 fte) – mostly thanks to external grants. The complex network of programme groups, research centres, and contacts via teaching and other organizational levels nonetheless seems to ensure sufficient cohesion and numerous points of mutual contacts.

The conversations with the committee conveyed a sense of collegiality and mutual inspiration, also across different methodologies, approaches and research traditions. The staff convinced the committee that pluralism is seen as a value to be cherished and not as a threat to be avoided. The department seems highly successful in creating a vibrant research community, in which junior and senior scholars all feel that they can work independently, but also rely on the support of their colleagues and collaborate where desired. The management contributes to this research-oriented culture by making sure that the formal structures work well, that excellent support structures (e.g., for grant writing and administration) are in place, and that research time is protected. Based on university allocation alone, the programme would be able to offer 0.28 fte research time per person, but through external funding that is in part shared across the department, an allocation of 0.4 fte is possible (an indication that collegiality is really taken seriously). Moreover, each staff member is given a teaching-free period where possible, and efficiency is a criterion in teaching allocation (e.g., allowing combinations of research and teaching interests). The department thus clearly seems more than the mere sum of a number of (undoubtedly!) excellent individual researchers.



The department sets very reasonable targets in terms of publication expectations, focussing on quality over quantity. Although staff members have confirmed that the workload is high – partly due to external pressures – the overall work satisfaction seems very high, not least because expectations and promotion criteria (especially from assistant to associate) are clear and transparent.

5.3 Research quality

The research quality is very high, both in qualitative and in quantitative terms. The self-assessment offers a convincing picture of a high level of scientific production in accordance with the goals and criteria of the strategy (e.g., focusing on quality/impact and being clear about minimal quantities). The selection of the top five publications with a brief substantial explanation of their relevance demonstrates willingness and capacity to explain research to non-specialists. The pluralism of methods, fields and topics, which is one of the hallmarks of the department, is also visible in the outputs – it would be an impossible task to summarize the topics and approaches, which range from the history of ideas to questions of international humanitarian collaboration, from party politics to problems of international comparative measurement, and from transnational governance questions to the implications of ethnic diversity.

The numbers are impressive; for example, in the period under evaluation (2013-2019) the members of the department produced a total of 525 refereed articles, of which 391 were in ISI ranked journals, and of these 210 in the top 25% journals – in addition to books, chapters, and non-peer-reviewed outputs. The writing of peer-reviewed monographs with renowned university presses is encouraged, to allow for forms of research that could not easily be pressed into the form of articles. This strategy has certainly worked out. Many of the outputs have received best book / best article awards. Of the steady stream of PhD theses (between 5 and 10 per year in the period under consideration), almost every year at least one PhD thesis received some kind of prize. The many opportunities for feedback in the programme groups or other formats hosted at the department seems one of the key factors for these successes.

In terms of competitive research grants (from the NWO and the ERC) the department has also been outstandingly successful. Between 2013 and 2019, almost 30 million Euros of external funding have been raised, many grants coming from highly competitive and prestigious sources. This was one of the factors that allowed maintaining a 40% research time allocation for all staff members and has paid for positions of numerous PhD candidates and postdoctoral researchers, who have done their part to contribute to the research output. The research support structures for grant writing, but also the collegial support (brainstorming ideas, jointly writing of grant application, provision of feedback) seem to be excellent and have done their part to enable this huge success, in addition to the excellence of the individual grant recipients. The members of the department (especially the senior staff) also contribute to service to the scholarly community in their respective fields. For example, in addition to numerous editorial activities at various journals by individual staff members, one journal – the European Journal of International Relations – is hosted from within the department.⁶

All in all, the department can certainly be considered one of the leading political science departments in Europe, if not the world. Its reputation is also reflected in leading places in international rankings (although the methodologies of these raise their own issues). The focus on research excellence and the

⁶ The strategy notes that staff members are encouraged to participate in, but not coordinate, larger grant proposals for research networks (e.g. from Horizon2020) – while this is understandably in terms of saving time, it seems not quite appropriate, nor necessary, as part of the strategy of such a large and successful department – it would mean free-riding on the efforts of others, who might in fact be less able to do so. In fact, the department has served as coordinator for two Horizon2020 cooperative projects.



collegial culture that supports it has been mentioned as a key factor for why staff members with outside offers chose to remain at the University of Amsterdam.

