



Assessment report

Sociology

2013 – 2018

RESEARCH REVIEW
SOCIOLOGY
2013-2018

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

Contents

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

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

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

Preface

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Dimitri Mortelmans

chair of the committee

1. Introduction

1.1 Terms of reference for the assessment

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

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

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

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

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

1.2 The review committee

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

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

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

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

1.3 Procedures followed by the committee

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

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

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

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

2. Sociology in the Netherlands – an appreciation

2.1 Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

2.2 Quality

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.4 The Janus head of viability

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

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

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

2.5 PhDs – continuity on a high level

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.6 Diversity – the long way to go

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.7 Integrity – procedures embedded and integrated in the daily practice

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

2.8 General recommendations

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Assessments of the research programmes

8. Radboud University Nijmegen

8.1 Quantitative assessment

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

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

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

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

8.2 Introduction, strategy and targets

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

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

8.3 Research quality

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8.4 Societal relevance

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

Examples of their valorisation activities are:

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

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

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

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

8.5 Viability

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

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

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

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

8.6 PhD programme

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

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

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

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

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

8.7 Research integrity

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

8.8 Diversity

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

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

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

8.9 Recommendations

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Appendix A – Curriculum Vitae

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Appendix B – Programme of the site visit

Monday 24 February 2020, Radisson blu hotel,

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

Tuesday 25 February: Trippenhuis

Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

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

Erasmus University Rotterdam

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

Wednesday 26 February: Trippenhuis

Utrecht University

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

University of Groningen

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

Thursday 27 February: Trippenhuis

University of Amsterdam

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

Radboud University Nijmegen

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

Friday 28 February Trippenhuis

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

Appendix C – Tables

I. Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

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

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

Table 1.2 Funding - Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

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

Table 1.3 Output - Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

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

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

Table 1.4 PhD candidates (internal) - Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

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

2. Erasmus University Rotterdam

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

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

Table 2.2 Funding – Erasmus University Rotterdam

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

Table 2.3 Output – Erasmus University Rotterdam

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

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

Table 2.4 PhD candidates- Erasmus University Rotterdam*

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

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

3. Utrecht University

Table 3.1 Number of staff and research fte – Utrecht University

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

Table 3.2 Funding – Utrecht University

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

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

Table 3.3 Output – Utrecht University

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

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

Table 3.4 PhD candidates - Utrecht University

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

4. University of Groningen

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

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

Table 4.2 Funding – University of Groningen

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

Table 4.3 Output – University of Groningen

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

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

Table 4.4 PhD candidates - University of Groningen

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

5. University of Amsterdam

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

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

Table 5.2 Funding – University of Amsterdam

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

Table 5.3 Output – University of Amsterdam

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

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

Table 5.4 PhD candidates - University of Amsterdam

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

6. Radboud University

Table 6.1 Number of staff and research fte – Radboud University

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

Table 6.2 Funding- Radboud University

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

Table 6.3 Output - Radboud University

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

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

Table 6.4 PhD candidates - Radboud University

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

Appendix D – Meaning of the scores

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

Appendix E – General indicators

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

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

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

** including the publications in top 10% journals

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

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

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

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

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

Table 3: External research funding* per FTE scientific staff

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

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

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

Respons of the Institute

Sociologie brede aanbevelingen rapportage

In het rapport zijn een negental algemene aanbevelingen voor alle Sociologiegroepen in Nederland opgenomen. De reactie vanuit Sociologie-Nijmegen op deze aanbevelingen en een eventueel tijdspad volgt hieronder.

1. All Sociology programmes should gather and develop a new system of evaluation of research that relies more on quality than on quantity.

De commissie was hoogstwaarschijnlijk niet op de hoogte van het feit dat dit in het nieuwe SEP-protocol al is verdisconteerd. Daarin ligt meer nadruk op kwaliteit van onderzoek, worden de DORA-richtlijnen onderschreven en is meer aandacht voor de publieke vertaling van onderzoek. (implementatie=lopend).

2. All universities should start a process of administrative simplification both in the domain of education as well as research. The aim of this exercise is not to give up accountability procedures but to make them lean and with a minimal impact on the research time of the staff.