5.4 Societal relevance

The department distinguishes three kinds of engagement under the category of “societal relevance”: policy and stakeholder engagement, dissemination of research to a broad audience, and research-based societal and stakeholder engagement. The examples provided in the report are very convincing: the pluralism of research topics, methods and approaches is also reflected in the various connections to the broader society. In addition to various memberships (especially of senior staff) in advisory boards and panels, one example that is particularly noteworthy is the blog *StukRoodVlees*, in which department members present their research findings to a broader audience (including journalists) in an accessible language. Although social scientists from outside the department and UvA contribute as well, staff members of the department play a key role to keep the blog alive. Feeding a blog on such a regular basis (including podcasts) is no small feat. As staff members have explained in the conversations with the committee, they also involve younger scholars, e.g., by encouraging PhD candidates to submit pieces. This is an excellent way not only of distributing the burden on more shoulders, but also of making outreach activities part of the academic socialization and training of PhD candidates.

It was made clear in the conversations that there is encouragement, but not pressure, for everyone to engage in societal relevance activities. It is taken into consideration in the annual review talks but does not seem to constitute a burden on staff members. In practice, almost everyone seems to find approaches that are interesting for him or her – again, the pluralism of the department shows itself.

5.5 Viability

Overall, the department seems to have a high degree of viability – it has excellent staff members and the internal structures seem to be set up very well to support them in fulfilling their tasks. The greatest risk is the heavy reliance on external funding (especially for PhD candidates and postdoc positions). Currently, about 2/3 of the research budget come from external sources, many of which are highly competitive (and increasingly so when researchers move from the junior to the mid-level and senior-level categories of grants). Even though some trust can be put into the capacity of staff members and support structures to acquire such grants also in the future (not least thanks to the Matthew effect), there might be some degree of vulnerability here (e.g., because of external developments such as the lowering of the EU budgets for research).

What is very positive – and speaks to the collegiality of the department – is the fact that external money is used partly for the group, in the sense that staff members buy out not only part of their teaching time but also part of their research time and cover it by external grant money. This helps to ensure that all staff members can have 40% research time (while the university only allocates 28%), instead of risking a bifurcation in “research stars” and other staff members who hardly have a chance to get their research going because they are too busy with teaching and administrative tasks (which would threaten the pluralism (if some staff members ended up not doing research any longer or certain lines of research found it easier to get external funding) and the collegial collaboration that seem to be one of the success factors of the department).

A strategy that has recently been adopted to ensure the financial viability of the department, apart and beyond the acquisition of external research funding, is to increase student numbers by offering a new dual-language bachelor. This seems a useful strategy for ensuring stable finances.



Involving junior staff and PhD candidates more into the management of the programme groups (a recent move) seems a good idea in order to make sure that bottom-up suggestions and ideas can be taken up. A good feedback culture and an open ear by senior staff and management should help to draw attention to problems early on and to understand what junior staff need to flourish in the department.

Workload and work-life-balance remain a challenge and need to be carefully monitored, especially for junior staff. It must be admitted, however, that many factors that influence workload are not in the hands of the department, but rather the university and/or the national science policy (e.g. length of the academic year; structural lack of funding for research time; availability of external funding). What is in the hands of the department is to carefully monitor the workload on administrative tasks and to make sure that it does not eat into the 60% teaching-40% research time division.