De sectie Sociologie kan zich goed vinden in deze suggestie. We zijn echter van mening dat dit veeleer een universiteit brede, of zelfs VSNU verantwoordelijkheid is. Vereenvoudiging van procedures is veelal gericht op vermindering van werkdruk. Hiervoor is binnen FSW al veel aandacht: het bestuur van FSW vervult hierbij een voortrekkersrol. Door het instellen van zogenaamde werkdruk-officers wordt geïnventariseerd waar verlichting kan worden geboden. Momenteel wordt getracht de aanbevelingen te implementeren om zo procedures soepeler te laten verlopen. Tegelijkertijd is er in bureaucratische instellingen (zoals ook universiteiten), een blijvende roep om meer te organiseren en te formaliseren (rond onderwijs, examens, beroepsmogelijkheden, werving en selectie, diversiteitsbeleid, begeleiding). Het is voor de sectie Sociologie niet mogelijk om zich hieraan te onttrekken.

(implementatie beleid vermindering werkdruk = lopend).

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

De leiding van de sectie Sociologie begrijpt het advies van de commissie. Binnen de universiteit is ook een omvangrijk programma van cursussen (GROW) beschikbaar voor Postdocs om competenties te vergroten. Dit wordt op de website van RSCR ook kenbaar gemaakt. Ook is het mogelijk leiderschapstrainingen te volgen via Radboud Career Services en is er de mogelijkheid voor individuele loopbaanadviezen. Dat wellicht het aanbod bij Postdocs nog niet geheel bekend is, duidt er op dat voorlichting over de mogelijkheden wellicht geïntensiveerd kan worden. Naast RU-brede voorlichting, kunnen deze mogelijkheden nog nadrukkelijker worden besproken in de jaargesprekken met Postdocs.

(implementatie uitbreiding voorlichting = vanaf 2020).

4. The committee acknowledged lack of clarity about the PhD trajectory when starting and insights about potential later career trajectories and suggests: (1) to develop a clear insightful document on different career paths and its implications at the start of the PhD; (2) In addition to information, a more pro-active policy is necessary to prepare the non-academic skills of PhDs during their trajectory; (3) Start reflecting on the use of internships for co-creation with society. The committee believes that a cocreation internship outside academia could significantly stimulate innovation in research in the Netherlands.

Deze aanbeveling is sterk verwant aan die bij het bovenstaand onder 3. Tekstueel zijn er daarom enkele overeenkomsten. De sectie Sociologie is het niet geheel eens met dit advies. Voor ons is nu juist een belangrijk selectie criterium voor PhD's dat zij een carrière binnen de wetenschap ambiëren. Personen zonder deze ambitie worden niet aangenomen. Indien PhD's binnen 1 jaar aangeven dat zij geen wetenschappelijke carrière nastreven en laten zien dat zij ook de wetenschappelijke kwaliteiten niet bezitten, is dit een reden om het contract na 1.5 jaar te beëindigen. Het PhD traject is voor hen dan niet de juiste route. Het kan wel zo zijn dat PhD's er later in het traject achter komen dat zij buiten de academie de loopbaan willen voortzetten na afronding van de promotie. Dit is bij Sociologie dan vrijwel altijd in een onderzoekersfunctie op hoog niveau (CBS, SCP, WODC, Ministeries). Uiteraard vinden we dit een goed en passend vervolg op de PhD loopbaan en geven we wensen voor een dergelijke transitie zoveel mogelijk aandacht en ondersteuning.

(1) Binnen de Radboud universiteit is een omvangrijk programma van cursussen (GROW) gericht op niet-academische competenties beschikbaar voor PhD's. Dit wordt op de website van RSCR duidelijk kenbaar gemaakt. Ook is er de mogelijkheid voor individuele loopbaanadviezen via Radboud Career Services. Dat wellicht het gehele aanbod bij PhD's nog niet geheel bekend is, duidt er op dat voorlichting over de mogelijkheden wellicht geïntensiveerd kan worden.

(2) Het beleid van RSCR schrijft voor dat de loopbaan van de PhD jaarlijks wordt besproken in de jaargesprekken. Naar aanleiding daarvan treedt de leidinggevende faciliterend op voor de PhD in termen van adviseren over cursussen, aanreiken mogelijke stageplekken, en informeren over toekomstige posities uit zijn/haar netwerk.

(3) De sectie Sociologie wenst te benadrukken dat, hoewel niet-academische stages zeer wel mogelijk zijn, vrijwel alle PhD's (zelf) kiezen voor een academische buitenlandse stage. (geen implementatie nodig).

5. The committee saw some gender balance, all universities still have a considerable way to go. The committee appreciates the awareness across the research programmes, but regrets the slow progress in this respect. We recommend that all programmes continue to address the gender imbalance and develop a clear action plan to speed up the hiring of female full professors.