5.6 PhD programme

The PhD community is large, international, diverse and has a vibrant culture of mutual support and learning not only from more senior staff, but also from peers (e.g., through a PhD candidate club for mutual feedback). Both article-based and monograph-based PhDs are possible; the decision is taken on an individual basis. There are many opportunities for PhD candidates to get involved in organizing events and to network (not least because of money for events from various projects, which senior staff members seem to generously share with junior colleagues and PhD candidates). Each PhD candidate has at least two supervisors, which can come from one or several programme groups (or, in the case of interdisciplinary projects, from other departments of the university).

PhD candidates expressed great satisfaction with the accessibility of their supervisors and the quality and rhythm of feedback. They felt well supported with regard to networking and career planning and seemed happy with the quality of the additional courses they can take. They knew where to turn in case of issues with their supervising team (e.g., PhD representatives or programme group leaders), but such problems seemed infrequent. A considerable part of the PhDs continued an academic career, which speaks to the quality of the programme.

PhDs are funded through different kinds of contracts, coming from different sources of funding. This had apparently led to some lack of clarity with regard to teaching obligations and to PhD candidates not being sure whether everyone was treated equally. However, no PhD candidate seemed to see the percentage of teaching time as a major obstacle to completing their PhD; there are plans for implementing a clearer rule in the future. The management is aware that the different sources of funding can sometimes lead to impressions of unequal treatment and takes steps to ensure fairness. One issue on which PhD candidates claimed improvements could be made is to support PhD candidates who come from abroad to find their way around the (formal and informal) structures and expectations of Dutch academia, but it was not perceived as a major issue. Another suggestion was to consider offering courses for skills that would be useful for the job market outside academia, which seems reasonable given the scarcity of permanent jobs in academia (but also the many job opportunities for PhDs with a solid political science training outside academia).

5.7 Research integrity

The research culture is focussed on excellence, with a clear priority given to quality over quantity – this is an important aspect of reducing incentives for fraudulent behaviour of any kind. There are clear structures in place for addressing all issues such as data management or ethical issues such as privacy, or best practices on issues such as open data storage etc. These structures are obviously also needed because many external funders (e.g., the European Research Council) request them.



There is an Ethics Advisory Board at the level of AISSR. As has been emphasized in conversations with the committee, its attitude is to let people reflect on ethical dilemmas, not just to tick boxes. A Research Integrity and Data Management Protocol is in place, in line with recent updates on the national level. It is noteworthy that all PhD projects also go to the Ethics Advisory Board; it is laudable that awareness for possible ethical issues is thus raised also in the next cohort of researchers. These support structures help researchers to stay up to date with the latest developments, e.g. in terms of open data policies, which are in constant flux and therefore difficult to monitor for individual researchers.

5.8 Diversity

Diversity has many dimensions, and the staff members and management are well aware of this. Gender diversity is very good at junior level; at the level of full professor there is room for improvement (73% male, 27% female). The strategy for working on this that has been proposed is to use internal promotions to improve the balance, which seems realistic. Plans to have clear criteria for the promotion to full professor and to make sure that enough positions are occupied by women in the future seem credible. Also, staff members pointed out that their family situation (e.g., lack of childcare during the Covid lockdown) is taken into account in their annual review talks and their overall evaluation. This should make sure that there are no hurdles for parents in making their way in the department (which is in practice often a problem especially for mothers).

Ethnic diversity is something to work on, but there is an awareness of this as well. The recent black-lives-matter-movement also led to discussions within the department and the formulation of clear strategies, for example the request, in hiring procedures, that candidates integrate their strategies for diversity in their teaching statement. Two recent hires at the level of assistant professor have been persons of colour. These concrete improvements are a signal that the department's commitment to diversity is genuine.

5.9 Recommendations

- In many ways, the key recommendation for the department seems to be: continue doing what you have been doing, it seems to work very well! What is particularly noteworthy is the collegial and egalitarian atmosphere and the genuine commitment to pluralism; moreover, the involvement of PhD candidates and junior staff in management tasks seems an excellent approach for generating bottom-up ideas and initiatives
- Although (or: precisely because!) the staff all seem highly committed and intrinsically motivated researchers, it seems vital to keep an eye on work-life-balance and to make sure that stress is reduced wherever possible. One aspect of this topic is to make sure that administrative tasks are carefully calculated in terms of hours and sufficiently taken into account when tasks are distributed within the department.
- Management and senior staff might want to see what more could be done to help PhD candidates and junior staff members who come from abroad to understand the ins and outs of Dutch academia.
- The department should continue to work on diversity at the level of full professor. Clear criteria for internal promotion seem an important step here.



Given that many department members have emphasized structural problems in Dutch academia as a whole (e.g., length of the academic year, insufficient core funding), it seems advisable to participate, where possible, in activities that bring this issue to the attention of the broader public and politicians.⁷

⁷ The self-assessment mentions “advocacy for social sciences” already as one of the three additional objectives for coming years, and to “better understand and influence” politics of funding as one of the opportunities in the SWOT analysis. However, the department might give this combination of research and advocacy some further thoughts – combining research and advocacy here might lead to a problematic constellation that might raise questions about the objectivity of the research.



Appendix A - Programme of the site visit

Sunday 29 November 2020

Time	
16:00 -19:00	Preparatory committee meeting

Monday 30 November 2020

University of Amsterdam (UvA)

9:00 - 10.00	Internal preparatory meeting, preparation (UvA)
10.00 -10.45	Management
10.45 -10.55	Break
10.55 - 11.25	PhD candidates
11.25 – 11.35	Break
11.35 – 12.20	Junior Staff
12.20 – 13.15	Lunch
13.15 – 14.00	Senior staff
14.00 – 14.10	Break
14:10 – 14.40	preparing questions management
14.40 – 15.10	Management
15.10 – 15.20	Break
15:20 – 16.50	internal deliberation of the committee on assessment UvA
16.50 – 17.05	Informal presentation of the committee's first impressions and findings

Tuesday 1 December 2020

Vrije Universiteit van Amsterdam VUA

9:00 - 10.00	Internal preparatory meeting, preparation (VUA)
10.00 -10.45	Management
10.45 -10.55	Break
10.55 - 11.25	PhD candidates
11.25 – 11.35	Break
11.35 – 12.20	Junior Staff
12.20 – 13.15	Lunch
13.15 – 14.00	Senior staff
14.00 – 14.10	Break
14:10 – 14.40	preparing questions management
14.40 – 15.10	Management
15.10 – 15.20	Break
15:20 – 16.50	internal deliberation of the committee on assessment VUA
16.50 – 17.05	Informal presentation of the committee's first impressions and findings



Wednesday 2 December 2020

Leiden University

9:00 - 10.00	Internal preparatory meeting, preparation (Leiden University)
10.00 -10.45	Management
10.45 -10.55	Break
10.55 - 11.25	PhD candidates
11.25 – 11.35	Break
11.35 – 12.20	Junior Staff
12.20 – 13.15	Lunch
13.15 – 14.00	Senior staff
14.00 – 14.10	Break
14:10 – 14.40	preparing questions management
14.40 – 15.10	Management
15.10- 15.20	Break
15.20 – 16.50	internal deliberation of the committee on assessment Leiden University
16.50 -17.00	Break
17.00 – 18.00	Preparing state of the art report
18.00 -18.15	Informal presentation of the committee’s first impressions and findings Leiden University



Appendix B Tables

1. Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

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

	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018		2019	
	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#
Scientific Staff ¹	3.75	14	4.26	14	4.03	14	3.18	13	2.74	10	2.54	11	10	3.27
Post-docs ²	2.04	5	2.09	4	1.62	5	2.33	3	3.02	4	0.71	1	2	1.36
PhD candidates ³	9.28	15	8.79	13	5.49	9	3.88	7	1.70	3	2.00	2	2	2.00
Total research staff	15.03	34	15.14	31	11.14	28	9.39	23	7.46	17	5.25	14	14	6.63

Note 1: Comparable with WOPI categories HGL, UHD and UD; tenured and non-tenured staff.