De sectie Sociologie streeft naar een gelijke gender representatie binnen de staf om de kwaliteit van onderzoek en van de werkomgeving te optimaliseren. Om dit te bevorderen heeft RSCR in 2018 het Gender & Diversity beleid (zie RSCR website/zelfstudie Appendix 8) ingesteld. Meer specifiek kent dit RSCR beleid zes regelingen die vrouwelijke onderzoekers stimuleren in hun carrière.

Op dit moment is binnen de sectie Sociologie 58% vrouw (ratio 22:16). Deze oververtegenwoordiging is echter vooral te vinden op PhD niveau, en op UD niveau is er sprake van gelijke representatie. Bij de full-professoren is de verhouding 2 uit 5, maar bij de UHD's en bijzonder Hoogleraren is de verhouding nog behoorlijk scheef. Ondanks deze nog altijd ietwat scheve totale gender representatie, zijn door Sociologie de laatste jaren behoorlijke stappen gemaakt naar een meer gelijke balans. De sectie is van

plan het beleid in deze te continueren. Daarbij hopen we op begrip dat dit een langlopend proces is omdat we bij de zittende staf geen mogelijkheden zien de gender-balans te veranderen. (implementatie=lopend).

6. The committee acknowledges the difficulty to overcome the current absence of minority groups in the sociology departments. The committee urges the universities to no longer see ethnic diversity in terms of nationality only and start initiatives in the bachelor programmes to increase the number of participants from first generation students and Dutch students with a migrant background to choose the research master. For and Nijmegen, we expect at least one Dutch student with a migrant background in the PhD trajectory at the end of the next evaluation period.

De sectie Sociologie is het eens met de commissie dat de instroom van tweede generatie migranten studenten betrekkelijk klein is, met name op het PhD niveau. Voor de Radboud Universiteit is dit gegeven de ligging een groter probleem dan voor universiteiten in de randstad met haar meer diverse populatie. Het start allemaal met de instroom van studenten in de BA-Sociologie, en deze zijn veelal afkomstig uit de regio, zijnde Limburg, Noord-Brabant en Oost-Gelderland. Populatiegegevens laten zien dat het absolute aantal migranten kinderen met het noodzakelijke VWO diploma in deze regio in absolute zin betrekkelijk gering is. Daarbij komt dat de opleiding Sociologie kiest voor een hoofdzakelijk Nederlandstalig curriculum vanwege het uitstroomprofiel van de afgestudeerden. Onze afgestudeerden voornamelijk terecht op de Nederlandse arbeidsmarkt in functies als beleidsonderzoeker, beleidsmedewerker en/of in het onderwijs.

Dit gezegd hebbend zijn we van mening dat een toename van instroom van promovendi met een migratie-achtergrond begint met bewustwording. Binnen de staf (met name de Phd's) is diversiteit een belangrijk thema en we zijn van mening dat dit de inclusiviteit voor, en instroom van deze groepen promovendi kan bevorderen. Momenteel is er een half Turkse studente aangesteld als promovenda (afronding in 2021), zijn er 2 Duitse promovendi gestart met een PhD traject en is er 1 Singaporese promovenda (op een totaal van 12 PhD-studenten). Een Indonesische promovendus is in 2020 gepromoveerd en inmiddels werkzaam bij een Indonesische universiteit. (implementatie = lopend).

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

Binnen het onderzoeksinstituut RSCR is naar aanleiding van deze visitatie een document ontwikkeld dat PhD's (en andere staf) kan helpen bij issues rond auteurschap. Onder andere wordt aangegeven welke overwegingen spelen ten aanzien van de auteursvolgorde, en wordt aanbevolen in de acknowledgements op te nemen wie in welk deel van het artikel heeft geparticipeerd. Het moet duidelijk zijn dat PhD's binnen RSCR bij publicaties uit hun dissertatie altijd eerste auteur zijn. Het document is onlangs besproken in de Raad van Advies van RSCR en zal binnenkort via de website openbaar worden gemaakt.

(implementatie = 2021).

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

Staf van de sectie Sociologie is het van harte eens met deze suggesties. Binnen RSCR wordt een notitie voorbereid waarin regels en aanbevelingen staan voor auteursvermeldingen bij publicaties (zie ook punt 7). Het moet duidelijk zijn dat PhD's binnen RSCR bij publicaties uit hun dissertatie altijd eerste auteur zijn, en dat co-auteurschap substantiële participatie vereist. In deze notitie staat ook de aanbeveling om de onderlinge taakverdeling bij het tot stand komen van het artikel in de dissertatie aan te geven.