Note 2: Comparable with WOPI category Onderzoeker.

Note 3: Includes Standard PhD (employed) and Contract PhDs (externally or internally funded but not employed) – according to the VSNU definitions and only if they are allowed to spend at least 0.8 FTE on their research.

Table 1.2 Funding - Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

Funding	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018		2019	
	fte	%	fte	%	fte	%	fte	%	fte	%	fte	%	fte	%
Direct funding	4.34	29%	4.05	27%	3.34	30%	4.19	45%	3.48	47%	2.54	48%	2.43	37%
National research grants ¹	3.82	25%	5.03	33%	4.05	36%	2.05	22%	1.63	22%	-	-	0.69	10%
International research grants ²	2.66	18%	1.93	13%	0.79	7%	1.00	11%	1.00	13%	0.71	14%	1.51	23%
Contract research ³	2.21	15%	2.15	14%	1.64	15%	0.45	5%	0.15	2%	-	-	-	-
Other ⁴	2.00	13%	2.05	13%	1.40	12%	1.70	18%	1.20	16%	2.00	38%	2	30%
Total funding	15.03	100%	15.22	100%	11.22	100%	9.39	100%	7.46	100%	5.25	100%	6.63	100%

Note 1: Research grants obtained in national scientific competition, specifically, grants obtained from the Dutch Science Foundation (NWO) and the Dutch Royal Academy (KNAW).

Note 2: International Research grants include research grants obtained in scientific competition organised by non-Dutch bodies like the European Research Council (ERC) and the European framework programme (Horizon 2020), as well as Non-Dutch national science foundations (like the ESRC in the UK).

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

Note 4: Funds that do not fit in other categories (i.c. external sponsorship of contract PhDs).



Table 1.3 Output - Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Refereed scientific articles ¹	20	17	12	7	19	11	10	96
<i>ISI Ranked</i> ²	14	12	9	4	14	10	8	71
Non-refereed scientific articles ³	1	3	-	1	1	-	-	6
Scientific monographs	2	3	-	4	1	1	-	11
Editorship of scientific volumes	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	11
Scientific book chapters	16	18	12	15	15	8	8	92
Subtotal scientific publications	41	43	25	29	37	21	20	216
Professional publications ⁴	5	9	5	3	7	9	2	40
Publications aimed at the general public ⁵	11	6	3	7	3	3	4	37
Other research output (esp published inaugural and farewell speeches ⁶)	2	2	1	1	-	-	2	8
Total publications scientific staff	59	60	34	40	47	32	28	301
PhD Thesis ⁶	2	4	2	1	4	2	-	15

Note 1: Scientific articles included for the year of their official publication. Articles that are only available as 'online first' are excluded. We do not include a separate category for the editorship of Special Issues.

Note 2: This is a subsection of the broader category 'refereed articles' (1) and is not counted towards the total number of publications.

Note 3: Articles in journals that are non-refereed yet deemed important for the field (vakpublicaties).

Note 4: Publications aimed at professionals in the public and private sector (professionele publicaties), including scientific reports.

Note 5: Also known as populariserende artikelen. Only including publications that have appeared in hard-copy (not online only) and have passed an external editorial board.

Note 6: PhD-theses defended at the institute and supervised by one of the 'staff members'.

Table 1.4a Standard PhD candidates - Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

Enrolment																	
Starting year				Graduated after (<=) 4 years		Graduated after (<=) 5 years		Graduated after (<=) 6 years		Graduated after (<=) 7 years		Total graduated		Not yet finished		Discontinued	
	M	F	M+F	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	4	1	5	0	0%	3	60%	4	80%	0	0%	4	80%	0	0%	1	20%
2011		1	1	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%
2012	1	1	2	0	0%	2	100%	2	100%	2	100%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%
2013	1	2	3	0	0%	1	33%	3	100%			3	100%	0	0%	0	0%
2014	-	-	-														
2015	-	-	-														
Total	6	5	11	0	0%	6	55%					9	82%	0	0%	2	18%