Ook is het zo dat binnen het ICS, de landelijke onderzoeksschool waarin de Nijmeegse Sociologie PhD's participeren, een PhD altijd een externe stage volgt, meestal in het buitenland bij een gereputeerde collega. Bij het paper dat hieruit voortkomt zijn de primaire begeleiders vanuit de Radboud Universiteit veelal geen coauteur. Wij zijn er echter geen voorstander van om dwingend voor te schrijven dat er één single auteurspaper moet worden geschreven, of dat begeleiders geen co-auteur mogen zijn. Het schrijven van artikelen en begeleiden van een PhD is maatwerk en afhankelijk van persoonlijke kwaliteiten en omstandigheden. Een al te stringente regulering in deze zal hoogstwaarschijnlijk leiden tot vertraging in het promotietraject en tot minder binding van supervisors met hun promovendi. Dit achten wij ongewenst.

(implementatie = lopend).

9. The committee was impressed by the overall strength and depth of Sociology as a discipline in the Netherlands, but considered the differences between the six Sociology programmes to be rather small. Nevertheless, these are extraordinary times whereby sociology as a discipline is threatened from the bottom by a decrease in students but also from the top as overall finances for the social sciences might decrease in the coming years. We recommend to (1) create a structural united front of the managers of the sociology programmes, across universities. Programmes can compete with each other harshly in grant competitions but at the policy level the external threats will only be counteracted by a strong cross-department consultation. (2) Keep the discipline united in the future by using joint communication channels such as socialevraagstukken.nl to show the Dutch society what its sociologists do and to demonstrate the knowledge and solutions they produce. (3) Keep your evaluation discipline bound. Already one sociology programme is missing from this round's evaluation but a joint evaluation is a moment where you can show the overall quality and strength of Dutch sociology as a whole. Paradoxically, internal comparisons between departments within universities are much less powerful than a joint evaluation.

De sectie Sociologie is het van harte eens met de bovengenoemde punten en wil benadrukken dat de verhoudingen in de Nederlandse Sociologie behoorlijk goed zijn. Gemeenschappelijke initiatieven en samenwerkingen worden gecoördineerd via de NSV (Nederlandse Sociologie Vereniging), en betreffen het subsidiëren van Nederlandstalige tijdschriften, organiseren van de jaarlijkse Dag van de Sociologie en het faciliteren van online publicatie kanalen zoals Sociale Vraagstukken.nl. Daarnaast participeert

Sociologie Nijmegen in het ICS (landelijke onderzoeksschool) waarbinnen onze PhD's hun opleiding verkrijgen. Inmiddels hebben in het ICS meer dan 280 succesvolle promotietrajecten plaatsgevonden (plusminus 50 uit Nijmegen). Het ICS heeft internationaal een zeer sterke reputatie en biedt daarmee onze PhD studenten een goede opstap naar een succesvolle wetenschappelijke carrière (zie de zelfstudie). Ook onderschrijft de sectie de aanbeveling voor een landelijke visitatie in 2025 waaraan alle afdelingen zullen deelnemen. Bij een gereputeerde maar relatief kleine discipline als de Sociologie is het belangrijk om landelijk haar kracht en innovativiteit te tonen. De sectie Sociologie is het ook eens met de stelling dat lokale visitaties van meerdere secties binnen de universiteit minder krachtig zijn: daarin komen gereputeerde maar relatief kleine disciplines minder tot hun recht dan grotere disciplines met meer diversiteit aan benaderingen en thema's. (implementatie = lopend).

Aanbevelingen specifiek voor Sociologie Nijmegen

Een viertal aanbevelingen was specifiek voor Nijmegen. In vergelijking met de andere groepen was dit aantal laag.

1. The committee thinks that academic networks are an excellent instrument to stimulate future success in acquiring grant proposals. The staff members clearly showed to the committee that they are integrated in several larger academic networks. We recommend taking on a more leading role in the networks you are involved in. Instead of teaming up in a consortium as a partner, we recommend taking a leading role for well chosen grant proposals (identified in the strategic plan mentioned above). In this way, Nijmegen's sociology will become more agenda-setting and more successful in obtaining research grants.

Wij zijn het met de commissie eens dat het indienen van onderzoeksvorstellen en agenda setting veel energie en planning vereist. De potentie van de staf om meer succesvol te zijn in dit domein wordt erkend door de commissie mede door de aanwezigheid van staf in diverse netwerken. Hoewel de leiding van de sectie Sociologie van mening is dat de 'opportunities' worden erkend, is het niet altijd mogelijk hier een leidende rol in te spelen. Met een relatief kleine staf binnen Sociologie Nijmegen die onderwijs en onderzoek combineert is het lastig om onderzoekers meerdere maanden vrij te houden om aan bijvoorbeeld internationale subsidievoorstellen te schrijven. Daarbij komt dat de 'success rate' bij dergelijke grootschalige projecten betrekkelijk gering is, terwijl onze 'success rate' in kleinschaligere samenwerking betrekkelijk groot is. Als strategische keuze stimuleert de sectie Sociologie daarom vooral inzet bij persoonlijke subsidies en meer kleinschalige samenwerking en hierin zijn we ook tamelijk succesvol met deelname aan Zwaartekrachtprogramma SCOOP, NWA-TRIAL, ZonMW, VENI en VIDJ. Dit laat onverlet dat het goed is om na te denken over strategieën die het mogelijk maken meer met agenda-setting bezig te zijn, waardoor bepaalde subsidie meer binnen bereik komen. Hierbij kunnen we ook denken aan het schrijven van editorial of zogenaamde positioning papers. (implementatie = lopend).

2. The programme has a clear vision on the direction it wants to develop their research in terms of content. The programme deliberately chooses the card of interdisciplinary research starting from their problem driven sociological approach. The committee welcomes the clear choices made in the department and encourages the department to continue on the path chosen.

*De sectie Sociologie is verheugd dat de commissie haar strategische keuzes op het terrein van onderzoek herkent en onderschrijft. Ons onderzoeksprogramma is vooraleerst probleem-gestuurd en concentreert zich thematisch op vragen over sociale ongelijkheid en cohesie. Door gebruik te maken van interdisciplinaire inzichten staan we voor de groei van academische kennis door het afleiden van toetsbare hypothesen en deze te toetsen met kwalitatief hoogstaande data. Door vervolgens de vertaalslag naar het bredere publiek te maken trachten we onze kennis breed toegankelijk te maken. **(implementatie = lopend)**.*

3. Sociological research at the University of Nijmegen is at a high level. Nevertheless, the size of the department needs to be a constant point of attention. Limited resources require Nijmegen's sociology to make hard choices because it cannot do everything. We recommend acting more strategically and plan actions on (1) grant proposal writing and (2) agenda setting in your fields of expertise. A strategic master plan on these domains is necessary to plan your actions carefully during the coming years.

*Deze aanbeveling is sterk verwant aan die onder 1. Wij zijn het met de commissie eens dat het indienen van onderzoeksvorstellen en agenda setting veel energie en planning vereist. Binnen de sectie Sociologie zijn leidinggevend en zich bewust van hun voortrekkersrol en stimuleren medewerkers strategisch om vooral kansrijke subsidie-aanvragen te doen. Met name in de individuele subsidierondes zijn RSCR onderzoekers tamelijk succesvol (VENI, VIDI, NWO Talent). De positionering van Nijmeegse sociologen in grotere internationale consortia kan inderdaad verbeteren, en dit vergt meer inzet in netwerkvorming en betrokkenheid bij calls voor subsidierondes. **(implementatie = lopend)**.*

4. The committee appreciates the manifold valorisation activities of the programme. However, we do see less examples of co-creation than in other universities. We recommend extending its valorisation activities and strategies to more often and strategically stimulate co-creation processes.

*Gegeven de strategische keuzes in het onderzoeksprogramma en het facultaire beleid gericht op academische publicaties in gereputeerde tijdschriften, zijn onderzoekers van de sectie Sociologie van de Radboud Universiteit vooral wetenschappelijk actief en daardoor wellicht minder op het terrein van samenwerking met maatschappelijke partners. Recentelijk (ná de visitatie) zijn echter een aantal mooie voorbeelden van co-creatie vermeldenswaard. Binnen het NWA programma is door onderzoekers vanuit BSI en Sociologie een subsidie binnengehaald (1,7 milj.) om onderzoek te doen naar fysieke activiteit in de levensloop. Dit gebeurt samen met 10 maatschappelijke partners waaronder de HAN, KNVB, KNTB, Sport en Bewegen, Gemeente Nijmegen en het Mulier Instituut. In de slipstream van dit onderzoek is onlangs ook het ZonMw onderzoek Ongelijkheid in sportdeelname onder COVID gesubsidieerd geraakt (4 ton). **(implementatie = lopend)**.*