Table 1.4b Contract PhD candidates - Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

Enrolment																	
Starting year				Graduated after (<=) 4 years		Graduated after (<=) 5 years		Graduated after (<=) 6 years		Graduated after (<=) 7 years		Total graduated		Not yet finished		Discontinued	
	M	F	M+F	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	1		1	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%			0	0%
2011	-	-	-														
2012		1	1	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
2013		1	1	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%			0	0%	0	0%	1	100%
2014	-	-	-														
2015	2		2											1	50%	1	50%
Total	3	2	5	0	0%	1	20%					2	40%	1	20%	2	40%



2. Leiden University

Table 2.1 Number of staff and research fte – Leiden University

	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018		2019	
	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#
Scientific Staff ¹	6.92	26	6.49	31	6.12	29	6.67	31	8.27	36	9.37	39	10.94	49
Post-docs ²	3.29	6	0.77	3	1.40	2	1.91	4	2.07	3	0.87	3	0.88	3
PhD candidates ³	5.22	9	6.31	12	8.01	15	7.95	12	5.50	8	3.00	5	3.53	5
Total research staff	15.44	41	13.57	46	15.53	46	16.54	47	15.83	47	13.26	47	15.35	57

Note 1: Comparable with WOPI categories HGL, UHD and UD; tenured and non-tenured staff; only staff members with appointment $\geq .2$ fte with research time; research time allocated is 21% per fte.

Note 2: Comparable with WOPI category *Onderzoeker*; research time allocated is 100% per fte.

Note 3: Standard PhD (employed) and Contract PhDs (externally or internally funded but not employed) – according to the VSNU definitions – and only if they are allowed to spend at least 0.75 fte on their research; research time allocated is 75% per fte.

Table 2.2 Funding - Leiden University

	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018		2019	
	fte	%	fte	%	fte	%	fte	%	fte	%	fte	%	fte	%
Funding														
Direct funding	8.69	57%	9.57	71%	10.58	68%	10.05	61%	8.41	53%	9.21	69%	11.06	72%
National research grants ¹	4.44	28%	2.67	19%	1.50	10%	2.31	14%	4.02	25%	3.02	23%	2.56	17%
International research grants ²	2.31	15%	0.99	7%	1.79	11%	1.93	12%	1.13	7%	0.70	5%	0.1	1%
Contract research ³	0	0%	0.33	2%	1.66	11%	2.25	14%	2.27	14%	0.33	3%	1.08	7%
Other ⁴	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0.56	4%
Total funding	15.44	100%	13.57	100%	15.53	100%	16.54	100%	15.83	100%	13.26	100%	15.35	100%

Note 1: Research grants obtained in national scientific competition, specifically, grants obtained from the Dutch Science Foundation (NWO) and the Dutch Royal Academy (KNAW).

Note 2: International Research grants include research grants obtained in scientific competition organised by non-Dutch bodies like the European Research Council (ERC) and the European framework programme (Horizon 2020), as well as Non-Dutch national science foundations (like the ESRC in the UK).

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

Note 4: Funds that do not fit in other categories



Table 2.3 Output - Leiden University

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Refereed scientific articles ¹	21	33	21	26	33	29	50	210
<i>ISI Ranked</i> ²	16	29	15	20	26	24	47	177
Non-refereed scientific articles ³	2	8	3	9	6	3	2	33
Scientific books	3	5	3	4	8	8	5	36
<i>Scientific monographs</i>	2	2	2	2	2	4	2	16
<i>Editorship of scientific volumes</i>	1	3	1	2	6	4	3	20
Scientific book chapters	20	33	18	23	32	23	20	169
Sub total scientific publications	43	79	45	62	79	63	77	448
Professional publications ⁴	11	15	18	12	9	11	2	78
Publications aimed at the general public ⁵	8	24	23	19	25	13	18	130
Other research output (esp published inaugural and farewell speeches ⁶)	-	1	-	-	1	-	2	4
Total publications scientific staff	62	119	86	93	114	87	99	660
PhD Thesis ⁶	2	5	3	4	4	3	4	25

Note 1: Scientific articles included for the year of their official publication. Articles that are only available as 'online first' are excluded. We do not include a separate category for the editorship of Special Issues.

Note 2: This is a subsection of the broader category 'refereed articles' (1) and is not counted towards the total number of publications.

Note 3: Articles in journals that are non-refereed yet deemed important for the field (vakpublicaties).

Note 4: Publications aimed at professionals in the public and private sector (professionele publicaties), including scientific reports.

Note 5: Also known as populariserende artikelen. Only including publications that have appeared in hard-copy (not online only) and have passed an external editorial board.

Note 6: PhD-theses defended at the institute and supervised by one of the 'staff members'

Table 2.4 Standard PhD candidates - Leiden University

Enrolment																	
Starting year				Graduated after (<=) 4 years		Graduated after (<=) 5 years		Graduated after (<=) 6 years		Graduated after (<=) 7 years		Total graduated		Not yet finished		Discontinued	
	M	F	M+F	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	%	%	#	%
2011	2	4	6	0	0%	2	33%	3	50%	4	67%	5	83%	0	0%	1	17%
2012	1	1	2	0	0%	2	100%	2	100%	2	100%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%
2013	1	1	2	0	0%	1	50%	2	100%	2	100%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%
2014	3	2	5	0	0%	2	40%	4	80%	4	80%	4	80%	0	0%	1	20%
2015	2	1	3	0	0%	0	0%					0	0%	2	67%	1	33%
Total	9	9	18	0	0%	7	39%					13	72%	2	11%	3	17%

Note 1: Since the number of PhD candidates is so small and in recent years the Institute has not been allowed to fund PhD candidates from its own funds (*eerste geldstroom*), Leiden University did not present separate tables for each of the relevant categories of PhDs as defined by the VSNU. Instead figures for all internally funded candidates are presented in a single overview.



3. University of Amsterdam

Table 3.1 Number of staff and research fte – University of Amsterdam

	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018		2019	
	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#
Scientific Staff ¹	19.97	51	21.90	53	24.09	52	28.83	58	29.25	60	29.10	58	28.95	57
Post-docs ²	1.78	4	3.77	9	10.32	17	9.83	17	9.42	17	10.84	19	9.26	17
PhD candidates ³	12.51	18	14.12	22	15.51	23	18.11	25	25.51	36	26.60	38	23.94	33
Total research staff	34.26	73	39.78	84	49.92	92	56.77	100	64.18	113	66.54	115	62.16	107

Note 1 Comparable with WOPI categories HGL, UHD and UD; tenured and non-tenured staff (research time allocated is 40% per FTE)

Note 2 Comparable with WOPI category Onderzoeker (research time allocated is 100% per FTE)

Note 3 For the purpose of this table, we only include Standard PhD (employed) and Contract PhDs (externally or internally funded but not employed) – according to the VSNU definitions – and only if they are allowed to spend at least 0.8 FTE on their research (research time allocated is 90% per FTE)

Table 3.2 Funding - University of Amsterdam

	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018		2019	
	fte	%	fte	%	fte	%	fte	%	fte	%	fte	%	fte	%
Funding														
Direct funding	20.82	61%	19.86	50%	17.41	35%	21.90	39%	22.18	35%	22.32	34%	21.05	34%
National research grants ¹	8.05	24%	9.58	24%	16.41	33%	16.89	30%	17.07	27%	17.12	26%	15.50	25%
International research grants ²	4.03	12%	8.54	21%	13.25	27%	16.63	29%	21.31	33%	23.10	35%	22.72	37%
Contract research ³	1.35	4%	1.80	5%	2.85	6%	1.35	2%	3.63	6%	4.01	6%	2.90	5%
Other ⁴	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%
Total funding	34.26	100%	39.78	100%	49.92	100%	56.77	100%	64.18	100%	66.54	100%	62.16	100%

Note 1: Research grants obtained in national scientific competition, specifically, grants obtained from the Dutch Science Foundation (NWO) and the Dutch Royal Academy (KNAW).

Note 2: International Research grants include research grants obtained in scientific competition organised by non-Dutch bodies like the European Research Council (ERC) and the European framework programme (Horizon 2020), as well as Non-Dutch national science foundations (like the ESRC in the UK).

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

Note 4: Funds that do not fit in other categories

Table 3.3 Output - University of Amsterdam

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Refereed scientific articles ¹	72	62	72	85	75	91	68	525
ISI Ranked ²	46	43	61	68	51	74	48	391
Top 25% ³	25	27	35	33	24	33	33	210
Non-refereed scientific articles ⁴	9	4	4	1	3	4	1	26
Scientific books	3	7	9	5	12	6	8	50
Scientific monographs	1	2	2	0	4	4	3	16
Editorship of scientific volumes	2	5	7	5	8	2	5	34
Scientific book chapters	18	33	36	30	46	27	35	225
Sub total scientific publications	102	106	121	121	136	128	112	826
Professional publications ⁴	37	43	17	35	34	21	24	211
Publications aimed at the general public ⁵	15	12	9	9	19	15	20	99
Other research output (esp published inaugural and farewell speeches) ⁶	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	5
Total publications scientific staff	155	161	147	165	193	164	156	1141
PhD Thesis ⁷	5	7	5	10	8	8	9	52

Note 1 Scientific articles will only be included for the year of their official publication. Articles that are only available as 'online first' are excluded and will then probably be included in the subsequent review period. We include a separate category for the editorship of Special Issues.

Note 2 This is a subsection of the broader category 'refereed articles. This subcategory should not be counted towards the total number of publications.

Note 3 The top 25% is defined based on the five-year impact factor, within disciplinary categories of Web of Science.

Note 4 Articles in journals that are non-refereed, yet deemed important for the field (vakpublicaties).

Note 5 Publications aimed at professionals in the public and private sector (professionele publicaties), including scientific reports.

Note 6 Also known as populariserende artikelen. Only including publications that have appeared in hard-copy (not online only) and have passed an external editorial board.

Note 7 PhD-theses defended at the institute and supervised by one of the 'staff members'.

Table 3.4a Standard PhD candidates - University of Amsterdam

Enrolment																	
Starting year				Graduated after (<=) 4 years		Graduated after (<=) 5 years		Graduated after (<=) 6 years		Graduated after (<=) 7 years		Total graduated		Not yet finished		Discontinued	
	M	F	M+F	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	0	1	1	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
2011	2	5	7	0	0%	1	14%	5	71%	6	86%	6	86%	0	0%	1	14%
2012	1	1	2	0	0%	2	100%	2	100%	2	100%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%
2013	1	1	2	0	0%	2	100%	2	100%			2	100%	0	0%	0	0%
2014	7	1	8	1	13%	6	75%	7	88%			7	88%	1	13%	0	0%
2015	3	2	5	0	0%	4	80%	4	80%			4	80%	1	20%	0	0%
Total	14	11	25	1	4%	15	60%	20	80%			21	84%	3	12%	1	4%



Table 3.4b Contract PhD candidates - University of Amsterdam

Enrolment																	
Starting year				Graduated after (\leq) 4 years		Graduated after (\leq) 5 years		Graduated after (\leq) 6 years		Graduated after (\leq) 7 years		Total graduated		Not yet finished		Discontinued	
	M	F	M+F	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	0	0	0														
2011	0	0	0														
2012	0	1	1	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%
2013	0	0	0														
2014	0	1	1	1	100%							1	100%	0	100%	0	0%
2015	1	0	1	0	0%							0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Total	1	2	3	1	33%							1	33%	1	33%	1	33%

Data in tables 3.4a and 3.4b is cumulative



Appendix C – 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

